Hranush TOVMASYAN
Brusov State University

PRESUPPOSITIONAL AND LOGICAL ARCHITECTURE OF THE TEXT

The paper is an attempt to shed light on one of the most interesting issues on the crossroads of pragmatics and text linguistics – presuppositional and logical structure of the text. The relevance of this study is determined by the fact that it unveils text architecture from a new angle – its micro-/macropresuppositional content. The research outcomes allow of the following statement – the semantic structure of the text largely owes to and depends on the macro-/micro-presuppositions of the text underlying it. The paper also clarifies the differences between the notions of micro-text and macro-text on the one hand and micro-presupposition and macro-presupposition on the other as these phenomena play a crucial role in text composition and progression.

Key words: *presupposition, text, structure, micro-/macrotext, micro-/macro-presupposition, text perception, understanding and interpretation, presupposition base*

The presuppositional structure of the text is the intensional of the elements of the text which relies on the quantity of the themes of the text, its semantic nuclei. I label them micro-presuppositions of the text. In this respect it is pivotal to note the difference between micro-presuppositions and macro-presuppositions of the text. The first ones represent a single unit of information mainly incorporated within one logic and actualized via one sentence/ utterance. The second ones set up and develop after two and more micro-presuppositions come together within one logically connected stream of thought.

The text is a system of complex meaningful units that are united in a semantic structure by a single concept. The macro-structure of the text is shaped by denser and more complex information blocs – micro-presuppositions. The semantic mapping of micro-presuppositions is actualized via predication, thus contributing to text cohesion and global coherence.

From the recipient's perspective the text is a potential outcome of the recipient's subjective activity and knowledge scope. The semantic structure of the text is reduced to the hierarchy of his/ her presupposition base. In this respect van Dijk puts it "Macrostructures have a cognitive nature. Macrostructures have a subjective nature since different language users may find different information in the text more important" /van Dijk, 1988: 33/. Besides, upon comprehension a reader performs an act of interpretation of the sentences, constructs a set of macro-

structures, which transform the highly complex information to a manageable size, which works as the formula on which comprehension is based /van Dijk and Kintsch, 1983/.

The semantic wholeness of the text is actually one of its most important characteristics, yet it is subjective. The semantic wholeness of the text has both micro- and macro-structure, the latter can be represented as a hierarchy of semantic blocs of various values – predications. In this particular case predication is the realization in the text of the semantic links which are indispensable for the actualization of the main semantic motive of the message /Артемская, 1989: 164/. It should be mentioned that the same idea has found different interpretations by different scholars, in some cases quite categorical though. Namely, Kulikov states that the most important feature of the text that distinguishes it from all other linguistic formations is the semantic super-structure of the text. (I claim it to be the macro-presupposition of the text as it is the latter that functions as a nucleus for all minor predications, smaller information blocks, micro-presuppositions.) Hence, the minimal unit of the text is the minimal unit of the given semantic super-structure /Куликов, 1983: 6/.

The *central thesis* of this article is the claim that the marco-presupposition of the text is composed of smaller chunks of information which are the micro-presuppositions of the utterances of the given text, thus creating an immediate connection between the presuppositional structure of the text and its logical one. In the article I clearly single out that the linear composition of the utterances, i.e. their logical sequence is preconditioned by the micro-presuppositions of the utterances and ultimately the macro-presupposition of the text.

There is an abundance of works on the hierarchy of the elements of the text on the one hand and the delimitation of the macro-text with a complex inner structure on the other.

A micro-text contains only a micro-presupposition, that's to say only one single concept unfolds in it. In this respect Zhinkin states that "In any text, if it is relatively accomplished and consistent, there is only one thought, one thesis, one statement uttered" /Жинкин, 1956: 250/. I find this approach most appropriate for defining the micro-text. Further Gak puts it that the semantic organization of the text in its denotative perspective is its signification (nomination) which signals the connection between the linguistic unit and its extra-linguistic designatum, signification /Гак, 1974: 6/, that's to say predication. The micro-text has been labelled in a number of ways. For example, Blokh uses the term *dicteme* to signify the minimal text segment that is formed by sentences and has its own theme /Блох, 1987: 17/.

Interestingly, this view is quite close the one elaborated by Chafe – the main unit of oral discourse is intonation unit (IU) which can be compared with one

predication. IU is the reflection of the focus of consciousness, the focus constantly (not evenly) moving from one fragment of reality to another. Each IU can contain no more than one element of information, one new idea (namely, one presupposition) which stands for a certain referent – events, states or their participants. Following Chafe's ideology, there are two main phenomena, better to say, two constituents – IU and discourse. Notably, between these two the scholar differentiates a third intermediate unit as well – the sentence which Chafe identifies with the super-focus of consciousness /Chafe, 1994/.

