

The Educational Institution –Belarusian State University of Culture and Arts”
The Department of Culturology

Agreed
Head of the Department
_____ A.I. Smolik
«__» _____ 2022 year.

Agreed
Dean of the Faculty
_____ N. E. Shelupenko
«__» _____ 2022 year.

EDUCATIONAL AND METHODOLOGICAL COMPLEX
ON ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE

**DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE TEXTS OF CULTURAL
ANTHROPOLOGY**

for the specialty of the II stage of higher education 1-21 80 13 Culturology

Compiled by: associated professor Arkadz Babko
Reviewed and approved
at the meeting of the University Council
Minutes No

Minsk 2022

AUTHOR:

Babko, A. I. assistant professor of the Department of Philosophy and Methodology of Humanities, the Educational Institution –Belarusian State University of Culture and Arts”, PhD, associate professor;

REVIEWERS:

The Department of General Scientific Disciplines of the Educational Institution –Institute of Entrepreneurship”; Pozdniakov, A. V. assistant professor of the Management of Social and Cultural Activities Department, the Educational Institution –Belarusian State University of Culture and Arts”, PhD, associate professor.

Recommended by:

Department of Culturology of the Educational Establishment –Belarusian State University of Culture and Arts” Minutes No , 2022); University Council of the Educational Establishment –Belarusian State University of Culture and Arts” (Minutes No , dated 2022).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXPLANATORY NOTE	4
THEORETICAL SECTION	5
PRACTICAL SECTION	15
KNOWLEDGE CONTROL SECTION	31
AUXILIARY SECTION	50

РЕПОЗИТОРИЙ БГУКИ

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The fundamental importance of the course “Discourse Analysis of Texts of Cultural Anthropology” in the context of training researchers in the field of theoretical cultural studies stems from the role of language in culture. According to Hans-Georg Gadamer, “we live in language.” Linguistic practices, however, manifest themselves essentially as discursive practices, permeating all cultural processes. The curriculum on the discipline is designed to help the postgraduate students preparing for research in cultural anthropology, master its (rather complex) theoretical material, form and consolidate methodological and technical skills of discourse analysis of texts of cultural anthropology. In order to ensure the effectiveness of the educational process, it takes into account interdisciplinary links (especially links with other disciplines in which culture is studied). Significant place is also given to the organization of independent work of students, without which the strong assimilation of the material is impossible.

The curriculum contains an explanatory note, theoretical and practical sections, a section on knowledge control and an auxiliary section. The theoretical section includes lecture material on all topics of the course. The practical section contains materials for seminars. In the section devoted to the control of knowledge, the criteria for assessing the knowledge of master’s students, questions exam issues, topics of research papers, requirements for them, and assignments for independent work are formulated. The auxiliary part contains the course syllabus.

THEORETICAL SECTION MATERIAL FOR LECTURES

1. THE TEXTUAL PERSPECTIVE IN CULTUROLOGICAL RESEARCH

Keywords: communication theory, cultural studies, cultural text, hermeneutics, literary studies, methodology, rhetoric, sentence, text.

In etymological terms the word "text" is linked to the words of ancient languages, designating certain aspects or types of craft activities (for example, Lat. *-texere* means *-to weave* or *-spin*). Accordingly, in a first approximation, the text is a certain product made of the language material. In the hermeneutic tradition the text is language entity, which requires interpretation. The notion of meaning is in this case of key importance because the text contains a certain sense, to be detected. Certain problems associated with the phenomenon of the text were analyzed in the realm of other traditions. In the field of rhetoric, for example, skillfully built speech is in the center of attention, and it is seen as the result of the efforts of the speaker. In the grammatical tradition utterance is interpreted as the actualization of language as such.

Ancient culture focused more on the sentence than text. The two phenomena were often pointed to with the single term (the similar situation we have even in the case of Plato and Aristotle).

In fact, the phenomenon of the text did not occupy a central place in the theoretical analysis of the language and culture until the second half of the twentieth century. Just at this time, a strong need and a strong intention to create the text theory appeared. There are different ways to consider the text theoretically. It can be understood as a structure, as an ordered set of language elements. In the sphere of communication theory it is regarded as a communication unit.

Cultural text is any object, phenomenon, process, action that expresses the culturally relevant meaning. In this interpretation, the whole cultural space and everything that happens in it, appears as a text. In accordance with it the study of culture can be presented as her "reading". From here the very important methodological consequences follow: cultural studies can and should be based on techniques developed in the field of literary studies, on the methodology and techniques specific to disciplines occupied with the analysis of texts.

A very important precondition for broad applying the text concept, for its extension to different cultural phenomena was R. Barthes' idea of difference between the text and work. The Text is for him a methodological field. It cannot be displayed because it is in the process of production ("The text is experienced only in an activity of production"). Therefore, the Text is subversive: it is directed against old fashion to understand writing.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

Which approach to the study of text do you prefer? Why?

Why did the text not occupy a central place in the theoretical analysis of the language and culture until the second half of the twentieth century?

How do you understand the term "cultural text"?

2. THE ESSENCE AND PECULIAR FEATURES OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND ITS TEXTS

Keywords: archeology, cultural anthropology, linguistics, text of cultural anthropology

The etymology of the term –anthropology” indicates that here we are dealing with the study of man. There are different types of anthropology, because man is an inexhaustible, complex, versatile creature. Cultural anthropology studies the cultural dimension of human existence. According to the encyclopedic definition of this discipline, it is –a major division of anthropology that deals with the study of culture in all of its aspects and that uses the methods, concepts, and data of archaeology, ethnography and ethnology, folklore, and linguistics in its descriptions and analyses of the diverse peoples of the world”. Modern cultural anthropology explores a variety of types of cultures and cultural phenomena. However, the focus of scholars (today, as before) remains non-European ethnic communities.

The interaction of philosophy and cultural anthropology is an extremely important factor in the successful development of anthropological research. In the process of this interaction a reliable worldview and methodological basis of the mentioned researches is developed, the fundamental concepts involved in them are defined, their prospects are outlined.

It should be noted that the term –anthropology” has been used in the history of philosophy and science in various senses. In theological discourse, for example, he was given the meaning of attributing human characteristics to God. Important in the context of understanding the essence of anthropology and its texts is the fact that in the early New Age –first through Descartes and Hobbes, and then Lametri and beyond –nature was the benchmark for a true anthropological definition of man. In this regard, nature –such as the body –and natural differences between people are identified as significant and important (we are talking about gender, age, temperament, character, race).

However, Kant sees anthropology differently: this science, in his opinion, should focus not on how nature created man, but on how he creates himself. And in this case, however, one can find interrelationships between philosophical tradition and cultural anthropology. In the history of philosophy and science we find many examples of these relationships. Thus, anthropology, which originated in the tradition founded by K. Wolff, soon became closer to ethnographic and ethnological research with an inherent interest in the constant and variable aspects of human existence.

Turning again to anthropology, which focused on the natural characteristics of man, to natural philosophical anthropology, we note that its focus on these characteristics is organically related to the interest in early cultures that show a strong natural basis. An identical situation occurs in the case of structural anthropology with its radical ahistorism.

Cultural anthropology interacts intensively with other scientific disciplines. A striking example of such interaction is its relationship with archeology. Archeological discoveries make it possible to more clearly identify and better understand the past of those cultures studied by anthropologists, and the achievements of the latter, in turn, give archaeologists effective means to adequately interpret their findings.

The term –text of cultural anthropology” can be understood (according to the textual approach) as everything that is studied in the scope of this discipline, because culture acts as a text and, exploring its various incarnations, we deal with a variety of texts. Among them, a significant place belongs to the text embodied in the language of a community (oral or written). The most important tasks of cultural anthropology include the collection, interpretation and evaluation of various monuments of a particular culture, created in ethnic language (myths, fairy tales, proverbs, etc.). However, this term can be interpreted as a reference for those works in which the results of relevant research are recorded.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

What is the essence of the relationship between philosophical and cultural anthropology?

How do you explain the ambiguity of the term "anthropology"?

What interpretations does the term –text of cultural anthropology” allow?

3. THE GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF DISCOURSE, ITS STRUCTURES AND TYPES

Keywords: discourse, discourse analysis, discourse practices, meaning, post-structuralism, structuralism.

The term –discourse” is very actively used by scientists. In many cases, however, it is used without being clearly defined. In addition, it has different meanings in different contexts. Sometimes it is interpreted very widely, as a particular way of understanding of and speaking about the world (or certain aspects of it). Other authors understand it in more special manner, and it is regarded as the internal order of the text. It should be kept in mind that very often its use is based on the idea that the language practices of people in various areas of public life are determined by certain characteristic just of them basic language structures. In this regard, we are talking about educational, religious or political discourse.

In structuralist and post-structuralist traditions the analysis and use of this concept is rooted primarily in the idea that man's relation to reality must be regarded as mediated by language.

First of all the research of French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926-1984) must be considered as highly important for the clarification and application of discourse concept. The theory concerning the discourse practices was developed by him in the first (–archaeological”) period of his work. He was interested in the first place, why certain statements are seen in an epoch as meaningful, as claiming to be true. His approach has, therefore, a historical character: the discourse is not considered as an abstract form which is significant and valid for all ages and

cultures, but as a piece of history. It is an important characteristic feature of discourse that it is able to set its own limits, its inherent temporality form, and its specific modifications. The philosopher defines this phenomenon as a set of statements which has a peculiar form of foundation. Although in every area of public life an infinite number of views can be expressed, what is spoken out in fact does not manifest itself as a great variety. Rather we can see that the views expressed are repeated in different variations. Discourse acts as a set of statements that went through a kind of filter, through a system of rules by which their meaning and significance are determined.

The majority of researchers working in the field of discourse analysis take upon the most essential features of Foucault's approach presented above. But unlike him, they articulate the aspect of interdiscursive competition, the struggle of discourses with each other, conflicts and collisions taking place in their relationship.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

Why is the term "discourse" so popular among scientists?

What are the most important features of M. Foucault's discourse theory?

What is the main difference between M. Foucault's approach and theories of other researchers working in the field of discourse analysis?

4. THE CONTEXTUAL ASPECT OF DISCURSIVE PRACTICES

Keywords: context, discourse, external context of discourse, internal context of discourse.

Discourse analysis cannot be complete if it ignores issues related to the contexts in which discursive practices occur. In the first approximation, the context of discourse is made by the conditions in which it occurs and which directly affect its implementation. These conditions (contexts) are both internal and external.

The internal context of the discourse is created by its participants. It is determined by their intentions, attitudes towards each other, social status and roles, the ratio of their knowledge levels, their communicative competence, etc. Obviously, the internal context of the discourse significantly affects its course and results. At the same time the character of pronunciation acquires extremely important value. When the bearers of discursive practices use expressions that convey a polite and tactful attitude to the interlocutor, listener, recipient, or show sympathy, deep respect, love for him, it creates a context that contributes to its successful deployment. In the case of the use of expressions with the opposite pragmatic meaning (antipathy, contempt, hatred) there is an internal context, which prevents the disclosure of its informational, communicative, creative potential.

Significant aspects of the internal discursive context are the interest (or disinterest) of its participants in creating it, their goals and desires. (In this point, the "resurrection of the author" is highly demanded, because the aspirations of another and his attitude towards me are essential to me.)

Discursive practices take place in certain socio-cultural conditions, which also significantly affect the nature, structure and subject matter of propositions,

speeches, texts. Even when speaking to our friends and like-minded people, we somehow take into account the conditions in which the communicative communities to which we belong are located (from local to global). This means that a successful and fruitful study of discourses is impossible without the involvement of theoretical achievements, methods, cognitive procedures accumulated by the humanities.

The internal and external contexts of discursive practices influence the nature of discourse development primarily through the reflexive activities of their participants (although the level of this reflexivity obviously varies). In the scope of certain areas of discourse analysis, the need to involve research tools developed in cognitive psychology in the study of relevant phenomena is indicated. Participants in discourses of various kinds always create certain mental models of the contexts in which discourses occur. Without them, we cannot adequately describe and understand how discursive practices function and how they are affected by the conditions in which they occur.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

Do you think the question of the priority of the internal or external context of discursive practices is correct? If so, which one do you attach primary importance to?

Describe the mechanisms of formation of the internal and external context of discursive practices.

How is the interdisciplinary nature of discursive analysis manifested in the study of contextual problems?

**5. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: THEORETICAL AND
METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS**

Keywords: discourse analysis, episteme, ideology, language, poststructuralism, structuralism.

The epistemological work of Gaston Bachelard played an essential role in the formation of philosophical basis of discourse analysis developed in the French-speaking world. His notion of epistemological break contributed to the conceptualization of history of science in terms of discrete. M. Foucault's notion of episteme (fundamentally important for his discourse theory) was heavily influenced by it. In the case of M. Pêcheux the influence of Gaston Bachelard is combined with the big impact of Marxist and psychoanalytic ideas (the traditional concept of subject should be checked and changed just with help of these ideas as he thought). For him discourse analysis is a highly important tool to do the research in the sphere of social sciences, and even more – to establish these sciences as proper sciences (i. e. to free them from the dictatorship of the social ideologies, because he thinks that "any science is initially the science of the ideology with which it breaks").

Discourse analysis is deeply linked to the structuralist and poststructuralist philosophy of language. Its fundamental idea according to which our relation to the reality is mediated by language is highly important for discursive analytics. Language is regarded as a tool with help of which we are constructing the social

world, including relations between individuals and their identities. The links between the system of linguistic signs and reality is conventional and changeable. Poststructuralist view of language is genetically linked to the structural linguistics. It borrows from its predecessor the idea according to which signs have meanings not thanks their connections with reality but on the basis of internal relations within their own network. At the same time it rejects characteristic of structuralism ascribing to the language structure such features as rigid stability, not-changeability and totality. The existence of structure is obviously not denied, it is seen as temporary and dynamic. And just the language use is that makes it movable and changeable.

In many texts devoted to the topic the fundamental role of philosophical ideas of M. Foucault in the development of discourse analysis is stressed. His idea that truth is a discursive event and not the reflection of pre-existing, independent from mind reality led him to the problem how the standards of truth and falsity are historically created, how they operate in different historical epochs. At the very center of attention should be the problem of ways by which discursive practices create the effects of truth. The task is to understand how these practices produce the impression of being linked to the truth and falsity as representations of reality. The impact of Foucault's ideas is very strong in the issue related to the subject of discourse. According to him "discourse is not the majestically unfolding manifestation of a thinking, knowing, speaking subject". In contrast, the subject is created by the discursive processes.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

Why are the ideas of Gaston Bachelard so relevant in the formation of philosophical basis of discourse analysis developed in the French-speaking world?

