
ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

УДК 81

Ekaterina A. Redkozubova*Southern federal university**Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation*

kateredkozubova@mail.ru

**MODERN COMMUNICATIVE SPACE:
APPROACHES TO DESCRIPTION****[*Е.А. Редкозубова* Современное коммуникативное пространство:
подходы к описанию]**

The article deals with the essence of modern communicative space and slang as its essential part. Communicative space is viewed as a phenomenon not only including cognitive and cultural space, but also reflecting ways and means of representation of various units which structure these spaces. The following types of communicative space are distinguished: universal communicative space; communicative space of lingua-cultural community; collective communicative space; individual communicative space. The study of a wide range of sources allows the author to classify and name the main features of the modern **communicative space**. The significance of such kind of study is determined by the urgent necessity of theoretical reflection on basic communicative problems.

Key words: communication, style, slang, discourse practice, communicative space.

Modern humanitarian knowledge is characterized by keen interest in the phenomenon of communicative space and detection of specific functions of linguistic units (or their classes) in the communicative space [1; 3; 4; 6; 7;]. In contemporary humanities two interpretations of the concept “communicative space” coexist. These interpretations may be classified as a wide approach and a narrow one. The broad interpretation treats the communicative space as a space in which communication is carried out.

The approaches to the research and the description of communicative space can be represented as follows:

1. general humanitarian (sociological, culturological, philosophical);
2. integrative by nature (lingua-philosophical, lingua-communicative, communicative and cognitive, communicative and pragmatic, lingua-cognitive, lingua-pragmatic, etc.);
3. linguistic proper (text, discourse, etc.).

It is possible to note that the broad interpretation of the concept "communicative space" is not excluded from any of the approaches mentioned above. The aspects of consideration define not only the direction of the analysis, but also parameters of the description of this objective space. In particular it leads to a certain fusion of the concepts "communicative space" and "communication space" in general humanitarian approaches. It would be pointless to deny the fact that on number of signs these concepts are extremely close and in concrete contexts they are synonymous and interchangeable, but, in our opinion, the concept "communicative space" is the most general and it is confirmed by its broad interpretation. The analysis of communication space demands a detailed consideration of specific features of communication channel, transmission media of information, management of communicative (information) streams, etc. In modern sociology of communication the structuring of communicative space considering its complex character and multidimensionality is generally accepted. In scientific researches, for example in G. G. Pocheptsov's works, four-regularity is established as a property of communicative space. The author suggests understanding the level of steady information exchange as a measurement of such spaces [2]. According to this approach communicative distance (close and far) and communication density (deep and superficial) are considered as the parameters determining the communicative space. These parameters also determine in mutual correlations the levels of interaction in communicative space: physical, psychological, social, intellectual, or information. In real communication all these levels are present in a complex interaction. Obviously, the consideration of these parameters is important also in relation to communication space; however, first of all, they define communication as a process. A different set of parameters is necessary for the description of communicative space and its structure.

In philosophy the communicative space receives the most generalized description that is caused by the specifics of this science. So, for example, A. Ryazanov notes that for modern humanitarian knowledge the concepts "ethnos", "space" and "communication" are crucial, and defines communicative space of ethnos as a complicated structured system fastened through intra-ethnic communication. This system consists of a set of the interconnected and interrelated structural elements [5]. A further definition of the set of these elements brings the author to the thought that the main elements are concepts, language, religion, historical memory, communicative behavior. The principle functions are to express and broadcast. On

closer examination the hierarchical organization of elements of such system is obvious. Language, being the most important means of saving and broadcasting knowledge and representations, cultural and ethnic identity, is understood as a semiotic system. Language units traditionally are considered as means of broadcast of cultures, in particular cultural, behavioral, communicative stereotypes. Besides, the differentiation of ethnic and state communicative spaces offered by the author is possible, and from the point of view of social philosophy it is necessary, but both of these types of spaces, apparently, are considered within this or that concrete linguaculture if it deals with identity saving. Thus, within any approach to the description of communicative space it turns necessary to consider linguistic data.