It is pivotal to draw some parallels between the conception outlined in this article and that of Chafe, the most important being the following – one minimal unit of the plane of expression (in this case micro-text) contains only one unit of the plane of content (in the given case, micro-presupposition). The combination of the minimal units of both planes generates higher, more complex units – macro-ones (in my terminology) or super- (in Chafe's terminology) which is not the simple sum of the lower linguistic units. And finally, according to Chafe, all units are summarized in discourse, in a certain linguistic structure which in my conception is nothing else but the text itself. Besides, I think that each minimal unit (micro-text) contains only one predication which can be supposedly understood as the correlation of the presupposition of the text with some extra-linguistic reality which comes forth when the idea, theme or, in my terminology, presupposition is verbalized.

The logical structure of the text is the sequence and structure of representing the semantic elements in the process of the development of the text.

Now let's consider the **communicative and structural wholeness** of the text. The communicative wholeness of the text is preconditioned by the communicative intention of the speaker of the text. In this respect the text is a speech segment with a certain illocution and a system of ways of verbalizing it. In other words, the text, as the main unit of communication must exert a certain effect on the interlocutors. Nevertheless, the exerted effect may be different conditioned by the author's communicative intention and the concept of the text. **In case of communicative effect** the author wants to inform or get information. Obviously, the communication takes place for transfer/ acquisition/ exchange of information. In other words, the aim of the communication is to call forth mental-verbal or physical reaction on the part of the interlocutor. In the case of aesthetic effect (which is especially topical in terms of fiction) the aim of communication is to exercise influence on the recipient and call forth his/ her mental-emotional reaction. Actually, such delimitation can hardly ever come up in a clear, sterile way. Such an isolation of the categories is done mainly for the purpose of analysis which in the scope of this research is quite the case.

It is noteworthy to say that nowadays the **structural wholeness** of the text is perhaps its most profoundly studied aspect /Барт, 1978; Беллерт, 1978; Givon, 1979; van Dijk, 1988; Crompton, 2002; Tárnyiková, 2009; Cornish, 2010, etc./, which is conditioned by the fact that it has its proper formal-signemic expression through language means that can be inventorized and categorized.

Now let's consider the **text-forming categories, components** and **elements**. Proceeding from the above-mentioned, the study of the **presuppositional** and **communicative** wholeness of the text actually deals with the text-forming categories, namely, the concept of the text, its presuppositional and logical structure, communicative and aesthetic impact. On the level of structural wholeness, the text-forming categories (namely syntactic, lexical and phonological) correlate with the text-forming components that are represented by diverse language means which in their turn have their correlates by way of text-forming elements. The text-forming components are actualized in these elements in the process of creating of a certain text. For instance, the phonological categories can be represented by such components as intonation, pausation, syntagmatic segmentation, timbre, tempo, voice quality, register, etc. As such text-forming elements are the only means of actualizing the above-mentioned components. Likewise, the same process of delimitation of text-forming components and elements can be spotted on lexical and syntactic levels.

As is known, there are two main features of the text that manifest its structural and semantic ties – cohesion and coherence. Coherence fulfils the following functions 1) secures the semantic connection between different parts of the text necessary for the detection of the theme of the text (macro-presupposition, micro-presupposition), 2) prepares the recipient for the adequate comprehension of the text, 3) secures the integrity of "text memory" by way of retrieving the previous parts of the text via repeating them.

In the present paper I do not pose on cohesion and coherence as central textual categories but rather put forward a new cognitive approach to the notion of text generation and perception.

There is a great difference, distinct connections and certain dependence between the text-forming categories if observed from the addresser's or perceiver's view, better to say, at the moment of its production or perception.

The starting point for any text production is the concept/ the macro-presupposition that actually preconditions the semantic structure of the text and the latter in its turn preconditions its logical structure. Besides, the macro-presupposition reflects the author's intentions and is in fact the indirect embodiment (through intentions) of the motive of production of a certain text. As such the macro-presupposition of the text specifies its communicative orientation

which is central in any text production. Obviously, the choice of the language means of a text is preconditioned by its logical structure and communicative orientation. These two vital text-generating components are a priori conditioned by the macro-presupposition of the text.

It is noteworthy that at text production level the author goes from the deep structure of the text, namely its macro-presupposition to the surface structure, that's to say its verbal "tissue". Though, obviously, at text perception the recipient goes in the reverse direction – from the verbally embodied text to its macro-presupposition.