What role did structuralist and poststructuralist philosophy of language play in the process of formation and development of philosophical framework of discourse analysis?

What is your attitude towards the ideas of M. Foucault? Do you agree with his understanding of truth and subject?

6. THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL CHARACTER OF THE DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF TEXTS OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Keywords: cultural anthropology, discourse analysis, linguistics, poetics, pragmatic aspect of language, rhetoric, Russian formalism, semiology, semiotics, sociolinguistics, sociology, speech act theory, text linguistics.

Discourse analysis has an interdisciplinary character. It is linked to the fact that discursive procedures can be successful only if they pay attention to complex interrelationship between discourse, knowledge, power, society and culture. Their interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary character manifests itself in different ways: not only its well-developed forms but also its historical roots are interdisciplinary. A very long tradition of language study (including the investigation of language use) is an essential factor of its formation. In this context a special role was played by classical rhetoric. As Teun A. van Dijk put it, "classical rhetoric both anticipates contemporary stylistics and structural analyses of discourse and

contains intuitive cognitive and social psychological notions about memory organization and attitude change in communicative contexts". At the same time the impact of poetics on the discursive analytics should be regarded as essentially important.

An important point in the prehistory of discourse analysis is the interdisciplinary intellectual movement of early twentieth century called "Russian formalism". In its scope the structural analysis of discourse was a remarkable and productive research endeavor ("Morphology of Folktale" by V. Propp). Another essential factor of this process was structural linguistics which gave the mighty impulse to structural analysis of culture and cultural texts. The study of signs (semiotics and semiology) was of great importance for the emergence and later development of discourse analysis too.

A very important factor of this process was the fruitful interaction between cultural anthropology and (first of all structural linguistics). At the same time sociolinguistics stimulated the interest into the study of language use, different communicative forms and their effects, the links between discourses and their historical, social and cultural contexts. The discourse analysis can draw not only upon sociolinguistics but also upon the results of sociological research. First of all, the sociological trend to investigate everyday communication forms as a very essential part of social reality gave a very rich and miscellaneous material for discursive analytical practices.

The next step in the development of linguistics which was concomitant to the emergence of modern discourse analysis and very influential for its disciplinary rise was the formation of text linguistics. This process started in the middle of the sixties in the twentieth century.

The very effective research tools for discursive analytical procedures were granted by cognitive sciences. Computing the understanding of language is a convincing example of such tools.

All these disciplines and theories gave and give inspiration to modern discourse analysis, were and are used within discursive analytical practices. Not only scientific theories, however, essentially influenced these practices. The development of philosophical language studies was highly relevant in this context too. First of all the articulation of pragmatic aspect of language should be mentioned here. The speech act theory is a brilliant example of this development, and it became a very important source of inspiration for discourse analysis. (The main idea of speech act theory is that speaking is not limited to producing some linguistic entities but is also a socially relevant action. If I say, for example, to somebody "My congratulations", I am not only speaking it, but also doing the action of congratulation.)

Discourse analysis is embedded in humanities, in their whole structure. It can start from different perspectives (linked to different disciplines), using different research tools. At the same time formal sciences (logic for example) are really important within its scope. And the role of philosophy in discursive analytics should not be underestimated.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

Why is discourse analysis an interdisciplinary research field?

What is the link between the modern discourse analysis and classical rhetoric?

Which trends in linguistic studies are peculiarly important for discourse analysis? Why?

7. THE ANALYSIS OF TEXTS OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY WITH RESPECT TO DISCURSIVE FORMATIONS

Keywords: discourse, discourse analysis, discursive formation, field of discursivity.

The concept of discursive formation seems to be problematic in some way. What is its meaning, place and role within the conceptual apparatus of discourse analysis? Why is it necessary?

For Michel Foucault the necessity of the concept “Discursive formation” is determined by the fact that we should describe the way how discourses exist. The philosopher describes the way of discourse existence on the basis of his vision of interrelationships between the discreteness and continuousness (this issue is of fundamental importance within the whole of his research). How are the discursive statements linked together? First of all the thinker analyzes the possible ways how the principle of discontinuity could operate within the scope of discourse and determine its unity. He distinguishes four possible ways through which it could do so and rejects all four as failing to achieve the goal. These possibilities are linked to the uniting effect of the same object, to the similarity of the statements themselves rather than their objects (similarity in style, vocabulary and so on), to the use of the same concepts, and to the same theoretical, thematic basis.

Neither of these possibilities, however, can assure the continuity of discourses. The first of them is invalid, because there are no consistent objects throughout history. Each candidate for the role of a single object of discourse is indeed a conglomerate of different objects, which appear successively or simultaneously in the historical development of cognitive activities. The second way is failing to achieve the goal because of different reasons (one of them is that the vision of what the procedure of description is like is changing throughout history in connection with new approaches, models and standards). The third idea is not successful because of the steady transformation of our concepts in the process of cognition. And the same can be said about the theoretical, thematic basis. It could be always the home of very different discourses.

Under these conditions the only way to describe the discursive practices is finding out the regularities within the processes of dispersion of discursive statements. The existence of such regularities allows make conclusion about the presence of discursive formations. The rules according to which the dispersion of statements occurs are called the rules of formation. These rules are differentiated in themselves: there are rules of existence, coexistence, maintenance, modification, and disappearance.

In the discourse theory presented by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe a very important concept was introduced which shows the relations between discourses and contextual discursive entities. It is “field of discursivity”, and it refers to the sphere of the excluded by a given discourse meanings of the signs. Discourses are in the state of constant tensions with their fields because the meaning fixation within them is always contingent and therefore is in the danger of change. The field of discursivity can always deliver the impulses for this change and the new variants of meaning fixation. The corresponding tensions manifest themselves in very clear way in the most important, central signs in the discourse structure. E. Laclau and Ch. Mouffe called them “nodal points”. Because of their fundamental importance they are in the epicenter of struggle between different discourses. And from this standpoint they are the “floating signifiers”: their meaning is extremely open to the change.

This opens rich possibilities for innovative behavior. Every statement entails something new although it is rooted in the past use of language and corresponding signs. If there is permanent possibility of challenging and undermining existing discourses (which never have complete structures), then there is always room for creative activities.

The critics of this theory point out to the not clear enough representation of extra-discursive fields by E. Laclau and Ch. Mouffe: are they formless and non-structured or do they have internal order? And how far do discursive fields reach? The critics say that the researchers do not separate the sphere situated far away from a given discourse and the sphere closely related to it.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

What role does the concept of discursive formation play in the M. Foucault’s theory of discourse?

How is the concept “Field of discursivity” defined in the discourse theory of E. Laclau and Ch. Mouffe?

Which of the presented in the text approaches do you prefer? Why?

8. THE METHODOLOGICAL BASIS AND TECHNIQUES OF DISCURSIVE ANALYSIS OF TEXTS OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Keywords: cultural anthropology, cultural connotations, cultural text, culturology, linguocultural studies, meaning, semiotic understanding of culture, textual analysis.

The methodology for identifying the meaning in different texts is called “textual analysis”. This analysis can be done in very different ways, some of which contradict each other. It can also have different philosophical bases. It can be based for example on realist principle. In this case the text is considered from the standpoint how deeply and accurately the reality is represented in it. Within the scope of structuralist tradition the text should be analyzed to reveal the basic structures immanent in it and fundamentally important for its understanding.

It is clear that the textual analysis has necessarily to do with linguistic forms of representation of ideas, thoughts, insights etc. How can it be important in the scope of culturology and cultural anthropology? Within the textual approach to the

investigation of culture the corresponding strategies, methods and techniques considered to be effective and fruitful. Why is it so? It is very important to take into account that the textual approach in these disciplines sphere is deeply linked to the semiotic understanding of culture. Just this understanding makes it possible to introduce the metaphor –“Culture as text”. So, this metaphor stands for the insight that the socio-cultural life is based on –collective systems of meaning”. These systems have different character and material embodiment. The point is that they produce sense.

In accordance with it the investigation of cultural phenomena must be first of all identification of their meaning. It is clear that R. Barthes’ idea of text as a methodological category and as a mobile entity is of great importance for approaching these phenomena in the –textual” way. Within this theoretical framework the researcher becomes a co-producer of meaning, a co-author of a text (we remember that text is open to different interpretations).

There are essential difficulties in reading the texts within the scope of cultural anthropology. The understanding of symbols is always a serious task. The proper taking into account the interrelationship between the text and context is not so easy too. It is important that the different patterns of associative thinking are characteristic of different cultures and they manifest themselves in the corresponding texts. Moreover, the language signs have specific cultural connotations. To understand these patterns and these connotations you must do intense linguocultural studies. It is absolutely clear that to be valid an interpretation of texts of cultural anthropology must have a solid empirical foundation. Therefore, you must read as many texts as possible and this reading must be as attentive as possible.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

Do you agree that textual approach can be fruitful in the sphere of cultural anthropology?

What are the conditions of its effectiveness and fruitfulness?

Does it have any relevance for your research?

PRACTICAL SECTION
MATERIAL FOR SEMINARS

THE TEXTUAL PERSPECTIVE IN CULTUROLOGICAL RESEARCH.

***Textual seminar on the essays of R. Barthes “From Work to Text” and
“The Death of Author”***

1. Prerequisites for a new vision of the relationship between text and work, author and reader.
2. Text as a methodological field.
3. The relationship of Roland Barthes' interpretive strategies in relation to the text and the work, the author and the reader.
4. Consequences and significance of a new understanding of the text and the work, the author and the reader.

R. Barthes
From Work to Text

It is a fact that over the last few years a certain change has taken place (or is taking place) in our conception of language and, consequently, of the literary work which owes at least its phenomenal existence to this same language. The change is clearly connected with the current development of (amongst other disciplines) linguistics, anthropology, Marxism and psychoanalysis (the term ‘connection’ is used here in a deliberately neutral way: one does not decide a determination, be it multiple and dialectical). What is new and which affects the idea of the work comes not necessarily from the internal recasting of each of these disciplines, but rather from their encounter in relation to an object which traditionally is the province of none of them. It is indeed as though the interdisciplinarity which is today held up as a prime value in research cannot be accomplished by the simple confrontation of specialist branches of knowledge. Interdisciplinarity is not the calm of an easy security; it begins effectively (as opposed to the mere expression of a pious wish) when the solidarity of the old disciplines breaks down – perhaps even violently, via the jolts of fashion – in the interests of a new object and a new language neither of which has a place in the field of the sciences that were to be brought peacefully together, this unease in classification being precisely the point from which it is possible to diagnose a certain mutation. The mutation in which the idea of the work seems to be gripped must not, however, be over-estimated: it is more in the nature of an epistemological slide than of a real break. The break, as is frequently stressed, is seen to have taken place in the last century with the appearance of Marxism and Freudianism; since then there has been no further break, so that in a way it can be said that for the last hundred years we have been living in repetition. What History, our History, allows us today is merely to slide, to vary, to exceed, to repudiate. Just as Einsteinian science demands that the relativity of the frames of reference be included in the object studied, so the combined action of Marxism, Freudianism and structuralism demands, in literature, the relativization of the relations of writer, reader and observer (critic). Over against the traditional notion of the work, for long – and still – conceived of

in a, so to speak, Newtonian way, there is now the requirement of a new object, obtained by the sliding or overturning of former categories. That object is the Text. I know the word is fashionable (I am myself often led to use it) and therefore regarded by some with suspicion, but that is exactly why I should like to remind myself of the principal propositions at the intersection of which I see the Text as standing.

The word proposition is to be understood more in a grammatical than in a logical sense: the following are not argumentations but enunciations, touches, approaches that consent to remain metaphorical. Here then are these propositions; they concern method, genres, signs, plurality, filiation, reading and pleasure. 1. The Text is not to be thought of as an object that can be computed. It would be futile to try to separate out materially works from texts. In particular, the tendency must be avoided to say that the work is classic, the text avant-garde; it is not a question of drawing up a crude honours list in the name of modernity and declaring certain literary productions in and others out by virtue of their chronological situation: there may be text in a very ancient work, while many products of contemporary literature are in no way texts. The difference is this: the work is a fragment of substance, occupying a part of the space of books (in a library for example), the Text is a methodological field. The opposition may recall (without at all reproducing term for term) Lacan's distinction between reality and the real: the one is displayed, the other demonstrated; likewise, the work can be seen (in bookshops, in catalogues, in exam syllabuses), the text is a process of demonstration, speaks according to certain rules (or against certain rules); the work can be held in the hand, the text is held in language, only exists in the movement of a discourse (or rather, it is Text for the very reason that it knows itself as text); the Text is not the decomposition of the work, it is the work that is the imaginary tail of the Text; or again, the Text is experienced only in an activity of production. It follows that the Text cannot stop (for example on a library shelf); its constitutive movement is that of cutting across (in particular, it can cut across the work, several works).

2. In the same way, the Text does not stop at (good) Literature; it cannot be contained in a hierarchy, even in a simple division of genres. What constitutes the Text is, on the contrary (or precisely), its subversive force in respect of the old classifications. How do you classify a writer like Georges Bataille? Novelist, poet, essayist, economist, philosopher, mystic? The answer is so difficult that the literary manuals generally prefer to forget about Bataille who, in fact, wrote texts, perhaps continuously one single text. If the Text poses problems of classification (which is furthermore one of its social functions), this is because it always involves a certain experience of limits (to take up an expression from Philippe Sollers). Thibaudet used already to talk –but in a very restricted sense –of limit-works (such as Chateaubriand's *Vie de Rancé*, which does indeed come through to us today as a text); the Text is that which goes to the limit of the rules of enunciation (rationality, readability, etc.). Nor is this a rhetorical idea, resorted to for some heroic effect: the Text tries to place itself very exactly behind the limit of the

doxa (is not general opinion – constitutive of our democratic societies and powerfully aided by mass communications – defined by its limits, the energy with which it excludes, its censorship?). Taking the word literally, it may be said that the Text is always paradoxical.

