4. Levy O., Goldberg Y. Dependency-Based Word Embeddings. Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Short Papers), 2014. – P. 302–308.

5. Melamud O., McClosky D. The Role of Context Types and Dimensionality in Learning Word Embeddings / O. Melamud, D. McClosky, S. Patwardhan, M. Bansal // Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2016. – 2016. – P. 1030–1040. – Retrieved from: http://arxiv.org/abs/1601.00893

6. Mikolov T., Yih W. Linguistic Regularities in Continuous Space Word Representations / Tomas Mikolov, Wen-tau Yih, Geoffrey Zweig. – Vol. 13. – 2013.

7. Pennington J., Socher R., Manning C. Glove: Global Vectors for Word Representation // Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP). – Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2014. – P. 1532–1543.

8. Ruder S., Vulić I., Søgaard A. A Survey of Cross-lingual Word Embedding Models Sebastian. – 2017 – Retrieved from: http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.04902

9. The Current Best of Universal Word Embeddings and Sentence Embeddings [Remote employment]. – Retrieved from: https://medium.com/huggingface/universal-word-sentence-embeddings-ce48ddc8fc3a

10. Tissier J., Gravier C., Habrard A. Dict2Vec: Learning Word Embeddings using Lexical Dictionaries // Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. – 2017. – Retrieved from: http://aclweb.org/anthology/D17-1024

Natalia Kybaliuk,
Inna Dolia
Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University
Vinnytsia
Ressearch Supervisor: I.V. Dolia, PhD in Philology, Senior Lecturer
Language Advisor: I.V. Dolia, PhD in Philology, Senior Lecturer

DISCOURSE AS THE MAIN UNIT OF PRAGMATIC LINGUISTICS

Introduction. One of the most important issues in the field of modern pragmatic linguistics is the question of discourse. Nowadays it is difficult to give a clear definition to this concept taking into account the broad history of the discourse text formation and its ambiguous position in the system of existing categories. The ambiguity of the notion is determined by the history of its formation and, to a certain extent, the uncertainty of its place in the system of language realization existing categories.

The term 'discourse' comes from the Latin word 'discursus' which means 'to wander'. Later on it acquires a few other meanings. 'Discourse' in the English

language receives a consistent meaning 'language, conversation, speech, dialogue' and the adjective 'discursive' in French translation means 'logical, rational, explicit' [7: 120].

Review of recent publications. Michel Foucault considers discourse as the combination of signs, acts of formation, a series of phrases and inference [5: 150]. The scientist also introduced the concept of discursive practices asa set of anonymous historical rules that embodies the conditions for the language realization functions implementation in the certain timeframes and in a general, linguistic, economic or geographical area.

According to V. O. Zvegintsev, "discourse is a complex or meaningful unity, an elementary unit of the text. It can be singled out at the level of language and implemented in the form of a set of sentences which are semantically interrelated" [3: 13-21]. We agree with Pocheptsov's point of view that discourse is a social phenomenon which is formed by the interaction of the addresser and the addressee according to certain social, pragmatic and communicative conditions [4: 150]. At the same time, I. S. Shevchenko and O. I. Morozova emphasize on the historical background of typology of any discourse analysis of which is only possible on the basis of historical features of a certain time. After analyzing the definitions of authoritative foreign and native linguists and scholars, we can conclude that there are two main approaches to its definition [6: 234]. The first group of researchers (V.O. Zvegintsev, O.T. Ishmuratov, etc.) defines it as one that is possible to be analysed only within a text, while other scholars (M. Foucault, I. C. Shevchenko, G. G. Pocheptsov) believe that more attention should be paid to the discourse social preconditions, expressive means and figures of speech which are used by speakers to achieve a certain goal.

Objectives of the paper. The discourse structure takes the central place among all the notions studied in the discursive analysis. As well as any text immersed in the situation discourse is characterized by a rather complex structure. Therefore it is necessary to distinguish its structural levels – macrostructure (global structure) and microstructure (local structure).

The well-known Dutch scholar T. van Dejk studied the discourse macrostructure in his researches in the most thorough way [1: 56-57]. He characterizes the macrostructure as a generalized description of the basic discourse content that is made by a recipient in the process of comprehension. Moreover, this description is structured in such a way to form a complete text. The researcher is convinced that macrostructures are correlated with long-term memory structures that summarize information which has been kept in the memory for a rather long time. In contrast to macrostructure, microstructure is the division of discourse into minimal components which should be investigated at the discursive level. These minimal units include predictions or clauses.

Results of the research. Having examined Barack Obama's speeches we studied the political discourse as a unity. Special attention was paid to the lexical, grammatical and phonetic units that were used to achieve the communicative and pragmatic intentions of a speaker, namely to influence the audience, persuade the listeners, convey the speaker's point of view. Here is an extract from the inaugural

speech of the 44th president which combines a number of stylistic means that make a harmonious unity up:

"America, we have come so far. We have seen so much. But there is so much more to do. So tonight, let us ask ourselves – if our children should live to see the next century; if my daughters should be so lucky to live as long as Ann Nixon Cooper, what change will they see? What progress will we have made? This is our chance to answer that call. This is our moment".

