

## DIALOGICAL DISCOURSE AS A FORM OF ARGUMENTATIVE REASONING IN COMMUNICATIVE SPACE

S.V. Nachernaya

*Department of Foreign Languages, TSTU; cvetlana\_nachrna@mail.ru*

*Recommended for Publication by Editorial Member Professor N.Ts. Gatapova  
and by Doctor Philology Professor M.N. Makeeva*

**Key words and phrases:** argumentation; discourse; evidence categories; rhetoric; text.

**Abstract:** The article refers to the categorical attributes of text and discourse, the differences between the parameters of rhetorical and logical reasoning, the efficiency of argumentation as a theory of reasoning.

---

The theory of rhetorical argumentation can be considered as a theory of reasoning and as a theory of evidence. Argumentation theory of reasoning transforms the process of argumentation and dialogical communication mechanism.

Dialogical discourse becomes argumentative form of reasoning, and in this communication space the role of both the speaker and that of the recipient are equally important.

The content of persuasive argumentation also changes: from impersonal, objectively impartial it becomes personal, subjective-oriented, expressing pragmatic interests of argumentor, some of which may coincide with the pragmatic interests of the opponent, but it is not always the case.

In terms of topics, persuasive argumentation covers a wide range of its components, ranging from rational arguments and ending with purely emotional ones. Rhetorical argumentation captures the relationship between people.

Discourse is a broader concept than text; it is both the process of linguistic activity and its result, i.e. the text. There are several categories of discourse: constitutive (that distinguishes the text from the non-text), genre-stylistic, formally structured, and meaningful (semantic and pragmatic), revealing the meaning of the text [1].

Categorical attributes of the text are considered to be “the existence or possibility of the title, theme, or main idea. It possesses a clear structure (the beginning, the main part, the end), semantic and structural cohesion, compositional maturity, stylistic unity” [2, p. 19–20].

Although there is no conventional multi-dimensional definition of the “text” in science, all scholars agree that the text is a product of the language, which has a complex structure and its own content. This applies to any text-based rules and regulations of the modern Russian literary language.

The word “text” (from Lat. *textus* – connection, construction) has several meanings, including: 1) the sequence of sentences, words (in semiotics signs)

constructed according to the rules of the language of the sign system and the generator of the message; 2) verbal work; in fiction it is the finished product or a fragment composed of the natural language signs (words), complex aesthetic signs (terms of poetic language, plot, song, etc.); 3) the author's work without comments and annexes [3].

Individuality is due to the author's style. The dynamic nature of the system is associated with the dynamics of the creative process and it can be expressed in the change of location of linguistic units from the beginning to the end of the text.

The communicative aspects of the text are put in the foreground in the modern interpretation of the text. The communication processes is concentrated in the text. It lies at the heart of communication and it is the primary unit of speech that expresses its complete proposition. As all texts have the general principles of their construction, which belong to the system of the language and linguistic features of the author, the text itself can be considered as a unit of the language.

The evidence is an essential part of any science: mathematics, logic, natural sciences, rhetoric. The rhetorical models may include new categories of changes to the rules of reasoning, attitudes, and can possibly revise the previously made decisions.

The difference between rhetorical argumentation and the evidence lies in the fact that the evidence is impersonal, while argumentation is personal. The conclusion of the evidence is always strongly evident, but that of the argumentation is only likely to be more or less convincing. The main difference of the evidence from the argumentation is its mechanical nature and impersonality. Argumentation, in contrast to the evidence involves a “clash of minds”, it is not forcing and its accuracy cannot be determined mechanically.

In rhetorical argumentation there is an ambiguity of expression, in this regard, one of the main problems of the theory of argumentation is to determine the meaning of the utterance, and match the speaker's intention with the listener's assessment with each new course of speech and ratios of evidence.

Aristotle defined rhetoric as “the ability to find possible ways of persuasion with respect to each subject”, Ch. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca considered the subject of the argumentation theory as the study of discursive means to cause or exacerbate sympathy for the approval of the proposed regulations. Ch. Perelman sought to develop Aristotelian idea of the interlocutor and audience, as well as to understand the use of modern concepts of the nature of the arguments used in the argumentation with respect to the listeners.

Ancient rhetoricians divided all questions in relation to the audience into ceremonial, deliberative and judicial oratory. This differentiation has led to the emergence of one of the fundamental principles of rhetorical discourse, namely, “correlation”. The length of the text based on the comparison attracted the attention of listeners and facilitated its perception due to a certain isolation and target design.

Thus, discourse has become a binomial frame, where one side is the best material, and the other one is a form of comparison.

Other forms of contrast have been used as part of discourse: consonance of one-root words, contrast opposition (antithesis), double antithesis (developed by Isocrates), double contrast (comparing objects, processes, and their characteristics).

Over time, the ideas developed by ancient rhetoricians were clarified, but they have not undergone major changes.

In fact, lexical argumentation has always been associated with the logical one; but linguistic analysis of rhetorical communication in the argumentative discourse was not possible until linguistics approached the study of text and discourse.

## References

1. Карасик, В.И. Структура институционального дискурса / В.И. Карасик // Проблемы речевой коммуникации : межвуз. сб. науч. тр. / под ред. М.А. Кормилицыной, О.Б. Сиротининой. – Саратов, 2000. – С. 25–33.
2. Милевская, Т.В. О понятии «дискурс» в русле коммуникативного подхода / Т.В. Милевская // Материалы междунар. науч.-практ. конф. «Коммуникация: теория и практика в различных социальных контекстах «Коммуникация–2002» (COMMUNICATION Across Differences). – Пятигорск : Пятигорск. гос. лингвист. ун-т, 2002. – Вып. № 2. – 184 с.
3. Большая советская энциклопедия. В 30 т. Т. 25 / гл. ред. А.М. Прохоров. – 3-е изд. – М. : Сов. энцикл., 1976. – 599 с.
4. Perelman, Ch. The new Rhetoric and the Humanities / Ch. Perelman // Essays on Rhetoric and Application. – Dordrecht, 1979. – 240 p.

---

### Диалогический дискурс как аргументативная форма реализации убеждения в коммуникативном пространстве

С.В. Начёрная

Кафедра «Иностранные языки», ТГТУ;  
cvetlana\_nachrna@mail.ru

**Ключевые слова и фразы:** аргументация; дискурс; доказательства; категории; риторика; текст.

**Аннотация:** Рассмотрены категориальные признаки текста и дискурса; параметры отличия риторической и логической аргументации; эффективность аргументации как теории убеждения.

---

### Dialogischer Diskurs als argumentierte Form der Realisierung des Überzeugens im Kommunikativraum

**Zusammenfassung:** Im Artikel wird es über die kategorialen Merkmale des Textes und des Diskurses, die Parameter des Unterschiedes der rhetorischen und logischen Argumentation; die Effektivität der Argumentation als Theorie des Überzeugens gesprochen.

---

### Discours dialogique comme forme argumentative de la réalisation de persuasion dans un espace communicatif

**Résumé:** Dans l'article on parle des indices de catégorie du texte et du discours, des paramètres de la différence entre l'argumentation rhétorique et celle logique, de l'efficacité de l'argumentation comme théorie de la persuasion.

---

**Автор:** Начёрная Светлана Владимировна – кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры «Иностранные языки», ФГБОУ ВПО «ТГТУ».

**Рецензент:** Макеева Марина Николаевна – доктор филологических наук, профессор, заведующая кафедрой «Иностранные языки», ФГБОУ ВПО «ТГТУ».