3. The Text can be approached, experienced, in reaction to the sign. The work closes on a signified. There are two modes of signification which can be attributed to this signified: either it is claimed to be evident and the work is then the object of a literal science, of philology, or else it is considered to be secret, ultimate, something to be sought out, and the work then falls under the scope of a hermeneutics, of an interpretation (Marxist, psychoanalytic, thematic, etc.); in short, the work itself functions as a general sign and it is normal that it should represent an institutional category of the civilization of the Sign. The Text, on the contrary, practices the infinite deferment of the signified, is dilatory; its field is that of the signifier and the signifier must not be conceived of as the first stage of meaning⁶, its material vestibule, but, in complete opposition to this, as its deferred action. Similarly, the infinity of the signifier refers not to some idea of the ineffable (the unnameable signified) but to that of a playing; the generation of the perpetual signifier (after the fashion of a perpetual calendar) in the field of the text (better, of which the text is the field) is realized not according to an organic progress of maturation or a hermeneutic course of deepening investigation, but, rather, according to a serial movement of disconnections, overlappings, variations. The logic regulating the Text is not comprehensive (define what the work means⁶) but metonymic; the activity of associations, contiguities, carryings-over coincides with a liberation of symbolic energy (lacking it, man would die); the work in the best of cases – is moderately symbolic (its symbolic runs out, comes to a halt); the Text is radically symbolic: a work conceived, perceived and received in its integrally symbolic nature is a text. Thus is the Text restored to language; like language, it is structured but off-centred, without closure (note, in reply to the contemptuous suspicion of the fashionable⁶ sometimes directed at structuralism, that the epistemological privilege currently accorded to language stems precisely from the discovery there of a paradoxical idea of structure: a system with neither close nor centre).

4. The Text is plural. Which is not simply to say that it has several meanings, but that it accomplishes the very plural of meaning: an irreducible (and not merely an acceptable) plural. The Text is not a co-existence of meanings but a passage, an overcrossing; thus it answers not to an interpretation, even a liberal one, but to an explosion, a dissemination. The plural of the Text depends, that is, not on the ambiguity of its contents but on what might be called the stereographic plurality of its weave of signifiers (etymologically, the text is a tissue, a woven fabric). The reader of the Text may be compared to someone at a loose end (someone slackened off from any imaginary); this passably empty subject strolls – it is what happened to the author of these lines, then it was that he had a vivid idea of the Text – on the side of a valley, a ouedflowing down below (ouedis there to bear witness to a certain feeling of unfamiliarity); what he perceives is multiple,

irreducible, coming from a disconnected, heterogeneous variety of substances and perspectives: lights, colours, vegetation, heat, air, slender explosions of noises, scant cries of birds, children's voices from over on the other side, passages, gestures, clothes of inhabitants near or far away. All these incidents are half identifiable: they come from codes which are known but their combination is unique, founds the stroll in a difference repeatable only as difference. So the Text: it can be it only in its difference (which does not mean its individuality), its reading is semelfactive (this rendering illusory any inductive-deductive science of texts – no grammar of the text) and nevertheless woven entirely with citations, references, echoes, cultural languages (what language is not?), antecedent or contemporary, which cut across it through and through in a vast stereophony. The intertextual in which every text is held, it itself being the text-between of another text, is not to be confused with some origin of the text: to try to find the sources, the influences of a work, is to fall in with the myth of filiation; the citations which go to make up a text are anonymous, untraceable, and yet already read: they are quotations without inverted commas. The work has nothing disturbing for any monistic philosophy (we know that there are opposing examples of these); for such a philosophy, plural is the Evil. Against the work, therefore, the text could well take as its motto the words of the man possessed by demons (Mark5: 9): My name is Legion: for we are many. The plural of demoniacal texture which opposes text to work can bring with it fundamental changes in reading, and precisely in areas where monologism appears to be the Law: certain of the texts of Holy Scripture traditionally recuperated by theological monism (historical or anagogical) will perhaps offer themselves to a diffraction of meanings (finally, that is to say, to a materialist reading), while the Marxist interpretation of works, so far resolutely monistic, will be able to materialize itself more by pluralizing itself (if, however, the Marxist institutions allow it).

5. The work is caught up in a process of filiation. Are postulated: a determination of the work by the world (by race, then by History), a consecution of works amongst themselves, and a conformity of the work to the author. The author is reputed the father and the owner of his work: literary science therefore teaches respect for the manuscript and the author's declared intentions, while society asserts the legality of the relation of author to work (the droit d'auteur or copyright, in fact of recent date since it was only really legalized at the time of the French Revolution). As for the Text, it reads without the inscription of the Father. Here again, the metaphor of the Text separates from that of the work: the latter refers to the image of an organism which grows by vital expansion, by development (a word which is significantly ambiguous, at once biological and rhetorical); the metaphor of the Text is that of the network; if the Text extends itself, it is as a result of a combinatory systematic (an image, moreover, close to current biological conceptions of the living being). Hence no vital respect is due to the Text: it can be broken (which is just what the Middle Ages did with two nevertheless authoritative texts – Holy Scripture and Aristotle); it can be read without the guarantee of its father, the restitution of the inter-text paradoxically

abolishing any legacy. It is not that the Author may not come back in the Text, in his text, but he then does so as a guest. If he is a novelist, he is inscribed in the novel like one of his characters, figured in the carpet; no longer privileged, paternal, aletheological, his inscription is ludic. He becomes, as it were, a paper-author: his life is no longer the origin of his fictions but a fiction contributing to his work; there is a reversion of the work on to the life (and no longer the contrary); it is the work of Proust, of Genet which allows their lives to be read as a text. The word bio-graphy re-acquires a strong, etymological sense, at the same time as the sincerity of the enunciation –veritable cross” borne by literary morality – becomes a false problem: the I which writes the text, it too, is never more than a paper-I.

6. The work is normally the object of a consumption; no demagogy is intended here in referring to the so-called consumer culture but it has to be recognized that today it is the quality of the work (which supposes finally an appreciation of taste) and not the operation of reading itself which can differentiate between books: structurally, there is no difference between cultured reading and casual reading in trains. The Text (if only by its frequent unreadability) decants the work (the work permitting) from its consumption and gathers it up as play, activity, production, practice. This means that the Text requires that one try to abolish (or at the very least to diminish) the distance between writing and reading, in no way by intensifying the projection of the reader into the work but by joining them in a single signifying practice. The distance separating reading from writing is historical. In the times of the greatest social division (before the setting up of democratic cultures), reading and writing were equally privileges of class. Rhetoric, the great literary code of those times, taught one to write (even if what was then normally produced were speeches, not texts). Significantly, the coming of democracy reversed the word of command: what the (secondary) School prides itself on is teaching to read (well) and no longer to write (consciousness of the deficiency is becoming fashionable again today: the teacher is called upon to teach pupils to express themselves, which is a little like replacing a form of repression by a misconception). In fact, reading, in the sense of consuming, is far from playing with the text. Playing must be understood here in all its polysemy: the text itself plays (like a door, like a machine with play) and the reader plays twice over, playing the Text as one plays a game, looking for a practice which re-produces it, but, in order that that practice not be reduced to a passive, inner mimesis (the Text is precisely that which resists such a reduction), also playing the Text in the musical sense of the term. The history of music (as a practice, not as an art) does indeed parallel that of the Text fairly closely: there was a period when practicing amateurs were numerous (at least within the confines of a certain class) and playing and listening formed a scarcely differentiated activity; then two roles appeared in succession, first that of the performer, the interpreter to whom the bourgeois public (though still itself able to play a little –the whole history of) the piano) delegated its playing, then that of the (passive) amateur, who listens to music without being able to play (the gramophone record takes the place of the piano). We know that today post-serial music has radically

altered the role of the interpreter, who is called on to be in some sort the co-author of the score, completing it rather than giving it expression. The Text is very much a score of this new kind: it asks of the reader a practical collaboration. Which is an important change, for who executes the work? (Mallarmé posed the question, wanting the audience to produce the book). Nowadays only the critic executes the work (accepting the play on words). The reduction of reading to a consumption is clearly responsible for the Boredom⁷ experienced by many in the face of the modern (unreadable) text, the avant-garde film or painting: to be bored means that one cannot produce the text, open it out, set it going. This leads us to pose (to propose) a final approach to the Text, that of pleasure. I do not know whether there has ever been a hedonistic aesthetics (eudaemonist philosophies are themselves rare). Certainly there exists a pleasure of the work (of certain works); I can delight in reading and re-reading Proust, Flaubert, Balzac, even – why not? – Alexandre Dumas. But this pleasure, no matter how keen and even when free from all prejudice, remains in part (unless by some exceptional critical effort) a pleasure of consumption; for if I can read these authors, I also know that I cannot re-write them (that it is impossible today to write like that) and this knowledge, depressing enough, suffices to cut me off from the production of these works, in the very moment their remoteness establishes my modernity (is not to be modern to know clearly what cannot be started over again?). As for the Text, it is bound to jouissance, that is to a pleasure without separation. Order of the signifier, the Text participates in its own way in a social utopia; before History (supposing the latter does not opt for barbarism), the Text achieves, if not the transparency of social relations, that at least of language relations: the Text is that space where no language has a hold over any other, where languages circulate (keeping the circular sense of the term). These few propositions, inevitably, do not constitute the articulations of a Theory of the Text and this is not simply the result of the failings of the person here presenting them (who in many respects has anyway done no more than pick up what is being developed round about him). It stems from the fact that a Theory of the Text cannot be satisfied by a metalinguistic exposition: the destruction of meta-language, or at least (since it may be necessary provisionally to resort to meta-language) its calling into doubt, is part of the theory itself: the discourse on the Text should itself be nothing other than text, research, textual activity, since the Text is that social space which leaves no language safe, outside, nor any subject of the enunciation in position as judge, master, analyst, confessor, decoder. The theory of the Text can coincide only with a practice of writing.

R. Barthes

The Death of Author

<https://genius.com/1529008>

***THE ESSENCE AND PECULIAR FEATURES OF CULTURAL
ANTHROPOLOGY AND ITS TEXTS***

Textual seminar on the essay Brigitte M. French “The Anthropology of Language and Discourse”

1. Theoretical prerequisites for the formation of linguistic anthropology.
2. The key difference between linguistic anthropology and formal linguistics.
3. Prerequisite and creative aspects of the use of language signs (according to Michael Silverstein).
4. Contextual aspect of language functioning in culture.

***Brigitte M. French
The Anthropology of Language and Discourse***

Seeking to understand the myriad ways that language use is inextricably, yet variably connected with the diversity of cultural practices and communities around the globe is an enduring concern central to the human imagination. While inquiries into these relationships between language and social life certainly precede the formalization of linguistic anthropology as an academic sub-discipline in the early 20th century, linguistic anthropology has developed methods and theories by which to systematically research them in broad conversation with interdisciplinary scholars in sociolinguistics, communication studies, and discourse analysis as well as in conversation with community members who are invested in culturally-specific notions, uses, and ideologies of language.

As a central component of consolidating anthropology as an academic discipline, founding scholar, Franz Boas called for the ethnographic investigation of language and asserted that in order to study any aspect of “culture” in a meaningful way, it must be done through the local languages in a given community. As part of the dual project of defining anthropological inquiry and scientifically fighting against racist and ethnocentric scholarship, Boas marshaled comparative historical, ethnographic, and linguistic data to show how peoples’ language, culture, and race could not be neatly mapped onto each other as isomorphic and transparent entities. Rather, Boas demonstrated multiple ways in which language, culture, and race developed along independent historical trajectories within and across communities. In this way, Boas challenged the assumptions and arguments of cultural evolutionary thought prevalent in social science at the time that problematically ranked communities, languages, and races into “primitive” and “complex” ones with European societies and languages at the top of the hierarchy and those in indigenous communities and/or the global South at the bottom. It is from this anchoring historical point moving into the 21st century that linguistic anthropology has empirically demonstrated and is ethically committed to understanding the deep analytic equality of all language varieties in conceptual terms while recognizing their unique structural and semiotic properties and investigating their enduring and dynamic connections to the communities which use them.

Boas' student, Edward Sapir became the first professional anthropologist in the North American context to be fully dedicated to the empirical investigation of the language and culture nexus. Sapir followed the heuristic established by Boas and developed a more robust understanding of human language use in social life. In particular, Sapir pointed to the importance of investigating the inherently creative potential of human language that took multiple linguistic forms and social functions which were not predetermined. Sapir explained: "Once the form of a language is established it can discover meanings for its speakers which are not simply traceable to the given quality of experience itself but must be explained to a large extent as the projection of potential meanings into the raw material of experience. Language has the power to analyze experience into theoretically dissociable elements and to create that world of the potential intergrading with the actual which enables human beings to transcend the immediately given in their individual experience and to join in a larger common understanding. This common understanding constitutes culture." In this way, Sapir directed analytic attention to the productive, rather than merely instrumental, role that language plays in cultural formations in relation to humans' subjective experiences.

The trajectory established by Boas, Sapir, and their students and colleagues in the early 20th century, grounded linguistic anthropology firmly in the empirical investigation of a multiplicity of linguistic forms in a variety of social contexts, a direction that became refined and advanced in new ways in the decades that followed as anthropology burgeoned as a discipline. It is important to note that Boas and his students did so primarily through the study of language structure and use in American Indian communities who were struggling for survival as direct consequences of colonialism and genocide in the Americas. This body of descriptively rich and fine-grained analysis was politically decontextualized from the lives and fates of American Indian communities living with the legacies of colonial nation-states. Nevertheless, it now provides linguistic and cultural data that disciplinary descendants (linguistic anthropologists) and genealogical descendants of anthropological "informants" are now returning to with new and critical perspectives in the 21st century. These recent returns to old linguistic anthropological analyses, in turn, are parts of broader indigenous cultural rights movements and heightened attention to reflexivity in anthropology.

In contrast to the emergence of linguistics as an autonomous discipline that abstracted language from its uses for formal analysis, linguistic anthropologists in the mid 20th century worked to highlight ways that analysis of language must be grounded systematically in social contexts of production. They did so in order to show the ways that language use is of paramount importance to understanding cultural practices, social identities, belief systems, and community membership.

This direction became richly developed by two complementary, yet distinct schools of thought and concomitant theoretical orientations for approaching the analysis of language in ethnographic contexts. Dell Hymes and John Gumperz pioneered the “ethnography of communication” and Michael Silverstein theorized a semiotic approach to questions of language use in social life. Taken together, ethnographic and semiotic approaches to language and culture remain the cornerstone of contemporary research in the field well into the 21st century.

