DISCOURSE STRUCTURE RELATIONSHIPS
(BASED ON INTERNATIONAL LEGAL "SOFT LAW" DISCOURSE)

N. K. KRAVCHENKO, Doctor of Philology, Professor,
National University of life and environmental sciences of Ukraine
E-mail: nkravchenko@outlook.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9839-6629

N.V. NIKOLSKA, PhD in Pedagogy, Assistant Professor,
National University of life and environmental sciences of Ukraine
E-mail: nina777-07@hotmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3393-3248

*Abstract. The paper addresses the problem of discourse structure as one of the most controversial issue of contemporary linguistic studies. The research **aims at** identifying two principal types of structural relationships between discursive parameters. The aim and its corresponding tasks have been achieved through the use of the complex **methodology** integrating the methods of critical discourse analysis, 'speech act theory' explanatory tools combined with the methods of Grice's pragmatics, form / function pragmatics and some politeness theory procedures. **The major finding** is that there are two types of structural interrelations between discourse parameters, i.e. multi level or hierarchic relations manifested at the level of discourse system and single-level syntagmatic and paradigmatic links identified at the subsystems level. In international legal discourse the structure is specified as the hierarchical subordination of pragmatic and verbal devices to a single cognitive basis represented by the conceptual opposition between "sovereignty" and "common good", resulted in the soft law strategy of normative mitigation in areas of international cooperation somehow intervening with the scope of the state sovereignty. The single-level type of structural relations is associated with both syntagmatic "if-then" links (when one pragmatic phenomenon triggers a set of other pragmatic devices) and paradigmatic connections (associative links of different pragmatic devices specifying the same concepts and its manifesting strategy).*

Identification of structural links between multilevel and single-level discourse parameters contributes to the further study of discourse as a particular structured system.

***Key words**: discourse structure, hierarchic relations, syntagmatic, paradigmatic, multilevel links, single-level relations, international legal discourse.*

Introduction. The problem of discourse as a structure of interconnected elements remains one of the most controversial in modern linguistics. The main difficulty in substantiating the structural properties of discourse is, on the one hand, the traditional (originated from structural paradigm) approach to understanding structure as a combination of syntagmatic, paradigmatic and hierarchical connections, which is difficult to "apply" to communicative-discursive phenomena. On the other hand, the approaches to identifying the discursive structure depend on understanding the discourse either as (a) a discursive semiosis within which framework a text is signified (dynamic / processual aspect) or as (b) a relatively stable configuration of communicative signs (static aspect).

In dynamic aspect it seems possible to talk about discourse structure as a set of components / modules involved into discursive semiosis. However, such an approach does not bring us closer to identifying the invariant properties of discourse as a structural integrity, distinguished by a certain regularity of principles and relationships.

The purpose of the article is to

identify the structural integrity of discourse in terms of relationships and interdependencies between its parameters.

Recent researches and publications. The contemporary studies of discourse structure are not numerous and focus on the relationships between either (a) the discourse components, which constitute a certain communicative hierarchy – from simple to more complex interaction units (speech act – communicative acts – exchange – transaction) [5] or (b) constituents of discourse situation, i.e. addresser; addressee, text as a verbal macro-sign, produced by the communicators common efforts; various contexts affecting the course of discursive semiosis, "interiorized reality" [1; 4; 6], etc. The weak point of the first approach is that it is operable only in respect to conversational discourse. The second approach does not take into account the differences between the structure of discourse and the model of a complex communicative sign. (respectively, discourse structure units correlate here with components of a communicative-discursive model).

In addition to these approaches, some scientists attempt to identify the cognitive basis of discourse structure, which determines a mode of signification in discursive semiosis and, correspondingly, the specifics of signifiers, communicators pragmatics and other discursive parameters [1, с. 112-123; 3]. This approach traces back to the concepts of "conceptual architectonics" and "discursive formation" by Michel Foucault [13]. Of particular interest to our research is the philosopher's idea of discourse as a specific space of knowledge, determined by deep "archetypal" attitudes and principles. The concept of discourse as a knowledge or cognitive structure (in terms of the actual cognitive discursive paradigm) was substantively developed by critical discourse analysis [22; 23], especially in its post-structuralism manifestation [2; 8; 10; 13; 18]. According to discourse analysis the integrity of discourse is determined by the model of signification, relating to a symbolic space of identical signs while excluding

alternative / illegitimate meanings. The latter approach constitutes the first methodological premise of our research relating to the identification of the structural relationships between multi-level parameters.

