

UDC 811.111'42:791.43

CINEMATIC DISCOURSE AS A POLYCODED AND MULTIMODAL PHENOMENON**T. A. Krysanova***Lutsk, Lesya Ukrainka Eastern European National University*

kobeka72@gmail.com

This article is devoted to the study of polycoded and multimodal nature of the cinematic discourse as a semiotically heterogeneous phenomenon. The cinematic discourse is interpreted as a complex integrated socially and culturally conditioned mental-communicative phenomenon that is characterized by a combination of lingual and non-lingual codes in its structure and is polycoded and multimodal by its nature. The paper analyzes the main approaches to the interpretation of the cinematic discourse as a creolized / polycoded / multimodal formation, proves the assumption that the cinematic discourse cannot be considered creolized, as it consists of more than two code systems that are in complex interaction aimed at constructing the meaning. The cinematic discourse contains more than two heterogeneous systems: verbal (speech), non-verbal (gestures, facial expressions, etc.) and non-lingual represented by cinematic means (close-up, camera movement, lighting, noise, music etc.). It is the inseparable combination of three semiotic systems, each is an obligatory element that serves to construct the cinematic meaning. The cinematic discourse contains various heterogeneous systems that make one perceptual flow. The article discusses the notions of the code and the mode that are of important value to explain the polycoded and multimodal nature of the cinematic discourse. The polycoded nature of the cinematic discourse focuses on the combination of several code systems attracted by filmmakers to construct the meaning. The multimodal nature of the cinematic discourse emphasizes its dynamic character and focuses on the addressee considering his cognitive and social features. The combination of different semiotic systems conduces to the film meaning construction.

Key words: cinematic discourse; code; mode; multimodal; polycoded; sign.

Introduction. The modern stage in the development of the linguistic science focuses on the study of heterogeneous linguistic phenomena and their characteristic features. Visualization contributes to the aesthetics of communication and also provides an opportunity to strengthen the pragmatic impact on the recipient of the message to make it more socially oriented and efficient. Texts that contain more than one sign system are increasingly becoming a subject of linguistic study, which causes terminological distinctions in their definition. The variety of approaches to heterogeneous messages that contain several semiotic systems and the need for their differentiation determine the **topicality** of our work. Researchers concur on the idea that the cinematic discourse is a heterogeneous phenomenon that includes several sign systems. However they argue about the interpretation of the correlation between these sign systems. The most common approaches to interpret the semiotic nature of the cinematic discourse are its interpretation as a creolized / polycoded / multimodal phenomenon.

The **aim** of the article is to study the polycoded and multimodal character of the cinematic discourse as a semiotically heterogeneous phenomenon. The cinematic discourse is considered to be a complex holistic mental-communicative phenomenon that is socially and culturally conditioned and characterized by the combination of lingual and non-lingual semiotic systems in its structure. The cinematic discourse is characterized by expressive, dialogic and media features; it aims to construct the reality and is always directed to the addressee – viewers. The cinematic discourse and the cinematic text are regarded as inseparable phenomena, as inseparable are the process and the result.

Interpretation of the cinematic discourse as a creolized formation. Creolized texts are considered to be nonlinear formations that include two sign systems. Researchers who consider the cinematic text to be creolized point out that it consists of two non-homogeneous parts: verbal and nonverbal; the latest belongs to the sign system different from the natural language [2, p. 106-110]. The dominant feature of non-verbal means is determined by graphic means, i.e. drawings, photographs etc. They are involved in the organization of the plane of content and the plane of expression being carriers of certain information [1, p. 8].

But some researchers argue that the cinematic text contains more than two sign systems. Considering the cinematic text as creolized, H. Slyshkin and M. Efremova admit that it takes more than two heterogeneous systems and interpret it as a complex interaction between linguistic and non-linguistic semiotic systems: lingual system contains written and oral components while non-lingual system contains a number of sign systems among them optical-kinetic (camera movement), paralinguistic (vocalization), extra-linguistic (laughing, crying, rate of speech etc.) that perform technical, informative and aesthetic functions [5, p.15-16].

The relations between the semiotic systems of a creolized text are of different types – addition, contrast, highlighting of certain aspects, commentary etc. However, the filmic verbal component is inconceivable apart from the image, the meaning arises at the intersection of verbal and visual components, so it cannot replicate or add to it. These types of relations are not characteristic of the cinematic text that makes it impossible to deem it creolized.

Besides the cinematic text cannot be interpreted as creolized as it contains more than two semiotic systems. The interpretation of the cinematic text as a creolized formation does not take into account the role of non-lingual components in the meaning construction and the pragmatic function they perform. A certain contradiction is caused

by the fact that the cinematic text contains more than two heterogeneous systems: verbal (speech), nonverbal (contains visual elements of non-verbal communication – gestures, facial expressions etc.) and non-lingual, represented by cinematic means (close-up, camera movement, lighting, noise, music etc.). The inextricable combination of three semiotic systems, each of which is the obligatory element serves the construction of the film meaning. It confirms the view that the cinematic text cannot be considered creolized, as it contains more than two code systems combined in the complex interaction aimed at the construction of the film meaning.