It was found that the use of the pronouns 'we', 'our' is a key to make the resonance in the speech what has an effect as if the president speaks to you personally, as if he addresses to every citizen of the country. The appropriate usage of quotes, in particular the mentioned name of Ann Nixon Cooper (a public figure, the African American rights activist), prevents obstacles on the way of information comprehension and, consequently, increases linguistic influence. A number of rhetorical questions in the speech make it more emotional and add the necessary pathos. These means combined with the rising intonation and pauses after rhetorical questions make the speech of the new president expressive.

Conclusion. So, the discourse is arranged hierarchically and only a harmonious combination of various expressive means and stylistic devices at all these levels creates a complete picture and makes it possible to influence the audience effectively. After the analysis of B. Obama's speech it was proved that micro- and macrostructures are interconnected and cannot exist independently. Therefore, to fulfil the main goal of political discourse – to impact the audience – lexical, grammatical and phonetic means of microstructure usage is greatly important what depends on the specific purpose indicated in the discursive text macrostructure.

References

1. Ван Дейк Т. А. . Язык, познание, коммуникация: Пер. с англ. / Т.А. ван Дейк . – М. : Прогресс, 1989. – 312 с.

Van Deik T. A. . Yazyk, poznaniie, kommunikatsiia [Language, Knowledge, Communication : Translated from English] / T. A. van.Deik – Moscow : Progress, 1989. – 312 s. [In Russian].

2. Демянков В. З. Политический дискурс как предмет политологической филологии / В. З. Демянков // Политическая наука. Политический дискурс : История и современныеи сследования. – М. : ИНИОН РАН, 2002. – № 3. – С. 32-43.

Demyankov V. Z. Politicheskiy diskurs kak predmet politologicheskoy filologii [Political Discourse as the Subject of Political Philology] / V. Z. Demyankov // Politicheskaya nauka. Politicheskiy Discurs : Istoriya i sovremennyie issledovaniya. – M. : INION RAN, 2002. – №. 3. – S. 32-43. [In Russian].

3. Звегинцев В. А. О цельнооформленности единиц текста / В. А. Звегинцев // Известия АН СССР. Сер. литературы и языка, 1980. – Т. 39. – № 1. – С. 13–21.

Zvegintsev V. A. O tselnooformlennosti yedinits teksta [On the Integrity of Text Units] / V.A. Zvegintsev // Izvestiia AN USSR. Seriya literatury i yazyka. – 1980. – Vol. 39. – №. 1. – S. 13-21. [in Russian].

4. Почепцов Г. Г. Теорія комунікації / Г. Г. Почепцов. – К. : ВЦ «Київський університет», 1999. – 308 с.

Pocheptsov G. G. Teoriia komunikatsii [Communication Theory] / G. G. Pocheptsov. – K. : VTs "Kyiv University", 1999. – 308 p. [in Ukrainian].

5. Фуко Мишель. Археология знания / Пер. с фр. М. Б. Раковой, А. Ю. Серебрянниковой; вступ. ст. А. С. Колесникова / Мишель Фуко. – СПб. : ИЦ «ГуманитарнаяАкадемия»: Университетская книга, 2004. – 416 с.

Foucault Michel. Arkheologiya znanii [Archeology of Knowledge] / Translated from French by M. B. Rakova, A. Yu. Serebriannikova; Introduction by A. S. Kolesnikov / Michel Foucault. – SPb. : IC "Humanitarnaia Akademiia": Universitetskaya kniga, 2004. – 416 s. [In Russian].

6. Шевченко І. С. Проблеми типології дискурсу / І. С. Шевченко, О. І. Морозова. // Дискурс як когнітивно-комунікативний феномен / Під загальн. ред. Шевченко І. С. : Монографія. – Харків "Константа", 2005. – С. 233 – 236.

Shevchenko I. S. Problemy typolohii dyskursu [Problems of the Discourse Typology] / I. S. Shevchenko, O. I. Morozova // Dyscurs yak kohnityvno-komunikatyvnyi fenomen [Discourse as a Cognitive and Communicative Phenomenon] / Under the Editorship of Shevchenko I. S. / Monograph. – Kharkiv : Constanta, 2005. – S. 233 – 236. [In Ukrainian].

7. Штерн І. Б. Вибрані топіки та лексикон сучасної лінгвістики: Енциклопедичний словник. / І. Б. Штерн. – К. "Артек", 1998. – 336 с.

Shtern I. B. Vybrani topiky ta leksykon suchasnoi lingvistyky [Selected Topics and Lexicon of Modern Linguistics] : Encyclopaedic Dictionary / I. B. Shtern. – K. : Artek, 1998. – 336 s. [In Ukrainian].

Valeriia Moiseieva
Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University
Vinnytsia
Research Supervisor: V.I. Kalinichenko, PhD in Philology, Ass. Prof.
Language Advisor: Ia.V. Hryhoshkina, PhD in Philology, Ass. Prof.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF LINGUISTICS, ITS CONNECTION WITH PHILOSOPHY

Introduction. Linguistics is the scientific study of language, and many topics are studied under this umbrella. At the core of linguistics is the search for the unconscious knowledge that humans have about language and how it is that children acquire it, an understanding of the structure of language in general and of particular