



Journal
of Danubian
Studies
and Research

Maritime Discourse as Part of Professional Discourse

Yurii Berlinskyi¹

Abstract: The purpose of the article is to analyze the existing views on professional discourse in linguistics and highlight the concept of maritime discourse in it. The material analyzes such key concepts as discourse, professional discourse and maritime discourse. The key approach to writing a work is diachronic, which manifests itself in the study of the works of linguists on this issue. The article summarizes the scattered views of scientists on the maritime discourse as part of the professional in one system, on the basis of which it is possible to study the key features of the maritime discourse. The value of the article is presented in the form of a theoretical generalization of different views on the concept of maritime discourse for understanding this phenomenon at the present stage of development of cognitive linguistics.

Keywords: linguistics; cognitive linguistics; discourse study

Introduction

The main mission of any social institution is to perform an organizational and disciplinary function, which consists in organizing the social life of people on the basis of generally accepted standards and methods of hierarchical subordination. Therefore, the institutional discourse, which is realized within the framework of a particular social institution, is a stable system of status-role relations, within which the power functions of symbolic coercion are carried out in the form of a normative prescription and legitimization of certain ways of worldview, world perception, vectors of value orientations and models of behavior. In other words, a social

¹ Postgraduate student, Izmail State University for Humanities, Ukraine, Address: Repina St, 12, 68601, Izmail, Odessa Region, Ukraine, Corresponding author: yurii.berlinskyi@gmail.com.

institution is an authority that manages the hierarchy of status roles, carries out status-role positioning of the main subjects of a social institution.

Social institutions arise in society to perform the most important functions of society - the organization of society as a holistic formation with a hierarchical structure, protection of society, socialization of new members of society, obtaining new knowledge, maintaining faith in a higher being, disseminating information, etc. Accordingly, political, military, marine, pedagogical and other types of institutional discourse arise and develop. Social institutions are historically conditioned, new institutions arise on the basis of the old ones, if there is a need for it. The main participants in the institutional discourse are its representatives and those who apply to the relevant institution.

Shipping has long been one of the most important aspects of human life. Let us consider the main (structure-forming) components of the marine discourse as an institutional discourse according to the scheme proposed by V.I. Karasik. To describe a specific type of institutional discourse, V.I. Karasik suggests considering the following components: 1) participants; 2) chronotope; 3) goals; 4) values (including the key concept); 5) strategies; 6) material (topic); 7) varieties and genres; 8) precedent (cultural) texts; 9) discursive formulas (Karasik, 2000, p. 34). The core of the discourse, according to V.I. Karasik, is “communication of the basic pair of communication participants” (Karasik, 2002, p. 234).

The marine discourse has a number of features that characterize communication within its framework as strictly institutional. First of all, this is the relationship between the participants in communication, for example, the captain and the sailor. In marine life, the concept of subordination reflects the status-role relationships of communicants. It can be said that the concept of subordination is key to the shipping discourse. It, in turn, is dictated by another main feature of marine life - clarity concerning everything - the daily routine, assigning tasks to subordinates, formulating orders and, accordingly, relations between sailors. Clarity and regulation are manifested both in the process of direct oral communication, and (to a much greater extent) in the texts of maritime documentation.

The chronotope of the maritime discourse is the setting typical of maritime communication. It can be at sea during the period of the contract or ashore while loading / unloading a vessel or in a crewing company. Modern media (Internet, maritime radio, mail) are expanding the chronotope of discourse.

The value component of the marine discourse, in our opinion, manifests itself, first of all, in the recognition of life as the highest value, from which it is necessary to value not only one's own, but also someone else's life. This value component is conditioned by a certain risk to life that accompanies the professional component of navigation. Discursive formulas are understood as peculiar turns of speech inherent in communication in the corresponding social institution.

Based on the peculiarities of the maritime discourse, in which there is a lack of time limitation (working hours - around the clock) and the presence of spatial restrictions (the bulk of the work and rest of the crew takes place within the boundaries of the ship), it seems appropriate to consider two types of maritime discourse - formal and informal maritime discourse. The formal part of the maritime discourse is made up of all maritime materials (scientific and technical materials related to the life and activities of maritime institutions) and acts of maritime management, which have a number of common lexical features: frequent use of terminology, which is constantly changing due to the loss of some words from circulation, changes in values; replenishment of new terms in connection with the emergence of new models of marine technology; the presence of abbreviations and index designations, as well as conventional signs.

Particularly noteworthy are elliptical constructions and clichés, which are often used in maritime communication and are quite difficult for the uninitiated to understand. In incomplete designs, as a rule, the components which can easily be reconstructed from the context or situation and do not impede the correct understanding of the transmitted information with proper knowledge of the marine specifics are omitted. Service words most often become such components, but sometimes they can also be significant words. For maritime documents, the cases of omission of articles and a number of prepositions are typical. Here are examples of naval teams that do not use articles and prepositions, although their presence is provided for by the rules of English grammar:

1. *Get x anchor ready!* (naval command, which is used when anchoring the ship, the article *an* is omitted for speed of transmission of the order).
2. *Stand by on VHF channel* (naval team, which is used to conduct VHF maritime communications).

The desire for conciseness and brevity also leads to the emergence of clichéd elliptical structures, which are becoming the norm in maritime communication. In the clichéd elliptical command, only those elements remain that are necessary for the

accurate transfer of information, and it is impossible to understand commands of this type without special knowledge. For example:

1. *Up anchor!* (naval command, denoting an order to un-anchor, in which the verb is subject to elimination).
2. *Starboard!* (naval command, denoting an order to turn the steering wheel to the right).

The first approach to the study of marine discourse allows us to draw preliminary conclusions that the specifics of navigation determines certain features of the marine discourse. Being institutional discourse in terms of its system-forming features and the presence of structural components, it still contains elements of personal private discourse. Further detailed study of the functioning of the components of institutional and personal discourses in the maritime discourse seems promising.

References

- Karasik, V. I. (2002). *Yazykovoy krug: lichnost', kontsepty, diskurs/Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse*. Volgograd: Peremena, p. 477.
- Karasik, V.I. (2000). *O tipakh diskursa/On the types of discourse*. Yazykovaya lichnost': institutsional'nyy i personal'nyy diskurs: sb. nauch. tr. Volgograd: Peremena, pp. 5–20.
- Kibrik, A. A. (2009). *Modus, zhanr i drugiye parametry klassifikatsii diskursov/Mode, genre and other parameters of the classification of discourses*. Voprosy yazykoznaniiya. № 2, pp. 3–21.
- Makarov, M. L. (2003). *Osnovy teorii diskursa/Foundations of the theory of discourse*. M.: ITDGK Gnozis, p. 280
- Oleshkov, M. YU. (2006). *Osnovnyye parametry modeli professional'noy kommunikatsii (na primere didakticheskogo diskursa)/The main parameters of the model of professional communication (on the example of didactic discourse)*. Sotsiokul'turnyye problemy v obrazovanii: mezh-vuz. sb. nauch. tr. M.: RITS MGOPU im. M.A. Sholokhova, pp. 62–71.