The discussed two levels of processing of verbal communication are: at first, we decode the perceived linguistic units on the surface (grammatical) level, further we observe the decoding of deep structures, that's to say their presuppositional content that lies beyond the perceived message. This process also brings into play cognitive structures – both linguistic and phenomenological.

Therefore, in an adequate perception of the text (from its verbally embodied plane of expression to its deep level plane of content – macro-presupposition) there is a crucial aspect – consituation – that embraces relations of both surface and deep levels. For the recipient to be able to perceive the text, he/ she must be able to understand both the signemic order of meanings and relate the text to reality, his/ her knowledge and perceptions of reality, that's to say his/ her presupposition base.

Interestingly, on the one hand, text perception is the **restoration** of the extralinguistic information, reality, the structure of the communication via the text itself, on the other hand it is impossible to see the meaning in the text itself. Instead, they can be **built, set up, created.** To perceive the meaning does not simply imply to understand it – it rather supposes **giving, assigning** meaning to it.

Thus, text perception is a psychological process. The essence of this lies in the idea that the recipient actually creates an image of the content of the text which is always dynamic. By saying dynamic I mean it is based on the presupposition base of the recipient. In this respect each recipient is said to create their own image, idea of the text. That's why no single text is decoded identically by at least two people. In other words, it does not exist as such, it is in a permanent process of creating its identity. In fact, the real issue of text perception is not the text itself as a linguistic entity but its content in the broadest sense. Namely, the content that will later circulate in larger dimensions, i.e. convert into presuppositional base for decoding other texts.

Analyzing the process of text perception (understanding, interpretation), many scholars note the importance of the recipient's prior experience. Hence, text perception and understanding take place when two components come together, namely 1) semantic organization and structure of the text, and 2) what is contained in the recipient's cognition and memory, and embraces his/her level of linguistic

competence and stock of knowledge on the given topic /Биева, 1982: 67; Кубрякова, 1987; Никифоров, 1982/. Nevertheless, to understand and perceive a text, the recipient's individual cognitive framework is not enough. There is another aspect which is more important than any other factor in text perception – that is the general background knowledge of the participants of the communication relevant for the present act of communication – presupposition base. And though many scholars speak about it indirectly emphasizing the recipient's language competence only, yet the existence of presupposition base is assumed which actually allows of the existence of social knowledge.

Obviously, text perception is not so much the comprehension of its meaning but rather decodification of the recipient's intention and motive of the received message.

As for the adequacy of text perception and comprehension, I mean a certain correspondence between the interpretations of the text given by the author and the recipient. It means that the presupposition base of the author and that of the recipient must coincide. And though I accept that a text is poly-presuppositional, as Zvegintsev terms it, nevertheless, there is a certain presuppositional invariant that maximally fully and precisely corresponds to the content of the text. The given invariant is preconditioned by the wholeness of the knowledge and views proper to an average speaker of the given language and mental-linguistic system on the one hand and a certain sign system that serve for the expression of the given knowledge and views on the other hand. In other words, the presupposition base preconditions the "presuppositional invariant" which allows of the perception of the preceding text as well as the existence of the potential invariant of perception of any text as the presupposition base specifies a certain system of indices into which all new texts are fit and through which they are perceived and evaluated.

So, a text is a discourse unit which manifests linguistic and extra-linguistic phenomena which in their turn display the linguistic consciousness and linguistic identity of the interlocutors.

Before passing on to the gist of this section, I would like to pose on some essential textual terms and notions that I will operate with here.

The first is the **situation** which is a fragment of objectively existing reality made up of both extralinguistic and linguistic phenomena. The situation, provoking a certain mental reaction, forces to some action – verbal or non-verbal. The reaction "shapes" into a **motive** which in its turn can embody into the **intention** of the verbal outcome/ reaction to the external stimulant – situation. To me the verbal reaction to the situation, the output of some verbal-mental activity is actually the **text** itself.

Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that the connection between the text and motive is not so straightforward. The motive as the stimulus for speech production

(text) is embodied into the concept of the generated text. The concept of the text is the mental clot, the maximally unfolded deep structure, its macro-presupposition, which is unfolded in the very process of text generation. The concept or presupposition is the immediate starting point for text generation and in some way is correlated with the inner dynamic scheme of the utterance or with the inherent meaning of the utterance which is actually the condensed inherent equivalent of the outer (generated) text. In contrast to the outer speech it lacks grammatical shape, a certain semantic order and sound form. Obviously, it is the presupposition that embodies the inner programming of the future utterance, namely the unconscious structure of some scheme on the basis of which in the utterance is generated. The macro-presupposition of the text is something that is not lexically, grammatically and phonetically shaped yet. Interestingly, it develops non-linearly, namely at text generation a scanning of the developing semantic structure takes place which can be simpler or more complicated, can develop in one or many directions, can actualize in micro- or macro-text via verbalization of the micro- or macro-presupposition.