Dell Hymes and John Gumperz demonstrated the centrality of language to the anthropological endeavor and developed a framework for thoroughly investigating it in particular communities that tended to be small and rural in places as distinct as India, Norway, Colombia, Mexico, Senegal, and the United States. They called for an empirical investigation of the multiplicity of participants involved in a communicative moment (including speakers, listeners, signers, audiences, over-hearers, metaphysical entities), the interactants’ goals, the genres of communication deployed, the physical and social setting of communicative events, the codes, registers, and dialects used in them, the social frame of the communicative event, and the culturally normative expectations for participation in them. These key components of ethnographies of communication highlighted the importance of language use for defining membership in local speech communities as well as for the successful performance of culturally-appropriate language use in specific contexts. In other words, this direction in linguistic anthropology stresses an understanding of language as a form of action – the doing of language by human actors along with the constitutive role language plays in social identity.

A precise understanding of the specific mechanisms by which language becomes a form of action that has multiple consequences in the world has been developed by Michael Silverstein’s semiotic approach to the language and culture nexus. Drawing upon the insights of Prague school linguist, Ramon Jakobson, Silverstein pointed to the multifunctionality of the linguistic sign and mobilized a Peircian model of signification to identify how linguistic forms and social functions become activated in discourse well beyond the purely referential to encapsulate multiple pragmatic meanings. In particular, Silverstein’s theorization of Peirce’s indexical sign has become key to the empirical mapping of meaning-making among social groups in specific cultural contexts, the cornerstone of linguistic anthropological research. An index is a kind of sign modality in which there is a co-occurrence in space or time between the sign vehicle and the entity which it is understood by a group to represent. To put it another way, the sign and the thing that it represents to a particular group “go together” in a given context. For example, what are colloquially referred to as regional “accents” become indexes of particular geographical areas in that linguistic forms of dialect variation

(lexicon, phonology, morphology, and syntax) mark speakers among their interlocutors as people from a particular part of the world that is identifiable. Likewise, dialect and code variation often index age, generation, gender, sexual orientation, class, race, religion, and other collective forms of identity in myriad communities around the globe.

Of course, such assumptions of co-occurrence between features of discourse and cultural identifications are much more complicated, change over time, and can be strategically deployed for different ends by social actors. To analytically account for the historically-grounded as well as the interactionally dynamic aspects of language use and social meanings ascribed to them through semiotic processes, Silverstein makes the sharp and useful distinction between indexical presupposition and indexical creativity. Indexical presupposition accounts for the history of language use, the commonplace assumptions about it, and the contextually established expected uses of linguistic forms and their concomitant social associations in a given context. Indexical creativity, however, allows analysts to demonstrate the emergent, contingent, and incipient changes that may happen when linguistic forms and their social meanings are in question or are in change. Silverstein puts it in the following way: “Adherence to the norms specified by rules of use reinforces the perceived social relations of speaker and hearer; violations constitute a powerful rebuff or insult, or go into the creation of irony and humor”. In this direction, honorifics, pronouns, other terms of reference and address used in discourse are rich sites for the empirical investigation of normative (indexically presupposed) and transgressive (indexically creative) forms of language use; as are explorations of shifts in generic structure, narrative, and linguistic features indicating temporality deployed by individuals and social groups in specific ethnographic contexts.

Taken together, empirical approaches developed by ethnography of communication scholars and semiotic approaches theorized by Periclan-informed linguistic anthropologists, provide a robust framework for the multilayered investigation of the ways in which social meanings are erected upon linguistic and discursive features that emerge in any given social context. To put it another way, a marriage of ethnographic and semiotic approaches in the anthropological study of language makes up the core of scholarly work in the field and directs us to the methodical analysis of meaning-making in embedded linguistic, discursive, interactional, social, and political contexts and relationships among them. Here, the notion of context refers to a layering of kinds of context that move from micro- to macro-levels and the dynamic and unfolding influences among them. The linguistic context refers to the immediate paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations in which a linguistic feature may or may not occur, such as the absence or presence of

post-vocalic /r/ in varieties of spoken English or the use of one language among many code possibilities in a multilingual educational setting. The discursive context is the broader genre of language use or speech act within which a particular linguistic feature appears, such as turn-taking in a casual conversation among friends or a highly structured security interview at an international airport. The interactional context denotes the ethnographically-observed participants, social norms, strategic deployment of discourse in which generic features as well as linguistic features can be foregrounded or backgrounded by interlocutors. Attention to the immediate social context highlights the fields of solidarity, inequality, belonging, identity, epistemology that are operative in framing interactional moments that guide expectations and interpretations of language use. The political context, which always, already imbricates all of the aforementioned layers of contextual analysis, brings to light explicitly the historical circumstances in which language and culture become overtly mobilized or self-consciously ignored by interested groups and institutions. National language policies, legislation against hate speech, and election oratory are but a few examples of this layer of context central to linguistic anthropological analysis. In the 21st century, a focus on politicized contexts in linguistic anthropology means there is a necessity for careful analytic attention to institutionalized structures of inequality along race, class, geographical, gendered, and geopolitical terms as well as attention to processes of war, genocide, transitional justice, human rights movements, indigenous rights movements, environmental justice efforts, and refugee crises when they are contextually salient to the study of the social uses of language.

.THE GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF DISCOURSE,ITS STRUCTURES AND TYPES

Seminar

1. The polisemic character of the term *“discourse”*.
2. The statement as a unit of discourse.
3. The planning, production and reproduction of discourse.
4. Interpretation of discourse in different philosophical and culturological traditions.

Literature:

https://monoskop.org/images/9/90/Foucault_Michel_Archaeology_of_Knowledge.pdf (Chapter 1).

Jørgensen, M. Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method / M. Jørgensen, L. Phillips. – London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 2002. – P. 1-3.

Macleod, C. I. Deconstructive Discourse Analysis: Extending the Methodological Conversation / C. I. Macleod. – South African Journal of Psychology. – 2002. - № 32 (1). – P. 4-10.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/29806807_Deconstructive_discourse_analysis_Extending_the_methodological_conversation)

THE CONTEXTUAL ASPECT OF DISCURSIVE PRACTICES

Seminar

1. The external and internal contexts of discourse.
2. The interrelationship between discourse structures and historical as well as cultural macro-contexts.
3. The context of discursive actualization of a particular text.

Literature:

Ifversen, J. Text, Discourse, Concept: Approaches to Textual Analysis / J. Ifversen. – Kontur, 2003. – №7. – P. 62-63.

Van Dijk, T. A. Relevance in Text and Context / T. A. van Dijk
<http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Relevance%20in%20text%20and%20context.pdf>.

Нестерчук, Г. В. Дискурс-анализ = Discourse analysis / Г. В. Нестерчук, Н. А. Тарасевич. – Минск : Народная асвета, 2019. – P. 12-16, 19-20.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS

Seminar

1. Discourse analysis as a theoretical and methodological whole.
2. The philosophical bases of different discourse analytical traditions.
3. A critical approach to taken-for-granted knowledge as a fundamental characteristic of discourse analytical perspective.
4. The account for the historical and cultural specificity of human knowledge within the scope of discourse analysis.

Literature:

Jørgensen, M. Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method / M. Jørgensen, L. Phillips. – London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 2002. – P. 3-18.

THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL CHARACTER OF THE DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF TEXTS OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Seminar

1. Discursive reading and analysis of texts of cultural anthropology as a system of cognitive procedures.
2. The complex character of text analysis from the perspective of a particular cultural form.
3. The semiotic analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.
4. The formal aspects of discursive approach to the analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.

Literature:

Van Dijk T. A. Formal Analysis of Metaphorical Discourse / T. A. van Dijk.

THE ANALYSIS OF TEXTS OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY WITH RESPECT TO DISCURSIVE FORMATIONS

Seminar

1. Specific discursive formation as a medium of origin, operation and interpretation of the text.
2. The analysis of text transformations in the dynamics of discursive formation.
3. The impact of contextual formation relations on the procedures of understanding, interpretation, application and creation of a new form of culture.

Literature:

https://monoskop.org/images/9/90/Foucault_Michel_Archaeology_of_Knowledge.pdf (Chapter 1).

Additional literature:

<https://www.sparknotes.com/philosophy/arch/section3/>

Summary

Two problems are already apparent after the first two chapters. The first concerns Foucault's equivocal use of the terms 'statement, event, and discourse.' The second problem is to set out the kinds of 'relations that may be legitimately described between statements.' A key issue here concerns the criteria by which we might say that two statements are 'in continuity,' that they are part of a group (keeping in mind that we've rejected all received notions of continuity in the last chapter). Foucault examines four 'hypotheses' on this matter. The first says that two statements belong to the same group if they refer to the same object. Two statements both belong to psychopathology, for example, if they refer to madness. This hypothesis falls apart, however, because there is no consistent thing called 'madness' throughout history. 'Madness' is not a single object, but a whole slew of different objects, emerging successively or simultaneously at different points in history. Thus, the unity of discourses on madness must actually be based upon 'the interplay of the rules that make possible the appearance of objects during a given period of time.' Far from there being a consistent 'madness' that defines all statements about it as statements belonging to psychopathology, there is only a broad range of statements (in 'daily practice, in law, in religious casuistry, in medical diagnosis') whose *relations* define the development of successive versions of madness. To describe a discursive unity, we then describe those relations. But this leaves us only with a paradox: such a description must address the *gaps and differences* that define the dispersion of the statements under consideration, thus attempting to define the unity of a set of statements by 'formulating their law of division.'

A second hypothesis would be to define a group of statements by certain relatively constant relations of similarity *between* them (rather than by what they refer to). Thus, a discursive unity might be defined by a certain style, a certain 'way

of looking,' or a similarity in vocabulary or metaphor. But this method, too, breaks down into the sheer multiplicity of statements. At one point, for example, Foucault thought that medical discourse might be defined by a certain kind of descriptive mode. But this theory was countered by a recognition that medical discourse is not just a series of descriptive statements, but also included 'ethical choices, therapeutic decisions, institutional regulations, teaching models,' and so on. Furthermore, the very notion of description itself changed throughout history as new models and standards emerged. Any organizing system that sought to define which statements were medical 'disintegrated as soon as it appeared.' Again, rather than individualizing a group of statements based on a simplistic idea of their similarity to each other, we must individualize the specific 'coexistence of these dispersed and heterogeneous statements; the system that governs their division...the way in which they interlock or exclude one another...the play of their location, arrangement, and replacement.'

A third hypothesis would unify a group of statements via the constant, abiding concepts that govern their method; grammar, with concepts like the noun, the verb, or even the word (as the sign of representation), is the clearest example here. But again, no sooner do we choose our stable concepts than we can note transformations of them and emergences of antithetical concepts further on. Again, any discursive unity must operate on the level of these very transformations and incompatibilities, on the variable differences that separate statements. Finally, there is a fourth hypothesis: statements or discourses could be grouped by their 'theme,' the theory that 'direct[s] research from afar.' Thus, we could put all discourses on 'evolution' or 'economics' in a unitary group. If we did, however, we would be ignoring or eliding the fact that a theme like that of 'evolution' can actually cover multiple, even *opposed*, discourses. Thus, evolution in the eighteenth century marked a discourse about the continuity of species, whereas in the nineteenth century it marked a discourse on the interaction of species with the environment. Discourses on economics, too, even when utilizing the same set of concepts, can operate on two entirely different theories of value. Again, we must direct our attention to these shifts and differentials, which in the case of thematics shows us not a constant theme but a 'field of strategic possibilities...that permit the activation of incompatible themes.'

These four hypotheses, then, have each failed, and each generated a new hypothesis. Rather than pursuing any of these four kinds of discursive unity, Foucault's method will be to describe 'system[s] of dispersion' between statements, and seek regularities only there. Wherever such regularities of dispersion can be found, we will say there is a 'discursive formation.' The rules that govern this dispersion will be the 'rules of formation.' These rules are 'rules of existence' for a given formation, but also rules 'of coexistence, maintenance, modification, and disappearance.' Such an approach, Foucault notes, is dangerous in that it may not lead us back to the discursive unities we thought we knew. In fact, it may threaten to leave the historian with only 'a blank, indifferent space, lacking in both interiority and promise.'

Analysis

Having dismissed most major, traditional forms of historical continuity in the previous chapter, Foucault continues by rejecting a series of much more subtle possibilities for unity (possibilities that he himself tried and rejected). The chapter shows that Foucault's aim is not simply to throw out tired old ideas about what unifies various historical statements, but also to reconceive of what it means to look for historical unity or continuity in any form.

The most immediate problem to emerge from Foucault's initial suspension of 'discursive unities' in the last chapter is the difficulty of saying anything about the statements made within disciplines relate to one another. Foucault now begins to address what might seem the most obvious place to start: the divisions of discourse into categories like economics, medicine, or grammar. Although Foucault admits that these groupings of statements seem 'quite obvious' (after all, many historical statements classify themselves under these divisions), this chapter proceeds to show that they are in fact so tricky to define that they cannot be taken for granted at all. Thus, this chapter is partly framed in terms of false starts: Foucault tries out four possible ways to begin specifying coherent groups of statements (by a common object of study, a common style or viewpoint, a constant set of operative concepts, or a common theme), and four times he finds that the relations between the statements are too multiplicitous, shifting, and even dissonant to submit to such organizing principles. A given discourse, even if it can be identified as such, develops as much through sudden irruptions, transformations, contradictions, and differences as it does through constancy or regularity.

But there is more to the failure of these organizing tactics than simply the undermining of unity by the forces of dissonance or transformation. Foucault is actually arguing that unities of discourse are *constituted* by such differences; when we look, with Foucault's method, for the factors that group a set of statements under a single discourse, what we find is a certain singular space in which these statements relate in a wide variety of ways. Our task then, in our pursuit of individualized discourses, must be to detail these relations rather than look for commonalities shared by all of the statements. Each relation can only be a matter of difference, of the relative size and nature of the gap that separates one statement from another. Thus, we arrive at the puzzling paradox that Foucault points to, in which the search for discursive unities can only proceed through the study of the differences that define the discursive relation.

This is why Foucault calls this chapter 'Discursive Formations,' in contrast to the preceding chapter's 'Unities of Discourse.' With groups of statements individualized by the nature and degree of their differential relations to each other (and to other groups of statements), we are really no longer talking about coherent 'groups' at all, but more properly of 'formations,' a term that articulates an identifiable regularity of relations without unjustly emphasizing relations of similarity over those of difference. The regularities that make a given discursive formation identifiable Foucault calls 'rules of formation.' Again, this is a term meant to encompass a broad range of principles of relation: rules of formation are

themselves of many kinds (existence, coexistence, maintenance, modification, and disappearance).

