ISSN 2414-4746

MODERN VECTORS OF SCIENCE AND EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT IN CHINA AND UKRAINE

中国与乌克兰科学及教育前沿研究

South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky

Harbin Engineering University

2016
ISSUE № 2

May 16 – 17, 2016

Odessa, Ukraine

Harbin, the People's Republic of China

DOI: https://doi.org/10.24195/2414-4746-2022-2
MODERN VECTORS OF SCIENCE AND EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT IN CHINA AND UKRAINE **ISSN 2414-4746**
This international yearbook, as a periodical, includes scientific articles of Ukrainian and Chinese scholars on the problems of Sinology, Cross-cultural Communication, Pedagogics and Psychology: contemporary review. Odessa, Ukraine; Harbin, China

Issue № 2
South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky
Odessa, Ukraine, 2016
Harbin Engineering University
Harbin, the People's Republic of China, 2016

Modern vectors of science and education development in China and Ukraine (中国与乌克兰科学及教育前沿研究): International annual journal. – Odessa : South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky, Harbin : Harbin Engineering University, 2016. – Issue 2. – 145 p.

The second issue of the materials represented by the Ukrainian and Chinese scholars are dedicated to acute issues of General and Contrastive Linguistics within the Chinese, English, Ukrainian and Russian languages; linguodidactic problems of teaching native and foreign languages within polycultural educational space; peculiarities of cross-cultural communication in geopolitical space alongside with psychological aspects of overseas students' and teachers' adaptation to study / work abroad.

The given articles may be of use to researchers, graduate students, postgraduates and practising teachers who are interested in various aspects of Sinology, Cross-cultural Communication, Pedagogics and Psychology.

ISSN 2414-4746

Recommended for press
by South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky,
by Harbin Engineering University

South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky,
Odessa, Ukraine
Harbin Engineering University
Harbin, the People's Republic of China

May 16 – 17, 2016

SECTION I
SINOLOGY IN THE PARADIGM OF GENERAL / CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS AND TRANSLATION STUDIES

UDC: 811+81′42+801.81

Druzhyna Tetyana Antonivna
Ph.D., Lecturer *at the Faculty of Translation, Theoretical and Applied Linguistics,*
State institution "South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky",
26, Staroportofrankovskaya Str., Odessa, Ukraine

FOLKLORE DISCOURSE INTERPRETATION IN CONTEMPORARY LINGUISTIC PARADIGM

The place of discourse in linguistics is specified in the article; the concepts «discourse» and «text» are distinguished; the term «folklore discourse» is defined in linguistic science; the specific properties and structure of folklore discourse are and revealed in the framework of study.

Key words: *discourse, text, folklore discourse, modern folklore, the structure of folklore discourse.*

The surge of scientific interest in language in the framework of discursive paradigm allowed studying the traditional phenomena in a new research view. One of these phenomena is folklore, such as folklore discourse. The rationale is related to the necessity of systemic and comprehensive description of the phenomenon "folklore discourse" in current linguistic science due to appearance of new aspects of this study. The target of research is the concept of «folk discourse» in current linguistics. The research subject is to ascertain the issues of definition, structure and typology of folklore discourse in linguistic science.

The goal of research is to show possibilities of current approaches to determine folklore discourse, including its structure in current linguistics. The planning tasks are: to describe the place of discourse in linguistics; to distinguish «discourse» and «text»; to get through discourse typology of folklore; to study out the concept of «folk discourse» in linguistic science; to distinguish the variety of genres of discursive existence of contemporary folklore; to identify properties, specificity and dynamics of folklore discourse.

The introduction of the concept «discourse» is due to the formation of current cognitive paradigm; thus, humanities knowledge is needed to explore the possibilities of the speech and communication models. A review of the discursive practice of society consolidates the sociolinguistic approaches, provides linguistic turn to the realities of language, its connection with extralinguistic markers [9, P. 18]. The concept of «discourse» is intended to bring together different aspects of the problem of language study process [6, P. 3]. There is dominated an anthropological approach to the coverage of non-linguistic and linguistic phenomena that intensify the research attention on thinking, feelings, identity, worldview of subject's speech in current linguistics [3, P. 400].

By means of discourse we can identify the relationship between conscience and language, which determines the process of knowledge and verbalization of knowledge about the world. Researchers studied discourse in its various manifestations. Each type of discourse is defined by a set of rules, implementation of which requires and takes place in a particular social sphere. E. S. Kubryakova notes that a widespread term «discourse» does not mean that it has already secured content that could be commonly considered [5, P. 23].

For all its variety of approaches for understanding of the term «discourse», all existing definition can be divided into three main groups: 1) discourse as a text, with its extralinguistic factors (N. D. Arutyunova, M. L. Makarov); 2) discourse as a base of the text, united by one extralinguistic

context of their creation and use (V. E. Chernyavskaya); 3) discourse as a process of conversation, linguistic unit (V. I. Karasik, G. N. Manayenko, E. S. Kubryakova, F. D. Sedov and others).