This fact induces to seek another term to interpret the cinematic discourse as a semiotically heterogeneous phenomenon and explain the integrated character of its semiotic systems.

Cinematic discourse as a polycoded phenomenon. The ambiguity of the notion “creolized” in relation to linguavisual texts has conducted to the employment of the term “polycoded”, reflecting the polycoded nature of human communication. The distinction between these notions is based on the specific character of the combination of sign systems within heterogeneous texts: polycoded texts are formed by a combination of elements belonging to different sign systems, provided that they are of equal significance in processing the message and cannot be changed or omitted. While creolized texts emphasize the fact of their creation using elements of different sign systems.

The sign system – is not simply a system of symbolic means, but the system of meanings [7]. The cinematic discourse is considered to be a combination of three narrative tendencies: pictorial, verbal and sound [4, p. 89]. The polycoded peculiarity of the cinematic discourse lies in the fact that separate shots have only the potential meaning. Only in a series of rhythmically mounted shots the image receives some semantic value [3, p. 53].

The cinematic discourse as a polycoded phenomenon is built on a combination of semiotically heterogeneous components – a verbal text, an image, and signs of another nature – within a single space. The specifics of polycoded phenomena is determined not so much by features of their constituents as their synergistic effect [6, p. 30-32]. They jointly construct the film meaning: the image serves as a support for the verbal text, the verbal text reinforces the image, the signs of the other nature – music, noise, lighting etc. intensify and specify the meaning. The interaction of constituents of the cinematic discourse as a polycoded phenomenon, not their structural features, serves the construction of the film meaning.

Though the cinematic discourse contains heterogeneous systems, it represents a single perceptual flow. The combination of film meanings produced by every semiotic system contributes to the common meaning which is the result of the interaction of all polycoded elements.

The interpretation of the cinematic discourse as a polycoded phenomenon requires to consider the notion of a code.

The code is understood as the system of communicative conventions, series of signs with series of semantic units (or meanings) paradigmatically and syntagmatically combined. The codes are applied to the messages in the general cultural frame, which determines the amount of knowledge of the recipient – his ideological, ethical, religious beliefs, attitudes, tastes, values etc. [7, p. 58]. The cinematic discourse is polycoded by its nature, all cinematic discourse units are formed by codes. The polycoded character focuses on the involvement of several structurally organized heterogeneous sign systems – codes, the combination and intersection of which promotes the constructing of the film meaning.

The film is a combination of certain semiotic codes, the film meaning is definitely organized, designed and codified [11, p. 59]. The meaning, according to C. Metz, is codified, not coded, which emphasizes the absence of absolute rules to transfer the film meaning. This fact stresses the idea that the film meaning construction has the dynamic character that has promoted the development of the multimodal film theory.

Cinematic discourse as a multimodal phenomenon. Modern interpretation of the communication on the basis of the meaning construction which is typical for cognitive pragmalinguistics contributes to the formation of a new approach to the investigation of semiotically heterogeneous phenomena – multimodal approach. This approach is based on the socio-semiotic communicative theory by M. Halliday [9] who considers the language as one of the semiotic systems that constitutes the culture system and models it as a resource for constructing meaning.

At present the researchers' interest to consider the cinematic discourse as a multimodal formation has been increasing. Multimodality as a notion based on the systemic-functional approach to the discourse analysis has been involved to indicate different resources used in the language to construct the meaning. Therefore, the multimodal approach to the cinematic discourse focuses on two aspects: attracting resources to construct the meaning and realizing the communication between film authors and film viewers.

The basic notions of the multimodal discourse analysis approach are the notions of a mode and semiotic resources. It should be noted that the definition of these notions is somewhat blurred and may vary depending on the researcher who studies the multimodal discourse. Researchers of multimodality connect the mode with the culture as a means of conveying its meaning, deny the static nature of the mode and see it as a heuristic unit [8]. It is obvious that the mode is a socially and culturally determined means to represent meanings in the communication.

Modes are associated with the sensory modality, perceived by one of the human senses – sight, hearing, tactility etc.

Modes are shaped and organized into a range of meaning-making systems in order to articulate the meanings demanded by the social requirements of different communities. All modes make meanings differently, and the meanings made are not always available to or understood by all recipients. Modes are open systems, they develop and change in response to the communicative needs of the society, new modes are being created, existing modes are being transformed [10, p. 52]. Different modes provide different dimensions of meaning making, and the choice of the mode constructs and allocates a certain meaning. The mode has a subjective character: its selection depends on the individual, the individual considers a certain visual image to be the mode [10, p. 202-203]. The mode is an active shaper of expression possibilities, not a passive transmission carrier [8, p. 76]. Each mode uses specific codes (in the terminology of researchers – “semiotic resources”) that distinguishes it from others.