The specification of the second type of structural relationships between single-level parameters are in line with the concept of multifaceted pragmatics [16; 17] and pragmatic attractions, i.e. relations "between the implicit dimension and inference patterns of direct acts' illocution viewed through the triggers and meanings of (…) the implicatures and semantic presuppositions" [16, p. 128].

Data and methods. The research data have been collected from the international-legal discourse based on the "soft law" documents of international environmental law and the law of the non-navigational uses of international watercourses [11; 20; 21]. Specification of the discourse structural relationships base on the complex methodology, which includes (a) the method of critical discourse analysis [2; 6; 22; 23], suggesting the connection between concepts of the institutional ideology, their manifesting discourse-forming strategies, corresponding pragmatic devices and verbal code as well as (b) 'speech act theory' explanatory tools [19] combined with the methods of Grice's pragmatics [15], form / function pragmatics [7, p. 30] and some politeness theory procedures [11].

Results. Exploring the patterns of relationships between discourse elements, researchers have identified some principles of its structural organization, i.e. (a) identity or invariance; (b) interdependence and interconditionality, implying regular correlations of parameters – both multilevel (at the level of the discourse system) and single-level (at the level of its subsystems); (c) parameters differentiation and (d) dynamics as a factor of the meanings re-articulation while replacing the structure of discourse [1; 2].

These principles identification bases on the idea of discourse as an integrated space of meanings, structured by the configuration of values (symbols,

"legitimate signs"), which determine the parameters of other levels. The analysis of international legal discourse [3] made it possible to reveal two types of structural relations between discourse parameters: hierarchical relations between multilevel units with the priority of cognitive parameters, and single-level relations of interdependence and interchangeability.

Thus, modern international legal discourse is constituted through the dichotomous unity of the value concepts of "sovereignty" and "common good" [3] associated with the archetypal "individual – common" opposition. Consequently, the pragmatic facet of these concepts involves, on the one hand, a set of "sovereignty protective" strategies and, on the other hand, strategies implementing the concept of "common good", which restrict the states' sovereign rights (political, economic, national-cultural, public) in favor of the "common good" regulation. In various international legal documents "common good" strategies are manifested by institutional strategies both of nature protection and legal regime of "res omnium communis" (common heritage of humanity),

In their turn, the institutional strategies (interactive-pragmatic parameters) deter-mine the information-pragmatic discourse properties or "operational" pragmatic devices (specifics of speech acts, presuppositions, implicatures, politeness strategies, cooperative maxims observing / flouting, etc.), which are finally indexed by verbal parameters.

In particular, "common good" strategies imply the 'soft law' pragmatics and stylistics. since any restriction of sovereign rights in favor of common (universal) interests requires "kick methods". Pragmatic devices include:

(a) Distance (negative) politeness means, i.e. generalization, disagentivity (predominance of nouns, nominalization, passivation), the use of empty signifiers denoted by abstract meaning lexemes, emphasis on the rights instead of obligations and other down-toning means, which scale down the level of states responsibility for the international document implementation:

"*Members have the right to take sanitary and phytosanitary measures necessary for the protection of human, animal or plant life or health*" [20];

"*convinced that the global and local challenges of climate change cannot be met without the participation of all people at all levels of society*" [11].

(b) indirect speech acts with directive illocutionary force intended to mitigate the imposition while urging states to take particular legislative measures:

"*This Declaration recommends States to consider these ethical principles in all decisions and actions related to climate change*" [11] (directive illocutionary force is mitigated here by the utterance structural arrangement in the form of representative).