Foucault recognizes that the positing of discursive formations and the rules of these formations does not make a concrete statement, and he does not even promise that discursive formations will take up the slack where false unities of discourses have been rejected. The project remains 'an as yet uncharted land and an unforeseeable conclusion.' We have suspended received notions of grand historical continuity, and now we have even erased the more modest signposts of disciplinary divisions. It remains to be seen whether Foucault's method will reconstitute them.

THE METHODOLOGICAL BASIS AND TECHNIQUES OF DISCURSIVE ANALYSIS OF TEXTS OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Seminar1.

1. Language and communication as fundamentally important subject matters of research in the sphere of cultural anthropology.
2. The necessity of search for the historical and cultural determinants of texts of cultural anthropology.
3. The principle of unity and interconnection of diachronic and synchronic approaches.
4. The principle of unity of semantic and pragmatic analysis in the discourse reading of texts of cultural anthropology.

Literature:

Jørgensen, M. Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method / M. Jørgensen, L. Phillips. – London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 2002. – P. 8-12.

Olssen, M. Discourse, Complexity, Normativity: Tracing the elaboration of Foucault's materialist concept of discourse / M. Olssen. – Open Review of Educational Research. – 2014, vol.1, №1. – P. P. 39-55.

Seminar2.

1. The necessity of the analysis of contextual aspects of creation and understanding of texts of cultural anthropology.
2. The problem of evident and hidden factors influencing the cultural texts creation.
3. The interrelationship of the superficial and deep levels of cultural text meaning.
4. The unity of the process and result in discourse analysis.

Literature:

Olssen, M. Discourse, Complexity, Normativity: Tracing the elaboration of Foucault's materialist concept of discourse / M. Olssen. – Open Review of Educational Research. – 2014, vol.1, №1. – P. 28-39.

KNOWLEDGE CONTROL SECTION

CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS ANSWERS AT THE EXAM

The grade of EXCELLENT (10) is given in the case when the postgraduate's answer is comprehensive and creative, shows a high degree of independent thinking and high analytical skills.

The grade EXCELLENT (8, 9) is given in the case when the master fully covers the content of the examination card, demonstrates a high degree of mastery of the study material and its full understanding, confidently refers to the most important texts on the course, shows the ability to solve theoretical and practical problems, accurately answers additional questions.

A grade of GOOD (5, 6, 7) is given in the case when the master student demonstrates a relatively complete knowledge of the main aspects of the problem, correctly covers the content of the exam card questions, fully answers additional questions.

The answer is assessed with a grade of SATISFACTORY (4), if the master student correctly retells the content of the examination questions and gets his orientation in the study material.

The grade UNSATISFACTORY (1, 2, 3) is given in the case if the master student has not mastered the course material and does not show even partial knowledge of the examination questions.

EXAMINATION ISSUES

1. The concepts of "text", "text of culture", "text of cultural anthropology".
2. The essence of the textual approach to the study of culture.
3. Concept of intertext. The phenomenon of intertextuality.
4. Text of culture and cultural situation.
5. Local and global coherence of the text.
6. The place of the textual approach in the humanities.
7. The most important types of anthropological research. The essence of the relationship between philosophical, natural and cultural anthropology.
8. Linguistic anthropology and cultural anthropology.
9. Worldview and methodology foundations of cultural anthropological research. The fundamental relevance of the concept of "culture" in the field of cultural anthropology.
10. The specifics of the texts of cultural anthropology.
11. The ambiguity of the term "discourse".
12. Statement as a unit of discourse.
13. Taxonomy of discourse.
14. The essence and features of culturological and cultural-anthropological discourse.
15. Culturological and cultural anthropological discourse in the Belarusian spiritual space. Belarusian culturological community.
16. Modernist interpretation of discourse.

17. The study of the relationship between discourse and power in postmodernist theories.
18. Modern constructionist theories of discourse.
19. Discursive practices and sociocultural reality.
20. The problem of individual and collective identity in different versions of discourse theory.
21. External and internal context of discourse.
22. Relationships of texts with contextual discursive formations.
23. Discursive practices as the manifestation of certain forms of mentality, production and transmission of cultural experiences.
24. The problem of the relationship between the formal semantic structure of discursive formation and individual creativity.
25. Basic versions of discourse analysis.
26. Philosophical foundations of discourse analysis.
27. Discourse analysis and hermeneutics.
28. Discourse analysis and deconstruction.
29. Unity of theoretical and methodological aspects of discourse analysis.
30. Formal discourse analysis. Formal aspects of discourse analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.
31. The problem of the relationship between descriptive and normative aspects of discourse analysis.
32. Critical-innovative nature of discourse analysis.
33. Discourse analysis of texts of cultural anthropology as a system of cognitive procedures.
34. –Reflexive turn” in cultural anthropology and discourse analysis.
35. Semiotic analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.
36. Discourse analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology in the context of intercultural dialogue.
37. Interdisciplinary nature of discursive reading and analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.
38. The unity of diachronic and synchronous approaches in the discourse analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology.
39. The principle of unity of semantic and pragmatic aspects of discourse analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology.
40. Methodological significance of postcolonial research in the context of discursive analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.

METHODICAL INSTRUCTIONS ON PREPARATION AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PAPER

The research paper should be an original author's study on the selected problem. The purpose of the essay is to acquire knowledge, abilities and skills to work with scientific literature and design an independent scientific text.

The research paper should include the following sections:

1) The title page, which contains the names of the university and the department, the full title of the theme of the work, the place and year of performance, the surname and name of the performer.

2) The table of contents, which should include the enumeration of all structural blocks of the research paper with the indication of the pages on which the relevant sections begin (the names of chapters and paragraphs are mandatory);

3) Introduction, in which the following requirements should be implemented:

- demonstrating the relevance of the topic of the essay,
- showing the degree of elaboration of the problem under consideration and justification of the novelty of the chosen approach to its consideration,
- formulation of the purpose and objectives of the essay, definition of the subject and object of research,
- definition of research methods;

4) The main part of the essay, containing a critical analysis of modern literature on the selected problem and authorial theoretical generalizations with the corresponding argumentation; its sections should be interconnected through the logics of the presentation so that the research paper is an integral scientific text;

5) Conclusion, which should be scientifically grounded;

6) List of used literature.

LIST OF THE TOPICS FOR RESEARCH PAPERS

1. The concept of text in the history of philosophy and science.
2. J. Lotman's concept of text.
3. Monologic and dialogic genres of discourse and their place in culture.
4. The interdisciplinary nature of discourse analysis.
5. The metatheoretical basis of discourse analysis.
6. G. Bachelard and French discourse analysis.
7. Multiperspectival discourse analysis.
8. Research in the field of artificial intelligence and their place in the formation of discourse analysis.
9. Phenomenological sociology and discourse analysis.
10. Psychoanalytic approach to discursive analysis.
11. The concept of semiosphere and discourse analysis.
12. Discursive psychology as a trend in the field of discourse analysis.
13. Ideology as a subject matter of discourse analysis.
14. The concept of language in the scope of discourse analysis.
15. The "pragmatic" turn in linguistics and its significance in the context of discursive analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.

16. The relevance of structural linguistics for the development of discourse analysis.
17. The relevance of poststructuralism for the development of discourse analysis.
18. The contribution of M. Foucault to the development of discourse analysis.
19. The problems of discourse analysis in the Belarusian philosophy and culturology.
20. The problem of interrelationship between different versions of discourse analysis.
21. The concept of cultural text in the modern culturology.
22. Cultural text as an issue of interdisciplinary studies.
23. The influence of postmodernist philosophy on the discourse analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.
24. J. Habermas' ideas and their significance in the context of discursive analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.
25. J. Derrida's ideas and their significance in the context of discursive analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.
26. J. Lacan's ideas and their significance in the context of discursive analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.
27. A. Gramsci's ideas and their significance in the context of discursive analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.
28. L. Althusser's ideas and their significance in the context of discursive analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.
29. Speech act theory and discourse analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.
30. E. Laclau and Ch. Muff's discourse theory and its relevance in the context of the analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.
31. Automatic discourse analysis and its role in the study of texts of cultural anthropology.
32. Discourse analysis of legal cultural texts.
33. Discourse analysis of political cultural texts.
34. Discourse analysis of texts of cultural anthropology and linguistics.
35. Meta-methodological aspects of discourse analysis of texts of cultural anthropology.

TASKS FOR INDEPENDENT WORK

Read the analysis of the interrelationship between discourses and discursive formations in the book of M. Jørgensen and L. Phillips "Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method" and answer the following questions:

1. The concept of the field of discursivity and its relevance in the sphere of discourse analysis.
2. The concept of the "order of discourse" and its relevance in the sphere of discourse analysis.
3. The possibilities for innovative behavior related to the interactions between discourses and their contexts.

Literature:

Jørgensen, M. Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method / M. Jørgensen, L. Phillips. – London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 2002. – P. 26-30.

Read the essay of Jan Ifversen “Text, Discourse, Concept: Approaches to Textual Analysis” and answer the questions to them (Ifversen, J. Text, Discourse, Concept: Approaches to Textual Analysis / J. Ifversen. – Kontur, 2003. – №7.– P. 60-69).

1. What are the essential features of constructivism?
2. Which concept of text is presented in the essay?
3. How is the interrelationship between text and context explained by the author?

Read the essay of Teun A. Van Dijk “Introduction: Discourse Analysis as a New Cross-Disciplin” and answer the questions to them (Van Dijk, Teun A. Introduction: Discourse Analysis as a New Cross-Disciplin / T. A. van Dijk. <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Discourse%20Analysis%20as%20a%20new%20Cross-Discipline.pdf>)

1. Why does discourse analysis have the interdisciplinary character?
2. Why does the interrelationship between descriptive and normative aspects of discourse analysis matter?
3. What is characteristic of the tradition of critical discourse analysis?

Read the article of T. A. van Dijk “Cognitive Context Models and Discourse” and answer the questions to them (Van Dijk, T. A. Cognitive Context Models and Discourse / T. A. van Dijk.

<http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Cognitive%20context%20models%20and%20discourse.pdf>)

1. The structures and functions of context models.
2. The structure of the context.
3. Text representations (text models) as part of context models.
4. Context models as interface between event models and discourse.

Read the following article of Stef Slembrouk and answer the questions to them.

1. How do you think polyperspectivism and the thematic richness of discursive analysis are explained?
2. How to explain the claims of discursive analysis on the role of the linguistic basis of linguistic anthropology?
3. What does discursive analysis gain from interacting with linguistic anthropology?

Stef Slembrouk

Discourse analysis

Current contributions: the contemporary range of discourse analytical engagements

While one can historically detect a gradual progression from an early, more narrow linguistic interest in the formal and functional mapping of various aspects of the situated utterance to a later, more process-oriented research perspective which lends priority to social questions such as the connections between language and identity, it is probably more accurate to state that discourse analysis has crystallised within language studies in two directions. One can note, on the one hand, a continuation of more linguistic uses of the term, in which discourse is viewed as the layer of meaning which is tied more directly to situations of language use. The focus here is often on large collections of verbal material of a particular situation or activity type and the use of quantitative methods and techniques of corpus linguistics. Specific discourse-related themes are selected for closer attention on aspects of naturalness in informal conversational language use). On the other hand, recent decades have witnessed the formulation of a broad project of discourse studies which more holistically views language use, often in combination with other forms of semiotic behaviour, from the angle of ‘social practice’. Much discourse research thus simultaneously attends to aspects of text and talk, processes of interpretation and cognition, and social-actional dimensions of communicative behaviour as well as its functioning at the level of ideological reproduction and socio-cultural transformation.

Especially in the latter tradition, discourse analysis has often (if not mostly) stood in an applied relationship to the social world, with discourse research oriented to the identification of recommendations for practice (here echoing Brumfit’s definition of applied linguistics as engaged with real-world problems and issues in which language plays a central role). A quite arbitrary list which attempts an impression of the range of possible themes could include: contextual complexity in the processing of cartoons by patients with unilateral lesions, the effects of story sequencing on affective reactions to news broadcasts, self-commodification in dating advertisements, pedagogical focus in foreign language classrooms and the use of repair strategies, media coverage of the genetically modified food debate, the communication of rights in contexts of police arrests and detention, and so on and so forth. Themes under the heading of registering discourse change in response to shifts in socio-cultural values are also many and varied. One such theme has been the interest in ‘technologies of discourse’.

Specific fields of application for discourse research have given rise to specialist off-shoots, such as professional discourse studies with further subdivisions for medicine, law and forensic science, social work etc. Discourse perspectives have been articulated for specific language-related interests. For instance, Hatim and Mason have done this for translation studies; Wadensjö and Roy for interpreting studies; Carter and Simpson for stylistics. While Barton,

Street and Collins and Blot have formulated a (critical) discourse analytical programme for literacy studies, Larsen-Freeman brokered comparable territory for second language acquisition research. Education has, of course, also been a major focus and media discourse. Discourse analysis can thus be summed up as entailing a multi-perspectival take on language use and social life. The themes of identities-in-discourse and identities-as-outcomes-of-discourse are undeniably among the most commonly addressed in research across social domains and fields of application. Instances of discourse analysis will in many cases also draw seminally on various traditions in the study of language use or semiotics. For instance, discursive psychology has developed themes from cognitive psychology such as the nature of everyday explanations, the functioning of memory and attitude by bringing together a conversation analytic perspective with social psychological constructivism.

Multimodal discourse analysis has drawn substantially on a systemic-functional perspective on meaning making for the development of a discourse analysis which is not restricted by an interest in verbal modes of communication, developing instead an interest in how the use of language interacts with other modes and modalities. Having said that, discourse analysis today often continues to lack on the side of a fuller engagement with the terrain of the body-actional behaviour and interactants' engagement with objects within visual range, despite pioneering work by authors such as Charles Goodwin, Christian Heath and Adam Kendon on colour categories, Goodwin on moves in a game of hopscotch and Goodwin on gesture in a framework of cooperative action; Heath on body movement in medical interaction, Heath and Luff on multimedia crisismanagement in London Underground line control rooms and Heath on the gestural embodiment of symptoms; Kendon produced a landmark publication for the study of gesture).