As has been mentioned earlier the **micro-presupposition** is a minimal, indivisible semantic nucleus, atomic theme. The **macro-presupposition** is respectively a combination of micro-presuppositions. The outcome of such a combination is a phenomenon of a different range – it is also a semantic nucleus but it has a more complex structure.

There is only one micro-presupposition in one act of predication, one correspondence of the presupposition of the text, its idea actualized via a speech act with the extra-linguistic reality which takes place in the process of verbalization of the idea. Macro-text is a combination of several predications respectively.

It is noteworthy that text analysis proceeds in the following order – from the form (of text-forming categories) to content (macro-presupposition). In other words, we proceed from the comprehension of words and their meanings to the motive of the utterance.

To make it clear, let's consider a maximally simple text – a micro-text as a logical unity.

Situation 1: A and B are going camping and are half way there. Approaching the filling station, B tells A: (text 1) There is a long way ahead. Take this (stretching out some money) and fill up the car.

(text 2) There is a long way ahead, take this (stretching out some money) and fill up the car.

Situation 1 has provoked B's verbal reaction, namely texts 1 or 2 which by the way can go even without verbal reaction, as for example, if B drives into the filling station, stretches out the money and points at the filler. Texts 1 and 2 are micro-

texts as they have all the 3 differential features of a text – thematic, communicative and structural. These three features are actualized in text-forming categories:

1. at the level of thematic unity (the text-forming categories are: macro-presupposition, presuppositional structure and logical structure of the text) – the parts of the text can easily change places that's why texts 1 and 2 are synonymic the only difference being in the actual division of the sentence,

2. at the level of communicative unity (the text-forming category in this case is the communicative impact) – motive, illocutionary force,

3. at the level of structural unity (the text-forming categories are syntactic, lexical and phonological categories) – texts 1 and 2 are represented by one utterance; though the parts of it are connected asyndetically the cause-and-effect relations are easily detected and reconstructed from the context, the texts are two-syntagm but they compose one single utterance, otherwise the single communicative intention and thematic wholeness of the text are lost.

Let's observe a more complex text.

Situation 2: A and B are going camping and are half way there. Approaching the filling station, B tells A: (text 3) There is a long way ahead. (text 4) Take this (stretching out some money) and fill up the car.

Situation 2 called B's verbal reaction (texts 3 and 4) which can equally have no reaction at all (only text 4 is meant here). Texts 3 and 4 are independent macro-texts. Their fundamental difference from the texts 1 and 2 is in the following:

1. at the level of thematic unity (the text-forming categories are: macro-presupposition, presuppositional structure and logical structure of the text) – texts 3 and 4 cannot change places as such a change will bring about the complete destruction of logic and distortion of meaning,

2. at the level of communicative unity (the text-forming category in this case is the communicative impact) – text 3 is a statement of a fact while text 4 is the motive. Hence, the communicative value, illocutionary force of the texts 3 and 4 are basically different,

3. at the level of structural unity (the text-forming categories are syntactic, lexical and phonological categories) – texts 3 and 4 are articulated as independent utterances, the pause between them being much longer and stronger than in the case of texts 1 and 2.

Overall, differences between texts 1 ad 2 on the one hand and texts 3 and 4 on the other are accounted for by the two "upper" text-forming categories (thematic and communicative unities) and phonological categories.

At the same time being micro-texts texts 3 and 4 compose a text of a more complex structure – macro-text. The reasons for such a supposition are as follows:

1. one single situation that calls forth a multitude of micro-texts that later come together into one macro-text, that's to say, one and the same situation caused

a more complex reaction – the macro-text is developed via scanning-development of two micro-themes,

2. a certain logical order of development of micro-texts – one serves as a logical motive for the other,

3. the cause-and-effect relations existing between texts 3 and 4 can be exposed at the lexical-syntactic level via connectives.

Summing up, the analysis carried out in the article sheds light on the presuppositional and logical structure of the text. As is clearly exposed in the article, the text is shaped and its utterances are logically ordered on the surface level only due to the macro-presupposition of the text. The macro-presupposition of the text is the basic "driver and regulator" for the further generation of the text and its respective semantic and logical structure. The macro-presupposition in its turn embraces a wide range of cognitive, social, linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge – presupposition base – which allows of two fundamental processes – text generation and its adequate perception.