(c) the Maxim of Quantity violation (from the perspective of Grice's Principle of Cooperation) since the delicacy of the negotiation and consensus situation is iconically reproduced by the text structural complexity, manifested by subordinate clauses, participial phrases, verbal adverb phrases, etc., which exceeds the optimal amount of information, thus flouting the corresponding cooperative maxim:

"*Considering that climate change not only erodes the sustainability of Earth's ecosystems and the services they provide, as well as threatening the future well-being of people and their livelihoods, local communities, and individuals through harmful and negative consequences, some of which are potentially irreversible, States and all actors should take appropriate measures within their powers*" [11].

Another 'soft law' pragmatics regularity encompasses the use of disclamers, stipulations and reservations as the markers of conventional implicatures that expand the possibilities of alternative use of the document:

"*Where a watercourse State considers that adjustment and application of the provisions of the present Convention is required because of the characteristics and uses of a particular international watercourse,*

watercourse States shall consult with a view to negotiating in good faith for the purpose of concluding a watercourse agreement or agreements" [21];

"If a watercourse State is requested by another watercourse State to provide data or information that is not readily available, it shall employ its best efforts to comply with the request but may condition its compliance upon payment by the requesting State of the reasonable costs of collecting and, where appropriate, processing such data or information" [21].

At the same time, the considered pragmatic parameters allow us to illustrate another type of structural relationships, which consist in interchangeability and interdependence of the single-level units when one pragmatic phenomenon triggers a set of other pragmatic devices. For example, negative / distant politeness expressed by structurally complex means correlates with violating the maxim of quantity of information, which, in its turn, results in conversational or conventional implica-tures. The illocutionary force of indirect speech acts is often based on conversational implicatures.

If we draw a parallel with the types of structural connections in a language system, the revealed type of relations is associated with both syntagmatic "if-then" links (cooperative maxims' violation always results in conversational implicatures) and paradigmatic connections (distant / negative politeness is regularly associated with indirect speech acts, the quantity maxim's flouting, etc.).

However, the possibility of different types of single-level structural interdependencies is explained by the first type of structural relationships – the hierarchical subordination of pragmatic devices to a single cognitive basis (in case of international legal discourse it is generalized by the concept opposition between "sovereignty" and "common good"; resulted in the soft law strategy of normative mitigation).

Conclusions and discussion. The paper has identified two principal facets of structural links between discourse parameters. The first type includes hierarchic relations between different levels of discourse system with the priority of cognitive parameters, determining the interactive-pragmatic discourse properties, resulted in their turn, in the operational pragmatics and its corresponding verbal code. The second type encompasses the single-level syntagmatic and paradigmatic interrela-tions at the level of discourse subsystems. The structure of international legal discourse is specified as the hierarchical subordination of pragmatic and verbal devices to a single cognitive basis represented by the conceptual opposition between "sovereignty" and "common good"; resulted in the soft law strategy of normative mitigation in those areas of international cooperation, which somehow intervene with the scope of the states' sovereignty. The single-level type of structural relations is associated with both syntagmatic "if-then" links (when one pragmatic phenomenon triggers a set of other pragmatic devices) and paradigmatic connections (associative links of different pragmatic devices with the same concepts and its manifesting strategy).

Identification of structural links between discourse parameters contributes to the further exploration of discourse as a structured system.

Список використаних джерел

1. Кравченко Н. К. Дискурс и дискурс-анализ: краткая энциклопедия. Киев : Интерсервис. 286 с.

2. Кравченко Н. К. Дискурс как структура. Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія : Філологія. 2017. № 26. Т. 1. С. 138-141.

3. Кравченко Н. К. Интерактивное, жанровое и концептуальное модели-рование международно-правового дис-курса : монография. Київ : Реферат. 2006. 320 с.

4. Лотман Ю. М. Внутри мыслящих миров : Человек – текст – семиосфера – история. Москва : «Языки русской

культуры». 1996. 464 с.

5. Олешков М. Ю. Основы функциональной лингвистики: дискурсивный аспект: учеб. пособие. Нижний Тагил : НТГСПА. 2006. 146 с.

6. Селіванова О. О. Основи теорії мовної комунікації: підручник. Черкаси : Чабаненко Ю., 2011. 350 с.