Critical issues and debates: discourse analysis and linguistic ethnography

Discourse analysis has always been a seminal and hybrid exercise. As a result, it may well have been insufficiently theoretically cumulative and methodologically systematic across different studies for it to constitute a bounded discipline in its own right. Lack of standardized terminology and a unifying conceptual framework may put it in a disadvantaged position in a cross-disciplinary perspective. This raises the question of its suitability to fill in the "linguistic" component within a programme of linguistic ethnography. Rampton expresses the view that linguistic ethnography amounts to an umbrella term for different research traditions. His list includes "interactional sociolinguistics and new literacy studies, as well as certain types of critical discourse analysis, neo-Vygotskian research on language and cognitive development, and interpretive applied linguistics for language teaching". The point about linguistic ethnography

then is not the range of sub-traditions and the differences between these, but instead a common subscription to a complementarity between, on the one hand, an ethnographic take on the empirical and detailed investigation of contexts of communication, and on the other hand, detailed analysis of the internal organisation of verbal, linguistic and other kinds of semiotic data.

In the words of Tusting and Maybin, UK linguistic ethnography includes a cluster of research which studies relationships between the micro-level of language practices and the broader context and social order, drawing on linguistics, social theory, and an ethnographic methodology which places the researcher at the heart of the research. This approach highlights particular issues for research into language practices. In this respect, it is interesting to note that, while discourse analysis most surely presents itself as one of the ways of doing the linguistic in linguistic ethnography, the relationship is by means exclusive of other traditions that may fill in what can be meant by detailed language analysis, although Wetherell, in a comment on linguistic ethnographic publications, observed how it produced –some hugely important pieces of research and some of the most inspiring and exciting discourse work to be found anywhere”.

The question can also be phrased in different terms. Is linguistic ethnography likely to involve another linguistic component than one which is oriented to understanding the creation of meaning in contexts of real and naturally occurring language use? The answer may well be no, but diverse traditions of analytical engagement with naturally occurring language use of course do exist and turn out to be relevant. So, while discourse analysis (following Rampton) is not necessarily a preferred partner in a linguistic ethnographic research set-up, a discourse analytical perspective often does come in, and it may come in sideways. This is, for instance, the case where linguistic ethnography involves the adoption of, say, a new literacy studies perspective, which is discourse analytical in its orientations but clearly involves more than just the analysis of discourse.

In addition, one must note that the relationship between linguistic ethnography and traditions of discourse analysis has at times been a critical one. For instance, Tusting and Maybin, wary of the risk of foregone interpretative closure and more tentative in the expression of critical engagements, insist on a cautious relationship with critical discourse analysis. More strongly, such caution may well have provided one of the reasons for the emergence of linguistic ethnography as a project of language study. Slembrouck develops a similar argumentation by locating the critical efforts of discourse analysts in the processual and dialogic terms of ongoing ethnographic contact. So, is this a matter of expected convergence of perspectives? Arguably, discourse analysis requires an ethnographic turn in its own right, irrespective of its teaming up with work that

self-identifies as linguistic ethnographic. Ethnography is then a matter of how discourse analysis is informed theoretically, how it does not take context for granted, insists on separate analyses of context and an engagement in the terms which speak from it (terms which will often be language-use-related but may be quite different). The complementarity of discourse analysis and ethnography within linguistic ethnography may well actually be about the necessary intertwining of accounts of interaction and their contexts, on the one hand, and analysis and interpretation of interactional or textual detail, on the other hand.

It is worth continuing to quote Tusting and Maybin here: –Broadly speaking, these [issues] relate to the nature of the truth claims which can be made on the basis of such work, in regard to the position of the researcher, tensions between participants and analysts, the impact of researchers’ political commitments, the relationship between different levels of social structure, and debates between realist and constructionist views.”

What is perhaps centrally at stake, then, is an openness which is required – and more than that, a necessary epistemological reflexivity which extends not only in the direction of the specific dialogic engagements with society and its actors-participants, but just as much in the direction of how one’s own field of scientific enquiry and activity is being shaped. Tusting and Maybin develop the case of linguistic ethnography’s ancestry in a liberal, humanist commitment: [this] may be a strength of linguistic ethnography, in that it leaves the range of questions that can be addressed relatively wide, and reduces a risk of intrinsic bias for which approaches like critical discourse analysis have been criticized. However, the lack of explicit articulation of a political position for linguistic ethnography may also be a weakness. Where most work in a particular field shares broadly similar underlying political perspectives, the answers to some important questions about the social structures within which action takes place may be assumed rather than examined. These hidden assumptions can shape the development of the field quite considerably, by framing what questions can be asked and the sorts of answers which are acceptable.

For discourse analysis specifically, the main conclusion then is that it serves to benefit considerably from adopting an ethnographic perspective, while embracing the role which it can play within specifically linguistic ethnographic research designs and epistemologies.

Research methods and future directions: recording, transcription and the relationship with fieldwork

It is hard to think of discourse analysis and not to include one or two paragraphs on the many advantages which audio, audio-visual and later digital recording have introduced, when it comes to producing reliable and replicable data

and the potential of this for analysing the social-in-the-interactional. Recording technology has over the past century been improved and refined and its current scope has been expanded tremendously by the advent of digital recording and storage (think, for instance, of the use of radio-microphones, which register the sound within a person's aural range). The current methodological dictate is still that recordings are to be transcribed before analysis. A transcription then counts as a written re-entextualisation of a stretch of recorded speech, often using a combination of conventions specific to writing together with other graphic devices which highlight the relevance of particular aspects of speech, other relevant behaviour and dimensions of activity and situation. The purpose of a transcription is to freeze the interaction so that it becomes amenable to repeated detailed scrutiny for purposes of analysis. Transcriptions come with varying degrees of sophistication and detail, and transcription practice has been detailed as posing particular challenges of authenticity/credibility, accuracy, accessibility/readability, translation and interpretative relevance, while being coloured by specific histories and traditions in the representation of orality in print. While transcription practice in discourse analysis originally tended to restrict itself to the representation of features of talk (including some paralinguistic features), nowadays, with the use of computer software, some of the burdens put traditionally on the written transcription have been lifted. On screen, transcriptions and video recordings are now graphically aligned enabling simultaneous access to a transcribed section and its corresponding video fragment. This is made possible by software such as in vivo transcription.

At the same time, recording practices and the practice of recording have also been debated, highlighting, among other things, the importance of preparatory conditions of sustained observation before recording takes place, the issue of researcher presence during and note-taking during/after the recorded events, the effects of recording itself on the interaction which is being captured, as well as attention to how recordings are selectively invested with viewpoint. Very recent discussions have swung the pendulum back in the direction of sustained direct observation and researcher field notes, as enabling a more comprehensive take on data events. Viewed from this angle, the data techniques of participant observation and interviewing as part of doing ethnography, and those of recording interaction in preparation of detailed analysis of language data present themselves as a complementarity which comes with different kinds of replicability.

My final point is that recent developments in software have actually contributed to this complementarity, as the digital condition also affords new possibilities in the area of integrative databases in which it is not only possible to read the transcription while the recording is being viewed or listened to, but other forms of

data can be accessed alongside, with potentials for cross-coding and cross-medial analysis. Not only has transcription practice been relieved of some of the pressures of exhaustiveness, detailedness and authenticity; at the same time, the terms of what can be included in a digital data corpus have shifted, enabling data holdings of quite diverse ancestry and nature.

Read the following texts and answer the questions to them.

CONCEPT OF INTERTEXTUALITY

Keywords: allusion, dialogue, intertextuality, parody, pastiche, plagiarism, post-structuralism, primary text, quotation, secondary text, structuralism, tertiary text

Inter-text is a text that is related to one or more other texts, especially using allusions to these texts. Thus, intertextuality refers to the phenomenon of interrelationship between texts and using this interrelationship for creating the texts. There are following forms of intertextuality: allusion, quotation, translation, plagiarism, pastiche, parody.

In some sense intertextuality is a normal way how the cultural texts exist because everything created by us is linked to the previously expressed. The level of explicitness or implicitness of these links varies, and yet it is present in any case. It needs by no means to be deliberate in any case, it can have accidental character. The term was introduced by Julia Kristeva in the essay "Word, Dialogue and Novel" (1966). Any text is from her standpoint "a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another". Moreover, she understands the "literary word" as a field in which the intersection of different texts occurs. According to it in the very center of attention "a dialogue of several writings" must be and not the search for fixed meaning. In the end it means that the meaning of a text is explored in a very complex way, and this exploring is always influenced by other texts. In each word (or text) "at least one other word (text) can be read". Approaching a text from this standpoint we must not consider it as a closed system.

One of the consequences of intertextual principle is focusing the research not on texts themselves but on their relations. At the same time within the scope of post-structuralist movement the idea was proposed that intertextuality refers rather to a single texts than to their networks. This approach can be traced back to Plato's dialogues where many voices are to hear which represent different perspectives (potentially different texts).

For some researchers this concept is peculiarly useful in the context of media culture analysis. Considering different media products as texts we can find the new facets of intertextuality here. First of all the texts can be produced in different media and interactions between them should be taken as interaction between the

corresponding media. To account for this kind of interactions the term “intermediality” was coined. In the sphere of media industry the terms “multiplatform” or “cross-media” are used to designate this phenomenon.

Analyzing intertextuality in the sphere of media culture the American scholar John Fiske introduced the concepts of primary, secondary and tertiary texts. The primary texts are devoted to some content. The secondary texts appear as results of the critical examination of them (they are produced by experts, by professional critics). The tertiary texts are not of such noble provenance, because broad audiences are creating them.

The macro-text is a phenomenon which bears some likeness to the inter-text. It can be described in terms of computer science in the following way. It comprises the links that exist among many documents rather than within one document. Typically, many people have contributed documents to macro-text and an institution is involved in maintaining the macro-text system. Maintaining the system involves maintaining both the interface to the documents and the connections among the documents. The many users of a given macro-text are searching for a few documents from a large set. Macro-text doesn't support the browsing of a single document, that is a micro-text facility.

QUESTIONSTO CONSIDER:

What is the difference between the inter-text and macro-text?

Is the differentiation between primary, secondary and tertiary texts useful from your standpoint? Why?

Which form of intertextuality do you think are the most important? Why?

LOCAL AND GLOBAL TEXT COHERENCE

Keywords: coherence, global coherence, local coherence, semantic aspect of text coherence, syntactic aspect of text coherence

The coherence of a text is its consequent logical organization. The coherent text consequently presents some meaning. The relations between its different parts must be arranged in such a way that they would make their own contribution to this meaning. It implies that text coherence essentially depends on how the text is structured. It's evident that in a coherent text content and form make up a unity and that the interrelationship of its ideas is represented in adequate structure.

The text coherence is considered to be highly relevant for text understanding and interpretation. It determines the importance of studying the phenomenon, its essence and kinds. It's important for identifying, rectifying or – in the best case – escaping the incoherence of our scientific papers and other works.

There are different ways to secure the text coherence. For example, if we are preparing a historical text we must pay attention to the chronological aspect of described events. In the scientific text the logical rules and laws are of peculiar importance.

The main types of text coherence are local coherence and global coherence. The first one is linked to interrelationship between bordering on one another text parts. The second one is focused on the whole of a text, on interrelationship between its all units with respect to the whole of its meaning.

The local text coherence has semantic and syntactic aspects. There are different syntactic tools to secure syntactic coherence (for example, the proper use of connectives). With respect to semantic aspect it's important that the contents of two consecutive text parts would be clearly understandable with respect to each other.

The global text coherence demands that every unit essentially contributes to the unfolding the text content, topic and ideas. At the same time their contributions must be organized according to some model, blueprint, system of principles.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

How the global and local text coherence are linked one to another?

What is the main prerequisite of securing the text coherence?

Which aspect of local text coherence is more important?

ROLE AND PLACE OF TEXTUAL APPROACH IN HUMANITIES

Keywords: cultural anthropology, culture as text, interdisciplinarity, literary studies, methodology, sociology, symbolic system, text, textual approach.

A broad understanding of the notion of "text" created the preconditions for the application of textual approach in various spheres of human cognition. In the sociological context an understanding is associated with it of how social life is organized around certain collective symbolic systems. In this regard, a special perspective in the sociological research appears.

The expansion of the concept of "text" on a variety of socio-cultural phenomena and practices serves as the basis for intensive cooperation between cultural studies (and sociology) and literary studies. Strategies, methods and techniques developed in the field of theoretical analysis of literary texts, become important and significant in the area of scientific disciplines dealing with society and culture. At the same time literary studies get richer their analytical capabilities because literary texts are included in the circle of "cultural texts": it allows using in literary research methods developed in social and cultural studies.

The metaphor of "culture as text" has been proposed by Clifford Geertz and the "disciplinary" place of her destination was primarily cultural anthropology. Studies which are conducted in its sphere are considered in connection with it as "reading" and cultural anthropology gets interpretative character. Clifford Geertz points out to the complex nature of interpretative procedures used in the process of "reading" cultural texts. It is extremely important that these texts are considered by him primarily as an expression of people's behavior, of social practices. This kind of textual approach cannot be accused to be antidemocratic, ignoring the everyday cultural contexts (such criticisms were addressed to the literary studies directed to the analysis of "refined texts").

In this regard essential relevant issues in terms of methodology appear. Textual approach serves as a methodological basis for research in the humanities. At the same time the interaction between different disciplines at the level of their methods and techniques is a very interesting and rewarding direction of methodological studies.

It is legitimate to argue that the metaphor –culture as text” acts as a basis for intensive interdisciplinary interactions, for the consistent implementation of the interdisciplinarity principle in the field of human cognition.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

In which research field did the metaphor –culture as text” appear?

Why did the metaphor –culture as text” get interdisciplinary character?

What is your attitude to interdisciplinarity principle?

MODERNIST INTERPRETATION OF DISCOURSE

Keywords: communicative action, communicative rationality, discourse, progress.

The most important place in the modernist vision of discourse is the articulation of its functional nature: discourse is seen as a phenomenon that functions in the course of the progressive development of mankind and aims to promote this development. The dynamics of discourse and language are associated with the need for a more accurate description of new discoveries, interests, attitudes, etc. At the same time in modernist theories a variety of discursive practices (based on ideas of progress, human rights and freedoms) unfolds. These practices are evaluated ambiguously in the scientific literature: their critics point out that they somehow hide social contradictions and problems.