The tendency to integration of research paradigms is characteristic of modern linguistics. Therefore, integrated approaches to the description of communicative space are the most promising. However, the existing approaches, despite their integrative character, do not allow to define adequately the characteristic features of communicative space though the consistent description of separate parameters or elements is submitted in their framework.

Taking into account communicative and pragmatic approach communicative space is considered as a zone of real and potential contacts of each of participants of communication from the point of view of speaking (sender) [5]. G. Pocheptsov defines the concept of communicative space as a basic one for the theory of communication and he notes that in its framework all communicative discourses are implemented [2]. In B. Gasparov's works the communicative space is considered in relation to the text, including a belle-letter style. According to B. Gasparov's idea the concept of communicative space can be considered as inner characteristics of texts, and it can be defined as a certain hypothetical complete communicative space of the author and the reader [1].

There are also narrower interpretations of the concept "communicative space", they concretize the term in its relation to this or that type of discourse (see, for example, works devoted to the analysis of communicative space of discourse of flattery), or to certain types of communication (for example, communicative space of the Internet), or to certain texts.

Representatives of the lingua-culturological approach offer their own ways to the analysis of cognitive and cultural space, these approaches, in our opinion, can be successfully extrapolated to the communicative space.

If we consider the communicative space as a phenomenon not only including cognitive and cultural spaces, defining their concrete projection, but also reflecting ways and means of representation of various units that structure these spaces, then the usage of principles applied to cognitive and cultural spaces is quite logical when the communicative space is studied.

As a result it is possible to offer the following structure of communicative space:

1. a universal communicative space which assumes the reflection of the general principles of communication for representatives of mankind as a species;
2. communicative space of lingua-cultural community;
3. a collective communicative space which is socially determined. This level of communicative space is represented by a set of elements: the number of collective spaces can be equal to numbers of the societies an individual belongs to, or it can be equal to number of societies that are present in lingua-cultural community (communities) when for example cross-cultural communication is realized;
4. an individual communicative space. It stands to reason that an individual communicative space includes segments of all other communicative spaces.

In our opinion, it is possible to identify special types of communicative space which are either in transitive zone between the communicative space of lingua-cultural community (CSLC) and universal communicative space, or which serve as means of additional structuring of the space. Communicative space closely related lingua-cultures (for example, Slavic) are referred to the communicative space of the first type. Larger communicative spaces determined by geopolitical factors which are related to the western and eastern standards are traditionally distinguished in sociolinguistics. In the communicative space of lingua-cultural community it is possible to differentiate communicative space of ethnos or ethnic group if the lingua-culture is multiethnic. In this case the main necessary condition is common language and culture. It is also possible to single out regional projections or reflections of lingua-culture. These types of communicative spaces are significant for cross-cultural and cross-ethnic communication, due to a complex character of formation they demand the analysis not only on the synchronic, but also on the diachronic level. This or that class of units can be represented in different degree in the concrete form of communicative space. Within such an approach the analysis of functioning of slang as a communicative phenomenon is of special interest, in our opinion. Slang as a special and specific set of units can be discovered practically in any language, it pos-

sesses the universal characteristics which allow to define it as a substandard phenomenon. Slang has all indications of an adaptive system. It is possible to assume the existence of some general tendencies of slang development as a language subsystem. The analysis of slang functioning in communicative space can reveal the existence of tendencies caused by both extra linguistic and proper linguistic issues.

Besides, when functioning in communicative space of a concrete lingua-culture ethnospecific signs of slang are revealed. In the communicative space of a lingua-culture (or related lingua-cultures) the projections of interaction between slang and standard literary language are implemented. Encoded informal speech may be involved in this process.