These positions are built on the basis of two fundamental characteristics of speech: effectiveness and procedural (text and communication). We can say that the attention of researchers slowly «moved» from formal perception of the discourse as «connected speech» («the text can be regarded as a sequence of units of any order. Discourse – is the same text, which consists of communication units of the language ...» [2, P. 8]) – to the functional and cognitive conception of the concept (the ideas were incorporated by T. A. Van Deyck). N. D. Arutyunova defines discourse as «the text, taken in the event-driven aspect; speech, which is regarded as purposeful social action as a component that is involved in the interaction between people and their mechanisms of conscience (cognitive processes). Discourse – it is a «speech, immersed in a life». Therefore, the term «discourse» unlike the term «text» is not applied to ancient or other texts, the links of the real life being not reduced immediately» [1, P. 136-137].

More often than not, the term «discourse» unlike the term «text» involves the aspect of understanding extralinguistic factors of speech origin. The term «discourse» was introduced in the wake of opposition to the units which were associated with real expressions, – «dead» generative linguistics texts (S. Harris, E. Benveniste). In this paper we present the term «discourse» after G. N. Manayenko as «conventional type of verbal behaviour of the subject in any sphere of human activity, determined by socio- historical conditions and grounded stereotypes and interpretation of texts as components which reflect its specificity» [7, P. 8].

As K. S. Serazhym noted, the classification of discourses at present stage of the humanities knowledge is still under development [8, P. 63]. The members of various branches of the humanities knowledge offer a wide range of discourse

typologies which both differ in the criteria revealing their essence and depend on scholars' interpretation of this term from its functional viewpoint.

In 1984, the explorer Robert G. Butler was one of the first who introduced the concept of «folk discourse», which is understood by scientist as «the process by means of which such implicit communication occurs in natural conversation» [11, P. 37].

The problem of description of the folk discourse so far is not resolved. Despite the fact that in modern studies the word combination «folklore discourse» is often used, but there is no coherent description of the folklore discourse specificity, there are only the individual observations that are often related with descriptions of pragmatic discourse (S. B. Adoneva, K. P. Yesypovych, S. Y. Nekludov, A. V. Kolistratova , M. M. Semenenko and others).

There were also made certain attempts to describe the cognitive-discursive folklore discourse in linguistic works (M. O. Abdrashitova, G. H. Bukharov, Yu. A. Emer etc.). The researchers when describing some folklore genres were focused on identifying the characteristics of conceptual system; they reconstructed the fragments of the worldview without offering the models which could describe the folklore discourse.

The difficulty of describing the folklore discourse is that it occupies a special place in the life of the group and man, being inherently complex phenomenon, and does not fit into the modern researchers develop of the dichotomy: institutional / personal; oral / written (V. I. Karasik , K. F. Sedov, I. V. Silantyev etc.).

Not all discourses can be solely referred to a particular type; certain discourses combine different characteristics. Such as, folklore discourse cannot be considered only as an institutional or person-centered: «folk discourse has an institutional feature of nature. Unlike other institutional discourses, it does not constitute communication within a specific social institution, the most important

signs of the institutional discourse (goal, the pattern of status-oriented communication) qualitatively and quantitatively different in it» [10, P. 76].

Thus, folklore discourse is characterized by a «special» type of institutionality. So, «special» institutionality of the folklore discourse originated from the domestic discourse, which closely «cooperate», serving, unlike literature, everyday life human needs. It seemed to be veiledly constantly present in everyday life, permeates all spheres of life, foreground at certain moments. Thus, proverbs, sayings, jokes and riddles are used in everyday language practice while performing the function of regulation, appealing to the authorities, the self expression and function of speech «embellishment».

The «special» institutionality of the folklore discourse makes again address to the problem of discourse typology (V. I. Karasik, A. E. Kybryk, M. L Makarov). One of the main criteria for opposing discourses is the category of formality of social relations between communicators, on the base of which the institutional and non-institutional discourses are opposed.

This typology was proposed by V. I. Karasik, proved popular in domestic linguistics in describing the institutional discourses (scientific, political, educational, medical, etc.), which are understood as linguistic interaction of representatives of social groups or institutions of one another, with people who realize their status and role within the existing capabilities of public institutions, the number of which is determined by the needs of society at a particular stage of its development [4, P. 193].

However, the proposed typology cannot be applied to the sphere of communication between members of social groups (subcultures), not related to the social institutions. In our opinion, it is significant to be more accurate when talking about the dichotomy of «personal / social» discourse in the further highlighting of the institutional and subcultural variations.