Jürgen Habermas’s philosophical and sociological conception can be seen as the supreme embodiment of the modernist interpretation of discourse. Habermas is sharply critical of the postmodern trend in philosophy and culture. He does not consider modernist theories to be inconsistent with the current state of affairs and refuses to acknowledge that the reason, which is highly valued in modern philosophy, has exhausted its creative potential. In his opinion, rational strategies can and should be used in the social sphere - in cases where a critical and reasoned approach to certain problems is required. Such an approach is required in the scope of communicative action. Communicative action (this term belongs to the most important in his socio-theoretical concept) acts as the embodiment of a special type of social activity: it aims to achieve agreement or mutual understanding between different people about something important to them. Jürgen Habermas calls the rationality involved in the scope of communicative actions accordingly communicative.

Statements made during communicative actions claim to be valid in three forms: first, as the validity of a true statement; second, as the legitimacy of the norm; third as the sincerity characteristic of expressive language. If the mentioned claims do not find recognition in those to whom the statements are addressed, and

there is no agreement between the interlocutors, a discourse becomes necessary within which they are problematized discussed. This phenomenon acquires in the scope of communicative action the character of a supreme authority that decides the fate of all that is said in it. If it is in its ideal form, it establishes the priority of the best arguments and an atmosphere of common search for truth and consent, and excludes privileges related to power or status in the social hierarchy. The normative basis of discourse is expressed in the following rules: all its participants are equal, all opinions, positions, topics can be made the subject of critical consideration, this consideration must be public. It is also important to demand the sincerity of its participants. In such circumstances, the discourse must lead to the victory of the best arguments and the adoption of the best joint decision, on the basis of which its deployment can continue.

In the theory of discourse developed by Jürgen Habermas, the latter obeys the principle of intersubjectivity, while in the concept proposed by Michel Foucault discourse becomes decisive in relation to intersubjectivity.

Critics of Habermas's concept emphasize the unrealistic nature of the standpoint, which postulates an ideal speech situation (a situation in which all discursive norms are met). What prevents, however, each of us from striving to make this lofty dialogic principle the maxim of concrete practical action?

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

How do you explain the characteristics of the modernist vision of discourse?

In your opinion, what socio-cultural factors contributed to the development of Jürgen Habermas's theory of discourse?

INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DISCOURSE AND POWER IN POSTMODERNIST THEORIES

Keywords: discourse, knowledge, postmodern, postmodernism, power, social order.

The term 'Postmodern' has correlative character: its meaning depends on the understanding of what 'Modern' is. Linking the latter to artistic movements around the turn of the twentieth century we should connect the former with trends in arts of the second half of this century. However, the both can be used in a very broad sense as referring to great historical epochs. In this latter context the postmodernism (as a theoretical reaction to one of these epochs) is an attempt of critical reassessment and revision of basic values of the Western culture and society which were formed during the Renaissance and Enlightenment. According to Vaclav Havel, postmodernism is a kind of transitional period, and the distinguishing features of such transitional periods are a mixing and blending of cultures and a plurality or parallelism of intellectual and spiritual worlds. These are periods when all consistent value systems collapse, when cultures distant in time and space are discovered or rediscovered. They are periods when there is a tendency to quote, to imitate, and to amplify, rather than to state with authority or integrate. New meaning is gradually born from the encounter, or the intersection, of many different elements".

The issue of discourse occupies an important place in the research of thinkers who are taken to belong to postmodernism. The work of Michel Foucault is of particular importance in this regard. In the 1970s, he conducted intensive research into the relationship between power and knowledge. Power in its conception is not related to specific individuals or their groups. It manifests itself through social practices. The philosopher emphasizes that it is wrong to consider power as a phenomenon that is exclusively repressive and destructive, because it is characterized by a certain productivity: it is able to create discourses, knowledge, the human body and subjectivity. It should be considered a condition for the possibility of public order. Ordering is the delimitation of objects and the establishment of links between them within different social segments, connected at the same time with each other. According to Foucault, this process is based on the relationship of power. For example, the public sphere, centered on the phenomenon of crime, arose through the emergence of specific institutions (e.g., prisons), distinctive actors (e.g., criminals), and special practices (e.g., re-socialization). In this case, it is also clear that the government is closely linked to the experts: this area cannot be described adequately without taking into account the place and role of criminology in it.

From standpoint of Michel Foucault, power establishes social order in general, and its individual segments in a certain, definite way, excluding other possibilities of this establishment. At the same time, it determines the ways of our pronunciation in the social context in general and in special social contexts. This means that the power also has a restrictive aspect. In this regard, the answer to the question concerning the source of restrictions characteristic of discursive practices is outlined: it is the power that acts as such a source. Power and discourse are inextricably linked: it is discourse that defines us as subjects and at the same time the objects about which we can know and speak. As a result, it is not the subject that speaks, but the discourse (and the language). The subject becomes a medium of discourse and language.

Michel Foucault's concept also has significant implications for addressing the question of the truthfulness of our knowledge. The philosopher argues that this knowledge cannot claim universal truth, for we have no possibility of going beyond certain discourses. The "truth effect" is created within discourses, and this should determine the direction of our research: instead of the question of the truth of knowledge, researchers should focus on how discourses create this effect.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER:

What is the essence of power according to Michel Foucault?

What is the essence of interrelationship between power and discourse?

What is Michel Foucault's attitude to the issue of the truthfulness of knowledge? Do you agree with it? Why?

TESTS

TEST 1

1. Within the ... theoretical framework the researcher becomes a co-producer of meaning, a co-author of a text.
2. A broad understanding of the notion of ... created the preconditions for the application of textual approach in various spheres of human cognition.
3. Literary studies get richer their analytical potential because literary texts are included in the circle of
4. The metaphor of culture as text has been proposed by
5. The metaphor of culture as text has been used primarily in
6. Textual approach serves as a ... basis for research in the different spheres of humanities.
7. The term “intertextuality” was introduced by
8. One of the consequences of intertextual principle is focusing the research not on texts themselves but on their
9. Considering different media products as ... we can find the new facets of intertextuality in this sphere.
10. Interpreted very widely ... means a particular way of understanding of and speaking about the world (or certain aspects of it).
11. The research of French philosopher ... must be considered as highly important for the clarification and application of discourse concept.
12. It is an important characteristic feature of ... that it is able to set its own limits, its inherent temporality form, and its specific modifications.

TEST 2

1. Within the scope of structuralist tradition the text should be analyzed to reveal the basic ... immanent in it and fundamentally important for its understanding.
2. It is important that the different patterns of associative thinking are characteristic of different cultures and they manifest themselves in
3. ... idea of text as a methodological category and as a mobile entity is of great importance for approaching the cultural phenomena in the “textual” way.
4. In the sphere of sociology textual approach means to investigate how social life is organized around certain collective
5. It is legitimate to argue that the metaphor “culture as text” acts as a basis for intensive interactions between different
6. Studies which are based on the textual approach are considered as “reading” and cultural anthropology gets ... character.
7. The meaning of a text is explored in a very complex way, and this exploring is always influenced by other
8. Analyzing intertextuality in the sphere of media culture the American scholar John Fiske introduced the concepts of primary, secondary and tertiary
9. Cultural ... is a state of culture or of its particular segment, which is characterized by internal tensions, contradictions, collisions, and linked to the presence of a variety of possibilities for its self-development.
10. Sometimes discourse is understood in special manner, and it is regarded as the internal order of the

11. In the ... theories discourse practices are considered to constitute the social world, social relations and identities.
12. According to Michel Foucault ... is a set of statements that went through a system of rules by which their meaning and significance are determined.

TEST 3

1. The metaphor "culture as text" has got ... character.
2. Clifford Geertz points out to the complex nature of interpretative procedures used in the process of ... cultural texts.
3. It is absolutely clear that to be valid an interpretation of cultural texts must have a solid ... foundation.
4. It is very important to take into account that the textual approach in ... sphere is deeply linked to the semiotic understanding of culture.
5. ... is a text that is related to one or more other texts, especially using allusions to these texts.
6. In some sense ... is a normal way how the cultural texts exist because everything created by us is linked to the previously expressed.
7. Julia Kristeva understands the "literary word" as a field in which the intersection of different ... occurs.
8. The use of term "discourse" is based on the idea that the language practices of people in various areas of public life are determined by certain characteristic just of them basic ... structures.
9. French philosopher ... defines the concept of discourse as a set of statements which has a peculiar form of foundation.
10. The majority of researchers working in the field of discourse analysis articulate the aspect of ... competition.
11. In structuralist and post-structuralist traditions the analysis and use of the concept of discourse is rooted primarily in the idea that man's relation to reality must be regarded as mediated by
12. From the standpoint of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe discourse is instable, because ... is instable.

TEST 4

1. If we are preparing a ... text we must pay attention to the chronological aspect of described events.
2. The main types of text coherence are ... coherence and global coherence.
3. The local text coherence has semantic and ... aspects.
4. The ... text coherence demands that every unit essentially ... to the unfolding the text content.
5. ... is a text that is related to one or more other texts, especially using ... to these texts.
6. The term "intertextuality" was introduced by in the essay "Word, Dialogue and Novel" (1966).
7. According to the idea of intertextuality in the very center of attention "a dialogue of several writings" must be and not the search for

8. Analyzing intertextuality in the sphere of media culture the American scholar John Fiske introduced the concepts of..., ... and ... texts.
9. In some cases discourse is regarded as the internal ... of the text.
10. The discourse theory proposed by Michel Foucault has a ... character: the discourse is not considered as an abstract form which is significant and valid for all ages and cultures.
11. It is an important characteristic feature of ... that it is able to set its own limits, its inherent temporality form, and its specific modifications.
12. Unlike Michel Foucault, other scientists articulate the aspect of ... competition, the struggle of ... with each other.

РЕПОЗИТОРИЙ БГУКИ

AUXILIARY PART
SYLLABUS
EXPLANATORY NOTE

World culture is a complex, multi-level, full of internal contradictions and collisions system, which affects the development of society on its all directions. In the XXI century, in spite of the clear trend of social and cultural differentiation of various ethnic and national communities, communicative processes have got determinant. In this regard, in the sphere of humanities the notion of “discourse” has come into widespread use. This notion is interpreted first of all as speech, inscribed in the communicative situation.

However, in modern conditions the representatives of social sciences and humanities mean by discourse a communicative phenomenon, a complex, hierarchically organized system of knowledge that contains linguistic and extra-linguistic elements (knowledge of the world, opinions, attitudes, goals of its participants, the ideological aspects, which are necessarily to take into account in order to understand the different texts including the texts of cultural anthropology). In this sense, discourses have important social and cultural implications for the subjects of cultural creative activities.

Culturological knowledge as a part of the humanities also appears in the discursive incarnation. It is now possible to talk about the diversity of culturological discourses, which have different bases. Therefore, the modern fundamental cultural studies serve as a methodological basis for the investigation of discursive practices and discourse features. In turn, discursive analysis acquires fundamental methodological significance in the context of the study of cultural phenomena and processes, including research of a reflexive nature (for example, “reading” texts of cultural anthropology).

Thus, the discipline “Discursive analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology” is a necessary component of the training of future researchers of culture. It organizes knowledge about cultural attitudes and practices, lets culturology and cultural anthropology function as a special types of discourse in the context of the humanities; it forms a special knowledge and competencies the masters in this field need to carry out their professional research and teaching activities.

Masters, who has managed the educational master program on specialty 1-21 80 13 “Culturology”, must possess the following specialized *competence* (SC-6): be skilled in the discourse analysis of culturological texts.

The purpose of the course is to deepen the professional condition of the masters in the field of theory and methodology of culture, of modern scientific achievements and development trends in the sphere of culturology.

The objectives of the discipline:

- to form an idea of science as a system of knowledge, which is based on specific principles, logic and methodology;

- to characterize the structure and substantive content of contemporary cultural discourses;
- To ensure knowing and using by masters the system of the key terms and definitions of the categories, fundamentally important for successful cultural studies;
- to develop masters' academic competences needed to perform research and innovation in the field of cultural studies;
- to facilitate the acquisition of practical skills of investigating the texts of cultural anthropology;
- to foster scientific creativity and innovative thinking that is based on the values of science; develop the skills of independent work with the texts of cultural anthropology.

As a result of studying the course masters must **know**:

- the history of science as a system that constantly evolves;
- the complex of disciplines devoted to the study of culture and their theoretical and methodological basis;
- universal, private, disciplinary and interdisciplinary scientific methods;
- key approaches, methods and techniques of cultural studies;
- topical themes and problems of culturological discourse;
- the essence of the textual approach to the study of culture;
- the characteristic features of discursive analytical procedures;
- the thorough characteristics of discursive analytical practices in relation to the texts of cultural anthropology.

As a result of studying the course masters must **be able**:

- to characterize modern methodological paradigms;
- to know and to apply the categorical apparatus of philosophy and methodology of science, and culturology;
- to analyse the current theoretical and methodological problems of modern culturology;
- to apply the methodological techniques and technology of the discourse analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology;
- to analyse the structure of the scientific method.

Masters must **possess**:

- communication skills to work in an interdisciplinary and international environment.

The time for classroom work is allocated in the following way: lectures take 18 hours and to seminars 24 hours are assigned.

The final form of students' knowledge control is examination.

THE CONTENT OF THE EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL

INTRODUCTION

The importance of discipline –“Discourse Analysis of Texts of Cultural Anthropology” in the training the researchers in the sphere of culturology. Subject,

content, purpose, objectives and structure of the course. Types of classes. Sources of information on the problems of the discipline. Control forms.

THE TEXTUAL PERSPECTIVE IN CULTUROLOGICAL RESEARCH

The historical aspect of philosophical, cultural, and linguistic study of a text. The emergence of text linguistics. The specifics of the interpretation of the text concept in different disciplinary and theoretical spheres. The specifics of text understanding in postmodern philosophy (articulation of the differences between "text" and "work" in the research of R. Barthes; rethinking the relationship between creation and perception of the text). The local and global coherence of text. The idea of "unstable text". The explicit and implicit premises of text understanding. Textual approach to the study of cultural phenomena as a manifestation of the semiotic concept of culture. Metaphors of "culture as text" and of "cultural text". Cultural text and cultural situation. The influence of the textual approach on socio-humanitarian cognition.

THE ESSENCE AND PECULIAR FEATURES OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY AND ITS TEXTS

History of the term "anthropology". The most important types of anthropological research (philosophical, natural and cultural anthropology). The essence of the relationship between philosophical, natural and cultural anthropology. Linguistic anthropology. Pedagogical anthropology, its relationship with cultural anthropology. Worldview and methodological foundations of cultural and anthropological research. The fundamental meaning of the term "culture" in the field of cultural anthropology. History of cultural and anthropological research. The specifics of the texts of cultural anthropology.