Communicative (informational) flows correlate not only with discourse types, but also with discourse practices. Traditionally in sociology discourse practices are defined as a category which designates the speech activity which is carried out according to requirements of certain discourse type in the course of its production and reproduction, that is discourse practice is considered as a social issue. Such an approach leads to recognition of discourse practices, typical of professional communities. Transference and reproduction of special knowledge in such community can be carried out by means of professional slang (or jargon). A certain set of discourse practices is characteristic of each type of discourse. It is possible to allocate dominant discourse practices, typical of a certain discourse variety. Primary and secondary discourse practices are possible to differentiate. Secondary discourse practices are characterized by a definite number of tasks, and interpretation is viewed as a basic one.

Translation can be considered as a dominant secondary discourse practice. At the same time translation is understood both as a cross-cultural discourse practice and as a peculiar interaction of communicative spaces of individuals or collective communicative spaces of societies. As a secondary discourse practice translation is implemented, for example, in interpretation of the text by means of slang or hybrid slang-argotic units. However, in our opinion, elements, argotic by origin, can become familiar not only to members of a closed (often secret) society: being actively used, they gradually move towards slang borders, and some argotic items can enter not only slang system, but also quite standard informal speech. Taking into account the points mentioned above, the following definition of the discourse practice may be proposed :it is a set of language units chosen in accordance not only with the type and kind of discourse but also with the communicative strategy and tactics.

Presumably, relying on already traditional interpretations of discourse practices, offered in M. Foucault's, Ge. Derrida's works, it is possible to speak about the dominant discourse practices of the era, including characteristics of a linguistic community (and its communicative space), and of communicative spaces of a higher level. If we consider discourse practices as a result of interaction between various segments of the communicative space and concrete language units (or classes of units), then the complex description of the communicative space of slang based on the discourse practices in different languages is obviously possible.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. *Воронцова Т.А.* Коммуникативное пространство в лингвопрагматической парадигме // Вестник Удмурдского университета. Сер. История и филология, 2009. Вып. 1.
2. *Почепцов Г.Г.* Теория коммуникации. М.; Киев, 2001.
3. *Redkozubova E.A.* Slang in the Communicative Space of South-African Linguistic Culture. 2013. №6. www.hses-online.ru
4. *Redkozubova E.A.* Male vs. Female: Gender in Modern English Slang // The Humanities and social sciences. 2015. №6. www.hses-online.ru
5. *Редкозубова Е.А.* Сленг в современном коммуникативном пространстве. Ростов н/Д, 2012.
6. *Redkozubova E.* The Phenomenon of the Secondary Coding in Modern English Slang // The Humanities and social sciences. 2016. №5 www.hses-online.ru
7. *Redkozubova E.* Slang as a Means of Persuasion and Manipulation in Modern Communicative Space // The Humanities and social sciences. 2017. №4 www.hses-online.ru

REFERENCES

1. *Vorontsova T. A.* Communicative space in the linguistic and pragmatic paradigm // Bulletin of Udmurtian University. Ser. History and Philology, 2009. Issue 1.
2. *Pocheptsov G.G.* Theory of communication. M., Kiev, 2001.

3. *Redkozubova E.A.* Slang in the Communicative Space of South-African Linguistic Culture // The Humanities and social sciences. 2013. No6. www.hses-online.ru
4. *Redkozubova E.A.* Male vs. Female: Gender in Modern English Slang // The Humanities and social sciences. 2015. №6. www.hses-online.ru
5. *Redkozubova E.A.* Slang in Modern Communicative Space. Rostov-on-Don, 2012.
6. *Redkozubova E.* The Phenomenon of the Secondary Coding in Modern English Slang // The Humanities and social sciences. 2016. No5 www.hses-online.ru
7. *Redkozubova E.* Slang as a Means of Persuasion and Manipulation in Modern Communicative Space // The Humanities and social sciences. 2017. No4 www.hses-online.ru

October 20, 2017