The proposed division allows describing subcultural discourses, including folklore discourse as a special formation. The member of the group in the

folklore discourse presupposes some algorithm of behaviour in certain typical situations, the algorithm of some emotional states experiences. The identity is elected from the proposed options the one, which is better, corresponds with its role, the internal state at a dafininte moment in a given situation, expressing their own attitude and mood through collective texts.

Thus, the norms and standards of a status-role behaviour in aesthetically processed texts sharing a limited number of genres, which are appointed to typical communication situations are conveyed in the folklore discourse. The discourse defines cognitive and value attitudes, consolidating binary relations: normal / abnormal, admissible / inadmissible, right / wrong and so on, offers a special worldview.

The communicant in the folklore discourse simultaneously appears as a «representative» of a social role (typical for institutional discourse), and as a person in all the richness of his / her inner world (which is typical for a person-centered discourse – existential type).

The folklore discourse variations cannot be described in the same way since types of communication channels are also different. Traditionally, one of the key features of the folklore is its oral nature. The oral communication channel may be called the leader for the folklore discourse. However, the emergence of new communication channels, increase of urban population and raise in the general level of literacy helped to expand the boundaries of folklore. The folklore discourse can exist not only in oral environment, but also in writing, including television or Internet communications. The folklore discourse is a complex entity that combines features of various types of discourse, due to its archaic origin, on the one hand, and the ability to adapt to modern society – on the other hand.

However, in such a case the folklore discourse characterizes the artistic comprehension of the world, aesthetic conditionality, communication purpose and discourse role alongside with linguistic means which are oriented to

aesthetic effect. A participant of folklore communication is a kind of co-creator, who knocks off, and there is a collective worldview. He chooses a certain genre, linguistic means to transfer his own situationally stipulated condition. Discursive existence of the current folklore genre is varied.

Each genre, depending on the settings, tasks, is implemented in a number of communicative situations in different discourses. Thus, the researcher Yu. A. Emer rightly observes that for some folklore genres in the current situation the other discourses provide the sphere of existence, first of all it concerns the folk song for which holiday discourse is the main means of representation: the installation of collective performance (song), the presence of the listener / viewer (rhyme, verses), aiming at general collective emotional experience, which is fully realized in a holiday discourse [10, P. 15].

The difficulty of describing the folklore discourse in its atypicality is the inability to relate to the already developed parameter of institutional / uninstitutional. It happens due to the fact that folklore arises within a period when there are no special-oriented social institutions, the participants of the folklore discourse perceive the model of folklore communication both as collective and his own ones, since in archaic society both positions were equal, no person was opposed to the team either.

In the folklore discourse the identity of its members as holders of traditional knowledge is fully reflected; whereas traditional texts contain collective knowledge; the author is not represented in the discourse.

«It should be mentioned that in contrast to other discourses the communicants form the worldview in which the collective discourse installation correlates to their personal settings, the collective worldview is a personal perception of each folk group» [10, P. 76].

Thus, the folklore discourse is the type of linguistic activity that presupposes some certain attitudes and norms, which were proposed by a collective and at the same time is personal for each participant in this discourse.

This paper refers to the folklore discourse after Yu. A. Emer, as «collective speech activity according to a socio-cultural situation, historical conditions. A component of this speech activity is an aesthetically decorated text with traditions which meets social needs and reflects the collective knowledge that stabilizes society» [10, P. 86-87].

The goal of the folklore discourse – is to transfer the collective knowledge that stabilizes life and takes part in socialization of an individual in a particular national-cultural group, in a particular social group. Folklore provides a social group with a possibility to express oneself, and also is a means of communication. The folklore discourse is a mechanism for regulating stability of society or a social group. Through the use of the folklore discourse the communication and conservation of norms, moral and ethical attitudes that underlie the understanding of the world and of society itself (consciousness of the people) are transmitted.

The folklore discourse, which is a form of culture, aims at preserving and expressing national / subcultural traditions. Folklore tends to tradition and the past, it simulates an ideal world, giving people the opportunity to experience emotional axiological, rethinking experience in the aesthetic aspect. Thus, the folklore discourse appears as a special kind of communication being materialized in a number of texts which are created by specific linguistic means and display a special worldview. The description of folklore in the cognitive-discursive perspective as a multidimensional phenomenon involves the construction of a multi-model. Folklore, remaining a relevant form of culture, is adapting to new conditions of existence.

The specifics of the folklore discourse and folklore communication is not so much in the specific texts themselves or other phenomena (the subject of folklore communication can be, in principle, anything); it lie in their collective perception and transmission, as well as their pragmatic function (the pragmatic

side of folklore is manifested in the fact that it functions as a set of forms that allow an individual and collective to focus on its cultural space).

Television, the Internet, tabloids, comics, popular songs, advertising demonstrate which part of the role in the folklore discourse plays, which everyday archetypes of social psychology it represents, which mechanisms they are supported with (e.g., rumours and gossips as «the language of national mentality»).