THE GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF DISCOURSE, ITS STRUCTURES AND TYPES

Discourse as totality of language tools used in a given theoretical or practical sphere. Discourse as a socio-cultural framework determining the conditions of meaningful speaking. The discourse interpretation as reflexive communication, taking place at the level of speech and presupposing the intrinsic value of the speaking manifestation of all the relevant for the speakers communication aspects (J. Habermas). The understanding of discourse as "speech that is appropriated by those who utter" (E. Benveniste). The discourse as violence that takes place over things (M. Foucault).

The statement as a unit of discourse. The statement as a dialogical process taking place between the subjects. Over-individual modus of "utterance" in the discourse.

The actualization of a specific text in the discourse. Representational discourses and texts: the selection criteria.

The classification of discourses in terms of organization level. Institutionally organized and institutional discourse. The ordinary and highly organized forms of discourse. The types of discourse according to the social spheres of deployment and application (educational, political, and so on.). The types of discourse according to cognitive realm (philosophical, art critical, and others.). The essence and peculiarities of culturological discourse. The set of culturological texts as its basis (the historical-cultural, thematic aspects - A. Moles). Culturological and cultural-anthropological schools and movements. Belarusian culturological and cultural-anthropological community.

The planning, production and reproduction of discourse. The internal organization of discourses and external links between them (the phenomenon of inter-discursivity). The problem of the scope of discourses. Discourse practices and socio-cultural reality: discourse as affecting individuals' perspective on real processes and phenomena. The interrelationship between discourse and politics as well as policy making.

The modernist interpretation of discourse as functional in the context of social progress and the rise of knowledge. The investigation of the links between discourse and power, discourse and ideology in postmodernist theories. The postmodernist understanding of subject as a variable and as a complex function of discourse. The contemporary constructionist theories of discourse: the way of talking about and understanding the world shapes it (E. Laclau and Ch. Mouffe).

THE CONTEXTUAL ASPECT OF DISCURSIVE PRACTICES

The peculiar features of discursive contextual relations. Correlative character of concepts "discourse" and "text". Highlighting discursive integrity through the notion of "context". Identification of discursive integrity as a unity of formal semantic, subjective, praxeological, translational, objectively expressed, mythological, cultural code units ("organization"). The kronotope of discourse. The external and internal contexts of discourse. The interrelationship between discourse structures and historical as well as cultural macro-contexts. The connection of discourse with contextual cultural entities. Discursive formation as a structure with non-rigid internal contextual interconnection of cultural elements: the impossibility to reduce it to the individual statements; the blurred relations between cognitive structures, unclear character of regulatory signs sets which are applied with respect to the texts and cultural forms, the lack of uniform semiotics and semantic systems; the uncertainty of communication strategies, practices of communication and transmission of cultural and civilizational experience; no special institutionally-renewable infrastructure; no fixed membership among the subjects of the formation – its creators and custodians.

The external context of discursive formation. The context and background aspect of discursive actualization of a particular text. The interrelationship of texts with contextual discursive formations. Meta-subjective character of discursive

formations in cultural dynamics. Discourse context as identifying the relationships of conjugate texts. The recontextualization of text in the discourse. The manifestation in discourse practices historically, culturally and typologically certain forms of mentality, production and translation of cultural experience. The non-isomorphic character of relation between discursive formation and text. Positioning of subjects in the contexts of discursive formations. The relative isolation of the formation from the subjects. Discursive formation as the system of selection and management of individual and group discourses. Representative-canonical texts - cultural patterns - in test function. The decisive regulatory influence of discursive formation on the cultural creativity and subjective searches for the correct evaluation of cultural and civilization realities. The problem of interrelationship between the formal semantic structure of discursive formation and individual creativity. Designing targeted discursive environments depending on the needs of the social actors.

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS

Discourse analysis as a theoretical and methodological whole. The philosophical bases of corresponding approaches: the main versions. A critical approach to taken-for-granted knowledge as a fundamental characteristic of discourse analytical perspective. The necessity to take into account the historical and cultural specificity of human views and knowledge within the scope of discourse analytical approach. The idea of deep connection between knowledge and socio-cultural processes as widely shared by discourse analysts. The different types and levels of discourse analysis. The interdisciplinary character of corresponding ideas, procedures, techniques etc. The traditional forms of discourse analysis (based on the erudition and sensibility of interpreters). Formal discourse analysis (oriented towards semiotics and linguistics). Anthropological discourse analysis. Discourse analysis and hermeneutics. Discourse analysis and deconstruction. The definition of interpretation in terms of semantic representations as based on subjective mental models of language users. The composition of mental models (settings – time and space, participants and their identities, roles, relations as well as their knowledge and goals, one or more events and actions). The role of general human knowledge in forming the subjective mental models; the relevance of peculiar epistemic communities in the process. The idea of cognitive psychology of discourse as a study of the basic structures of subjective mental models of interpretative activities. The problem of interrelationship between descriptive and normative aspects of discourse analysis. The tradition of critical discourse analysis: the exploration of possibilities for socio-cultural change.

THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL CHARACTER OF THE DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE TEXTS OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

Discursive reading and analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology as a system of cognitive procedures. Text analysis from the perspective of a particular

cultural form. The complex nature of the analysis (which is carried on the semantic, syntactic, pragmatic, paradigmatic and syntagmatic levels). Discursive text analysis, semantically correlated with the cultural prerequisites. –Reflective turn” in cultural anthropology (B. Malinowski) and discursive analysis. The semiotic analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology. The disclosure of correlations between the text and the narrative structures of the discursive nature (at the level of theme, plot, subjective activities (cultural creativity)).The formal aspects of discursive approach to the analysis of cultural texts (–automatic discourse analysis” of M. Pêcheux).Designing the models of assimilation, mastering and interiorizing by the subjects the cultural values on the basis of discursive analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology.The discourse analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology in the context of intercultural dialogue.The interdisciplinary character of discursive reading and analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology.

THE ANALYSIS OF THE TEXTS OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY WITH RESPECT TO DISCURSIVE FORMATIONS

Episteme and discursive practices (in the context of the analysis of texts belonging to the sphere of cultural anthropology).The analysis of specific discursive formation as a medium of origin, operation and interpretation of the text in the aspect of its prerequisites.The analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology in the context of the language specific to the respective discursive formation. The disclosure of connection between the discursive formation and analyzed text at the level of the relationship between the code of the text and code rules of formation. Identification of translation and transmutation influences on the contexts in which a cultural form functions in the realm of discursive formation. The analysis of the text transformations (semiotic and semantic, at the level of internal context, from the standpoint of meaning), which take place in the own dynamics of discursive formation. Identifying the impact of contextual formation relations on the procedures of understanding, interpretation, application and creation of a new objective form of culture.

THE METHODOLOICAL BASIS AND TECHNIQUES OF DISCURSIVE ANALYSIS OF THE TEXTS OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

The recognition of fundamental role of language and communication in the development of culture and cultural creativity.The identification of language and communication as fundamentally important subject matters of culturological research.The principal directedness of the research towards the search for the historical and cultural determinants of the texts of cultural anthropology.The principle of unity and interconnection of diachronic and synchronic approaches.The principle of unity of semantic and pragmatic analysis in the discursive reading of the texts of cultural anthropology. The indispensable character of the taking into account the contextual aspects of creation and

understanding of the texts of cultural anthropology. The necessity of the investigation of evident and hidden factors influencing the creation of the texts of cultural anthropology, of the superficial and deep levels of their meaning, of explicit and implicit prerequisites of their understanding and interpretation. The unity of the process and result in discourse analysis.

THE EDUCATIONAL-METHODICAL MAP OF THE DISCIPLINE

Chapter, topic number	Chapter, topic title	Time for classroom work					Time outline for the independent work	The forms of knowledge control
		Lectures	Practical classes	Seminars	Lab classes	Internae		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Introduction	1						
2	Topic 1. The textual perspective in culturological research	1		2				
3	Topic 2. The essence and peculiar features of cultural anthropology and its texts	1		2				
4	Topic 3. The general description of discourse, its structures and types	2		2				Ppt
5	Topic 4. The contextual aspect of discursive practices	1		2				
6	Topic 5. Discourse analysis: theoretical and methodological aspects	2		2				Ppt
7	Topic 6. The multidimensional character of the discourse analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology	2		2			2	

8	Topic 7. The analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology with respect to discursive formations	2	2				Testing
9	Topic 8. The methodological basis and techniques of discourse analysis of the texts of cultural anthropology	2	4				
	Altogether ...	14	18			2	

Literature

The main sources

1. Michel Foucault. The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language / translated from the French by A. M. Sheridan Smith. – New York : PANTHEON BOOKS, 1982. – 245 p.; Also [Electronic resource]. – Access mode:
https://monoskop.org/images/9/90/Foucault_Michel_Archaeology_of_Knowledge.pdf
2. Jørgensen, M. Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method / by: Marianne Jørgensen & Louise J. Phillips. – London : SAGE Publications, 2002. – 240 p. ; Also [Electronic resource]. – Access mode:
<http://www.rasaneh.org/Images/News/AttachFile/27-3-1391/FILE634754469767402343.pdf>.
3. Нестерчук, Г. В. Дискурс-анализ = Discourse analysis / Г. В. Нестерчук, Н. А. Тарасевич. – Минск : Народная асвета, 2019. – 191 с.

Further reading

1. Barthes, R. The Death of Author / R. Barthes. [electronic resource]. Mode of access :<https://genius.com/1529008>
2. "[Discourse Analysis – What Speakers Do in Conversation | Linguistic Society of America](http://www.linguisticsociety.org)". www.linguisticsociety.org.
3. Gutting, Gary and Oksala, Johanna, "Michel Foucault", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = [<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2019/entries/foucault/>](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2019/entries/foucault/).
4. Helslot, N. Pêcheux's Contribution to Discourse Analysis/ N. Helsloot, T. Hak. – Forum: Qualitative Social Research. – 2007. – Vol. 8. – № 2. (https://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/242/535#footnoteanchor_13)
5. <https://literariness.org/2018/03/20/key-theories-of-roland-barthes/>

6. <http://www.politicseastasia.com/studying/how-to-do-a-discourse-analysis/>
7. Ifversen, J. Text, Discourse, Concept: Approaches to Textual Analysis / J. Ifversen. – Kontur, 2003. – №7. – P. 60-69.
8. Macleod, C. I. Deconstructive Discourse Analysis: Extending the Methodological Conversation / C. I. Macleod. – South African Journal of Psychology. – 2002. - № 32 (1). – P. 4-10. (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/29806807_Deconstructive_discourse_analysis_Extending_the_methodological_conversation)
9. Olssen, M. Discourse, Complexity, Normativity: Tracing the elaboration of Foucault's materialist concept of discourse / M. Olssen. – Open Review of Educational Research. – 2014, vol.1, №1. – P. 28-55. (<https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2014.964296>)
10. Tannen, D. Discourse Analysis – What Speakers Do in Conversation / by Deborah Tannen. [Electronic resource]. – Access mode: <https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/discourse-analysis-what-speakers-do-conversation>.
11. Van Dijk, T. A. Cognitive Context Models and Discourse / T. A. van Dijk.[electronic resource]. Mode of access : <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Cognitive%20context%20models%20and%20discourse.pdf>
12. Van Dijk T. A. Cognitive Processing of Literary Discourse / T. A. van Dijk. [electronic resource]. Mode of access : <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Cognitive%20processing%20of%20literary%20discourse.pdf>
13. Van Dijk T. A. Formal Analysis of Metaphorical Discourse Cognitive Processing of Literary Discourse / T. A. van Dijk. <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Formal%20Semantics%20of%20Metaphorical%20Discourse.pdf>
14. Van Dijk, T. A. Introduction: Discourse Analysis as a New Cross-Discipline / T. A. van Dijk.[electronic resource]. Mode of access : <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Discourse%20Analysis%20as%20a%20new%20Cross-Discipline.pdf>
15. Van Dijk, T. A. Relevance in Text and Context / T. A. van Dijk[electronic resource]. Mode of access : <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Relevance%20in%20text%20and%20context.pdf>
16. Van Dijk, T. A. Discourse and Context. A sociocognitive approach /T. A. Van Dijk. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2008. — 267 p.

THE DIAGNOSTICS MEANS OF LEARNING OUTCOME

The most effective teaching methods and technologies that contribute to the search for and using by students the culturological knowledge, acquisition of independent research experience with respect to cultural processes and phenomena are:

- problem-modular training technology;
- teaching and research activities technology;
- design technology;
- communication technologies;
- gaming technology;
- case method.

To manage the training process and the organization of the control and evaluation activities for teachers it is recommended to use the rating, the credit-modular system of evaluation of master students' educational and research activities, variable models of led by the teacher self-study, educational complexes.

To create the necessary social and personal, social and professional competence of the masters a participatory approach to learning, discussion forms should be adopted in the practice of holding seminars. It is recommended to use the criterion-oriented tests as an element of educational achievements of students/ They are a set of tests in a closed shape with one or more embodiments of correct answers; tasks which suggest to establish a correspondence between elements of two variants with different number of ratios and the same or a different number of elements and versions; the test tasks which have the open form claiming a formalized response; tasks to establish the correct sequence. To determine compliance of educational achievements of students with the requirements of the educational standard it is also possible to use a problem, creative tasks involving heuristic activities and non-formalized answers.

GUIDELINES ON THE ORGANIZATION OF INDEPENDENT WORK OF STUDENTS

The role and place of individual work in the educational process of the university is determined by the current requirements to the graduates, the need to improve the quality of education and at the same time shift the time, energy and labor costs of the teacher and the student to prepare for the traditional lectures, seminars, practical and other activities, requirements connected with the entry into world educational space. All this affects the determination of the status of students' independent work as a compulsory basic element of professional training of specialists in social and cultural sphere. To improve the efficiency of students' independent work, in our opinion, it is necessary to adhere to the following guidelines:

- to determine at the beginning of the semester the key themes of the fundamental culturology that foster personal and professional competence of the specialist;
- to organize independent work
- to carry out systematic monitoring of the intersessional students' independent work and its management;
- to create favorable conditions for its execution;
- to recommend the necessary educational, scientific literature, periodicals culturological profile;

- to carry out, if necessary, counseling and correcting students' mistakes made in the process of independent study of certain topics;
- to sum up the results of mastering by students certain issues, using various forms of control (tests, colloquiums, short written work, presentations, etc.).

РЕПОЗИТОРИЙ БГУКИ