7. Ariel M. Research paradigms in pragmatics. In The Cambridge handbook of pragmatics. Allan, K. & Jaszczolt, K. M. (eds.). New York: Cambridge University Press. 2012. P. 23-45.

8. Ashley K. Richard. Critical Discourse Analysis in Analysing European Foreign Policy: Prospects and Challenges. Cooperation and Conflict. 2014. Vol. 49 (3). P. 354–67.

9. Bach K. Saying, meaning, and implicating. In The Cambridge handbook of pragmatics. Allan, K. & Jaszczolt, K. M. (eds.). New York: Cambridge University Press. 2012. P. 23-45.

10. Brown P. & Levinson S. Politeness. Some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987. 345 p.

11. Declaration of Ethical Principles in relation to Climate Change 13 November 2017. Available at: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php URL_ID=49457&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

12. Dunn Kevin, Iver B. Neumann. Undertaking Discourse Analysis for Social Research. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. 2016. 158 p.

13. Foucault M. The order of discourse. In: R. Young, ed. Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1981. P. 48-78.

14. Holzscheiter Anna Between Communicative Interaction and Structures of Signification: Discourse Theory and Analysis in International Relations. International Studies Perspectives. 2014. Vol. 15. P. 142–62.

15. Grice H. P. Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan. (Eds.), Syntax and Semantics, New York: Academic Press. 1975. Vol. 3, Speech Acts. P. 41-58.

16. Kravchenko N. Illocution of direct speech acts via conventional implicature and semantic presupposition. Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The Journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, 2017. Vol. II (1), June 2017. P. 128-168.

17. Kravchenko N., Pasternak T. Claim for identity or personality face: The Oscar winners' dilemma. Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, 2018. Vol. III(1), June 2018. P. 142-178.

18. Little Richard The Balance of Power in International Relations: Metaphors, Myths, and Models. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 317 p.

19. Searle J.R. & Vanderveken D. Foundations of illocutionary logic. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1985. 240 p.

20. Standards and related issues in the WTO Agreement on SPS and TBT. June 2017. Available at: https://www.slideshare.net/FAOoftheUN/standards-and-related-issues-in-the-wto-agreement-on-sps-and-tbt

21. United Nations Convention on the law of the non-navigational uses of international watercourses, 1997. Available at: http://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/8_3_1997.pdf

22. Van Dijk, T. Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2008. 267 p.

23. Wodak, Ruth. Introduction: Discourse Studies – Important Concepts and Terms. Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences. London: Palgrave, 2008. P. 1–29.

References

1. Ariel, M. (2012). Research paradigms in pragmatics. *Cambridge handbook of pragmatics*. Allan, K. & Jaszczolt, K.M. (eds.). New York: Cambridge University Press, p. 23-45.

2. Ashley, K. Richard (2014). Critical

Discourse Analysis in Analysing European Foreign Policy: *Prospects and Challenges. Cooperation and Conflict* 49, no. 3, pp. 354–67.

3. Bach, K. (2012). Saying, meaning, and implicating. *The Cambridge handbook of pragmatics*. Allan, K. & Jaszczolt, K.M. (eds.). New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 23-45.

4. Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 345 p.

5. Declaration of Ethical Principles in relation to Climate Change 13 November 2017. Available at: http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php URL_ID=49457&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

6. Dunn, Kevin, and Iver B. Neumann (2016). *Undertaking Discourse Analysis for Social Research*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.158 p.

7. Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In: R. Young, ed. *Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp. 48-78.

8. Holzscheiter, Anna (2014). Between Communicative Interaction and Structures of Signification: Discourse Theory and Analysis in International Relations. *International Studies Perspectives* 15, pp.142–62.

9. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, New York: Academic Press. Vol. 3, Speech Acts, pp. 41-58.

10. Kravchenko, N. (2017). Illocution of direct speech acts via conventional implicature and semantic presupposition. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The Journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, Vol. II (1), pp. 128–168.

11. Kravchenko, N., Pasternak, T. (2018). Claim for identity or personality face: The Oscar winners' dilemma. *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, 2018. Vol. III (1), pp. 142–178.