Film modes – speech, sound, image are transmitted with the help of two “information” channels: auditory and visual. The visual mode, transmitted by the visual channel, is represented by the image and is realized through characters’ facial expression, visual effects, pictures etc. The sound mode is realized through music, sound effects, noise etc. The only mode used in both channels is speech - presented in writing on the visual level and orally on the auditory level. The combination of these modes varies in time and space and constantly produces semantic consistency that can be analyzed only in dynamics.

Film meaning construction is the result of the interaction between the real world of filmmakers including camera movement, montage, lighting etc. and the fictional world of film storytelling. Film codes (semiotic resources) interact constructing the meaning according to the intersemiosis of modes. Film meaning is constructed by the interaction of various resources such as image, sound, music, gestures, camera effects, combined by montage into a linear order. Film codes are considered to be inferential mechanisms as they are connected with viewers’ inferential strategies and the author’s intention. Film codes contain cultural and social information which makes a film the reflection of social values and attitudes of the society to all present challenges.

Conclusions. Cinematic discourse is polycoded and multimodal by its nature. The polycoded nature of the cinematic discourse focuses on the combination of several code systems – verbal, nonverbal and non-lingual – attracted by filmmakers to construct the meaning. Different semiotic information is integrated in a single film semantic space at the level of content and the level of form. The multimodal nature of the cinematic discourse emphasizes its dynamic nature and focuses on the direction to the addressee considering its cognitive and social features. With the “information” channels – visual and auditory, the film transmits meanings constructed by the combination of semiotically heterogeneous codes.

Viewers are actively involved into the interpretation of this information on the basis of the inferential process that has social and cultural background. While watching the film, viewers (re)construct film meanings based on their world picture that conduces to the inferential process. Film interpretation and (re)construction of film meanings is not the result of simple decoding, but a dynamic process of the inferential reasoning. It is the interaction of different semiotic systems that is crucial for the film meaning (re)construction.

Multimodal analysis specifies the syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations between film units and stresses on the dynamic nature of the film, explains how the film meaning is constructed. The study of functional characteristics of film code systems and the character of their correlation is prospective for the further analysis of film meanings construction.

REFERENCES

1. Анисимова Е. Е. Лингвистика текста и межкультурная коммуникация (на материале креолизованных текстов) / Е. Е. Анисимова. – М.: Academia, 2003. – 124 с.
2. Ворошилова М. Б. Креолизованный текст: кинотекст / М. Б. Ворошилова // Политическая лингвистика. – Екатеринбург: Урал. гос. пед. ун-т, 2007. – Вып. (2) 22. – С. 106-110.
3. Лавриненко И. Н. Стратегии и тактики мены коммуникативных ролей в современном англоязычном кинодискурсе: дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.04 / И. Н. Лавриненко. – Харьков, 2011. – 260 с.
4. Лотман Ю. М. Семиотика кино и проблематика киноэстетики / Ю. М. Лотман. – Таллин: Ээсти Раамат, 1973. – 140 с.
5. Слышкин, Г. Г. Кинотекст (опыт лингвокультурологического анализа) [Текст] / Г. Г. Слышкин, М. А. Ефремова. – М.: Водoley Publishers, 2004. – 153 с.
6. Сонин А. Г. Моделирование механизмов понимания поликодовых текстов: дис. ... доктора филол. наук: 10.02.19 / А. Г. Сонин. – М., 2006. – 310 с.
7. Эко У. Отсутствующая структура. Введение в семиологию / У. Эко. – СПб. : Симпозиум, 2006. – 540 с.
8. Bateman J. A. Multimodal Film Analysis. How Films Mean / J. A. Bateman., K.-H. Schmidt. – London and New York: Routledge, 2012. – 330 p.
9. Halliday M. A. K. Language as social semiotic : The social interpretation of language and meaning / M. A. K. Halliday. – London : Edward Arnold, 1978. – 256 p.
10. Kress G. Multimodal Teaching and Learning the Rhetorics of the Science Classroom / G. Kress, C. Jewitt, J. Ogborn, C. Tsatsarelis. – London : Bloomsbury, 2014. – 230 p.
11. Metz Ch. Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema / Ch. Metz. – Chicago : Chicago Press, 1991. – 267 p.