Thus, the dynamics of the folk discourse today describe two processes: a) fragmentation of folklore information, destruction of a narrative plot structure, a narrative collage in place that meets the advanced features of a culture that recognizes the value, but not so much the story, as symbolic effectiveness of a method; b) crushing of the folklore space for various folk «subspaces»: school, prison, army, church folklore and so on).

We have a broad prospect for further research in which attention will be focused on a detailed analysis of verbal behaviour of the Ukrainians, Russians and English within certain communicative situations on the material of the folklore discourse.

REFERENCES

1. Arutyunova N. D. Discourse // Linguistic encyclopaedic dictionary. – M. : Sov. Entsyklopediya, 1990. P. 136–137.

2. Borbotko V. G. Elements of the Discourse theory / V. G. Borbotko. – Grozny, 1981. – 113 p.

3. Holubovska I. O. Ethnic peculiarities of the Ukrainian national linguistic world picture / I. O. Holubovska // Studia Lingvistica: collection of scientific works dedicated to the 80th anniversary of Professor F. O. Nikitina / Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. – K. : Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 2010. – Issue 4. – P. 400–413.

4. Karasik V. I. Linguistic circle: personality, concepts, discourse / V. I. Karasik. – M. : GNOZIS, 2004. – 389 p.
5. Kubryakova Ye. S. Regarding the term “discourse” and the knowledge structure it presupposes / Ye. S. Kubryakova // Language. Personality. Text. – M. : Languages of the Slavonic Culture, 2005. – P. 23–33.
6. Lytvynenko N. P. Ukrainian Medical Discourse : [monograph] / N. P. Lytvynenko. – Kharkiv : Kharkiv Historical and Philological Society, 2009. – 304 p.
7. Manaenko G. N. Text, speech activity, discourse / G. N. Manaenko // Linguistic system – text – discourse: Categories and aspects of research. – Samara, 2003. – P. 6–14.
8. Serazhym K. Discourse as a sociolingual phenomenon: methodology, architectonic, variability : [monograph] / Kateryna Serazhym. – K., 2002. – 323 p.
9. Sinelnikova L. N. Sociolinguistics: the present time / L. N. Sinelnikova // Sociolinguistics: XX century / Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv; chief edition by L. N. Sinelnikova, L. F. Kompantseva, G. A. Petrovskaya. – Luhansk : Znanije, 2002. – 296 p.
10. Emer Yu. A. World-modelling in the modern song folklore: cognitive and discursive analysis : Doctor’s thesis : 10.02.01 / Yu. A. Emer. – Tomsk, 2011. – 457 p.
11. Butler Gary R. Folklore and the Analysis of Folk Discourse: Cultural Connotation and Oral Tradition in Communicative Events / Gary Re Butler // Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics. – Toronto, 1984. – Vol. 5. – P. 32–50.

德鲁热娜·塔季扬娜·安东诺夫娜

语言学副博士学位，乌克兰南方师范大学翻译理论及应用语言学教授,

*大学地址：乌克兰敖德萨州老码头街*34 *号*

关于现代语言学解读民间文学艺术的话语问题

该研究课题是研究新出现相关连接的现代语言学与民间话语现象的相关性，系统和全面的描述的必要性。本文的目的是强调语言学民间话语，尤其是在现代语言学结构的定义目前的做法。

尽管在现代研究那句“民间话语”被频繁使用，但民间传说话语的特殊性的整体描述的事实，只有涉及民间话语的最务实和认知话语描述了一些看法。

民间话语的描述的复杂性在于，它在球队的生活中占有特殊的地位，该名男子是固有的复杂的现象，不适合现代的研究人员开发了一种分歧：机构/个人;口头/书面。困难还包括他的典型 - 在与已经开发的机构设置的可能性。这是由于这一事实，即民间传说出生在没有因此建立社会制度的时期，民俗话语的成员非常感知民间交流的模式既作为集体和拥有，在古代社会两个位置都是平等的，没有反对集体的人。

民俗话语是一种类型的语音活动的，预先假定由团队提出的某些态度和规范，并在同一时间是个人对该话语每个参与者。在本文中，民间话语宇伊玛后理解为“集体的语音活动，由于社会文化状况，历史条件。演讲活动的一个组成部分是 美观制作对应于公众的需要和反映社会稳定的集体知识的传统文本。

民间传说话语和民间交流的特殊性在于没有那么多的文字本身，或其他现象（对象民俗通信可以是，在原则上，任何东西）的特点，但在他们的集体产生和传播的方式，以及它们的实用功能（务实的一面民俗体现在事实上，它充当了一组允许个人和团队在他们的文化空间导航）的形式。

关键词：话语，文本，话语民俗，当代民俗，民间话语结构。