12. Kravchenko, N. K. (2017). *Dyskurs y dyskurs-analyz: kratkaia entsyklopedyia*. Kyev: Interservys. 286 p.

13. Kravchenko, N. K. (2017). Dyskurs kak struktura*. Naukovyj visnyk Mizhnarodnoho humanitarnoho universytetu. Seryja : Filologija*. № 26. Tom 1, s. 138–141.

14. Kravchenko, N. K. (2006). *Interaktivnoje, zhanrovoje I kontcep-tualnoje modelirovanije mezhdunarodno-pravovogo dyskursa*. Kyev: Feferat. 320 p.

15. Little, Richard (2007). *The Balance of Power in International Relations: Metaphors, Myths, and Models.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 317 p.

16. Lotman, J.M. (1996). *Vnutri myslyatshih mirov : Chelovek – tekst – semiosfera – istoriya.* Moskva: jazyki russkoj kultury. 464 p.

17. Oleshkov, M.J. (2006). *Osnovy funktcionalnoj lingvistiki : diskursivnyj aspect* : uchebnoje posobije. Nizhnij Tagil : NTGSPA. 146 p.

18. Searle, J.R. & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 240 p.

19. Selivanova O.O. (2011). *Osnovy teorii movnoji komunikatcii* : pidruchnik. Cherkassy : J. Chabanenko. 350 p.

20. *Standards and related issues in the WTO Agreement on SPS and TBT* (2017). Available at: https://www.slideshare.net/FAOoftheUN/standards-and-related-issues-in-the-wto-agreement-on-sps-and-tbt

21. United Nations Convention on the law of the non-navigational uses of international watercourses (1997. Available at: http://legal.un.org/ilc/texts/instruments/english/conventions/8_3_1997.pdf

22. Van Dijk, T. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 267 p.

23. Wodak, Ruth. (2008). Introduction: Discourse Studies – Important Concepts

and Terms. In *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michal Krzyzanowski.

London: Palgrave, pp.1–29.

ВЗАЄМОЗВ'ЯЗКИ ПАРАМЕТРІВ ДИСКУРСИВНОЇ СТРУКТУРИ
(НА МАТЕРІАЛІ МІЖНАРОДНО-ПРАВОВОГО ДИСКУРСУ М'ЯКОГО ПРАВА)
Н. К. Кравченко, Н. В. Нікольська

*Анотація. У статті розглядається проблема структури дискурсу, що є одним з найсуперечливіших питань сучасного мовознавства. **Мета** дослідження – визначити два основні типи структурних зв'язків між дискурсивними параметрами. Мети та завдання наукової розвідки досягнуто завдяки використанню комплексної **методології**, що інтегрує методи критичного дискурс-аналізу, актомовленнєвого аналізу, у поєднанні з методами прагматики Г. П. Грайса, формально-функціональної прагматики та елементами методу, базованого на теорії ввічливості. Основним **висновком** є те, що існують два типи структурних взаємозв'язків між параметрами дискурсу: багаторівневі або ієрархічні відносини, що виявляються на рівні дискурсивної системи, та однорівневі синтагматичні та парадигматичні зв'язки, визначені на рівні підсистем дискурсу. З'ясовано, що у міжнародно-правовому дискурсі структура постає як ієрархічне підпорядкування прагматичних та вербальних параметрів єдиній когнітивній основі, яка представлена протиставленням концептів "суверенітет" та "загальне благо" і зумовлює застосування інституційних стратегій м'якого права і тих сферах міжнародної співпраці, де є певне втручання в сферу державного суверенітету. Однорівневий тип структурних відносин асоціюється як із синтагматичними "якщо-то" зв'язками (коли одне прагматичне явище залучає низку інших), так і з парадигматичними відношеннями (асоціативні зв'язки різних прагматичних параметрів через їхнє підпорядкування одному концепту та стратегіям його реалізації).*

Виявлення структурних зв'язків між багаторівневими та однорівневими параметрами дискурсу сприяє подальшому вивченню дискурсу як певної структурованої системи.

Ключові слова: структура дискурсу, ієрархічні відносини, синтагматичні, парадигматичні, багаторівневі зв'язки, однорівневі відносини, міжнародно-правовий дискурс.