REFERENCES

1. Anisimova, E. E. (2003) *Lingvistika teksta i mezhkul'turnaja kommunikacija (na materiale kreolizovannyh tekstov)*. Moscow, Russia: Academia. [in Russian]
2. Voroshilova, M. B. (2007). Kreolizovannyj tekst: kinotekst. *Politicheskaja lingvistika* (Vol. (2) 22, pp. 106-110). Ekaterinburg, Russia: Ural. gos. ped. un-t. [in Russian]
3. Lavrinenko, I. N. (2011). *Strategii i taktiki meny komunikativnyh rolej v sovremennom anglojazыchnom kinodiskurse* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. [in Russian]
4. Lotman, Ju. M. (1973). *Semiotika kino i problematika kinoestetiki*. Tallin, Russia: Jejesti Raamat. [in Russian].
5. Slyshkin, G. G. & Efremova, M. A. (2004). *Kinotekst (opyt lingvokul'turologicheskogo analiza)*. Moscow, Russia: Vodolej Publishers. [in Russian]
6. Sonin, A. G. (2006). *Modelirovanie mehanizmov ponimaniya polikodovyh tekstov* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Moscow State Linguistic University. [in Russian]
7. Jeko, U. (2006). *Otsutstvujushhaja struktura. Vvedenie v semiologiju*. Saint Petersburg, Russia: Simpozium. [in Russian].
8. Bateman, J. A. & Schmidt, K.-H. (2012). *Multimodal Film Analysis. How Films Mean*. London and New York: Routledge.
9. Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meanin*. London: Edward Arnold.
10. Kress, G., Jewitt, C., Ogborn, J. & Tsatsarelis C. (2014). *Multimodal Teaching and Learning. The Rhetorics of the Science Classroom*. London: Bloomsbury.
11. Metz, Ch. (1991). *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*. Chicago: Chicago Press.

Крисанова Т. А. Кінодискурс як полікодове і мультимодальне утворення. Стаття присвячена вивченню полікодового і мультимодального характеру кінодискурсу як семіотично неоднорідного явища. Кінодискурс в роботі трактовано як складний цілісний соціально і культурно зумовлений мисленнево-комунікативний феномен, який характеризується сполученням лінгвальних і нелінгвальних кодів у своїй структурі та є полікодовим і мультимодальним за своєю природою. У роботі проаналізовано основні підходи до розуміння кінодискурсу як креолізованого / полікодового / мультимодального утворення. У статті доведена думка, що кінодискурс не можна вважати креолізованим, так як він складається з більш ніж двох кодових систем, які знаходяться у складній взаємодії, спрямованій на конструювання смислу. Кінодискурс містить більше ніж дві негомогенні системи: вербальну (мовленневу), невербальну (містить зображення елементів невербальної комунікації – жести, міміку тощо) і нелінгвальну, яка представлена кінематографічними засобами (крупний план, рук камери, освітлення, шуми, музичний супровід тощо). Саме нерозривне поєднання трьох семіотичних систем, кожна з яких є облігаторним елементом, слугує конструюванню смислу кінотексту. Гетерогенні системи кінодискурсу являють собою єдиний перцептуальний потік. У статті розглянуто поняття коду і модусу, які є ключовими для розуміння полікодового і мультимодального характеру кінодискурсу. Полікодовість кінодискурсу акцентує увагу на поєднанні декількох кодових систем, залучених творцями кінофільму для конструювання смислу. Мультимодальність кінодискурсу підкреслює його динамічний характер і спрямованість на адресата з урахуванням його когнітивних, соціальних особливостей. Смисл фільму структуровано різноманітними семіотичними системами, поєднання яких сприяє конструюванню кіносмислу відповідно до інтерсеміозису модусів.

Ключові слова: знак; кінодискурс; код; модус; мультимодальний; полікодовий.

Крысанова Т. А. Кинодискурс как поликодовое и мультимодальное образование. Статья посвящена изучению поликодового и мультимодального характера кинодискурса как семиотически неоднородного явления. Кинодискурс в работе истолкован как сложный целостный социально и культурно обусловленный мыслительно-коммуникативный феномен, который характеризуется сочетанием лингвальных и нелингвальных кодов в своей структуре и является поликодовым и мультимодальным по своей природе. В работе проанализированы основные подходы к пониманию кинодискурса как креоллизованного / поликодового / мультимодального образования, доказано, что кинодискурс нельзя считать креоллизованым, так как он состоит из более чем двух кодовых систем, которые находятся в сложном взаимодействии, направленном на конструирование смысла. Поликодовость кинодискурса акцентирует внимание на сочетании нескольких кодовых систем, вовлеченных создателями фильма для конструирования смысла. Мультимодальность кинодискурса подчеркивает его динамический характер и направленность на адресата с учетом его когнитивных, социальных особенностей. Смысл фильма структурировано различными семиотическими системами, сочетание которых способствует конструированию кино смысла.

Ключевые слова: знак; кинодискурс; код; модус; мультимодальный; поликодовый.