REFERENCE

1. Астремская Е.В. Проблема семантического структурирования текста при чтении // *Функционирование текста в лингвокультурной общности.* Москва: Институт языкознания, 1989.
2. Барт Р. Лингвистика текста // *Новое в зарубежной лингвистике.* Вып. VIII. Москва: Прогресс, 1978.
3. Биева Е.Г. К вопросу о факторах, определяющих понимание текста // *Уровни текста и методы его лингвистического анализа.* Москва: Изд. АН СССР, 1982.
4. Беллерт М. Об одном условии связности текста // *Новое в зарубежной лингвистике,* вып. VIII. Москва: Прогресс, 1978.
5. Блох М.Я. Диктема и целый текст // *Семантика целого текста.* Тезисы выступлений на совещании. Москва/ Одесса: Наука, 1987.
6. Гак В.Г. О семантической организации текста // *Лингвистика текста.* Материалы научной конференции. Москва: МГПИИЯ им. М. Тореза, 1974.
7. Жинкин Н.И. Развитие письменной речи учащихся 3-7 классов // *Изв. АПН РСФСР,* вып. 78. Москва: Наука, 1956.
8. Кубрякова Е.С. Текст – проблемы понимания и интерпретации // *Семантика целого текста.* Тезисы выступлений на совещании. Москва/ Одесса: Наука, 1987.

9. Куликов С.В. Что такое минимальная единица текста? // *Текст как инструмент общения*. Москва: Ин-т языкознания АН СССР, 1983.

10. Никифоров С.В. Возможное психолингвистическое рассмотрение прагматического аспекта декодирования текста // *Уровни текста и методы его лингвистического анализа*. Москва: Изд. АН СССР, 1982.

11. Chafe W. Discourse, consciousness, and time. The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

12. Cornish F. "Anaphora: Text-based or discourse-dependent? Functionalist versus formalist accounts" // *Functions of Language*, v. 17 (2), 2010.

13. Crompton P. Theme in argumentative texts: an analytical tool applied and appraised (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Lancaster, Lancaster, UK, 2002.

14. Givon T. On Understanding Grammar. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

15. Tárnyiková J. From Text to Texture. Olomouc: FF UP, 2009.

16. van Dijk T. A., Kintsch W. Strategies of Discourse Comprehension. New York: Academic Press, 1983.

17. van Dijk T. A. News Analysis: Case Studies of International and National News. New Jersey: Erlbaum, 1988.

Հ. ԹՈՎՄԱՍՅԱՆ – ***Տեքստի կանխենթադրությային և վրամաբանական կառուցվածքը.*** – Հոդվածում արծարծվում է գործաբանության և տեքստի լեզվաբանության հատման տիրույթում գտնվող հետաքրքիր մի թեմա. տեքստի կանխենթադրությային և տրամաբանական կառուցվածքը: Ըստ ուսումնասիրության արդյունքների՝ տեքստի կանխենթադրությային կառուցվածքը մեծապես պայմանավորված է դրա հիմքում ընկած միկրո/ մակրոթեմայից կամ միկրո/ մակրոկանխենթադրույթից: Հոդվածում նաև հստակ տարանջատվում են մի կողմից միկրո/մակրոտեքստ, իսկ մյուս կողմից միկրո/մակրոկանխենթադրույթ հասկացությունները, քանի որ այս երևույթներն առանցքային դերակատարում ունեն տեքստի ձևավորման և ծավալման մեջ: Ուսումնասիրության առանցքում են նաև տեքստի ընկալման, հասկացման և մեկնման մեխանիզմները հաղորդակցվողների կանխենթադրությային հենքի տեսանկյունից:

Բանալի բառեր. կանխենթադրույթ, տեքստ, կառուցվածք, միկրո-/մակրոտեքստ, միկրո-/ մակրոկանխենթադրույթ, տեքստի ընկալում, հասկացում և մեկնում, կանխենթադրությային հենք

Г. ТОВМАСЯН – *Пресуппозиционное и логическое строение текста*. – В статье рассматривается одна из самых актуальных проблем на стыке прагматики и лингвистики текста: пресуппозиционная и логическая структуры текста. Согласно результатам исследования, пресуппозиционная структура текста зависит от его микро-/макропресуппозиций. В статье также дается четкое разграничение между понятиями микро-/макротекст, с одной стороны, и такими текстообразующими понятиями, как микро-/макротема и микро-/макропресуппозиция, с другой. Детально рассматриваются механизмы восприятия, понимания и интерпретации текста с позиций пресуппозиционной базы коммуникантов.

Ключевые слова: пресуппозиция, текст, структура, микро-/макротекст, микро-/макропресуппозиция, восприятие, понимание и интерпретация текста, пресуппозиционная база