

Министерство образования и науки Российской Федерации
*Федеральное государственное автономное образовательное учреждение
высшего образования*
Санкт-Петербургский государственный электротехнический университет «ЛЭТИ»
им. В. И. Ульянова (Ленина)

Гуманитарный Факультет



МАТЕРИАЛЫ

V Межвузовской научно-практической
Конференции

«АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКИ»

19 апреля 2016 года

Санкт-Петербург
2016

УДК 81.
ББК Ш10я43

Материалы Пятой межвузовской научно-практической конференции «Актуальные проблемы современной лингвистики», г. Санкт-Петербург, 19 апреля 2016 года. 348 с.

Организатор конференции

Кафедра иностранных языков
Санкт-Петербургского государственного электротехнического университета СПбГЭТУ
«ЛЭТИ» им. В. И. Ульянова (Ленина)

Состав оргкомитета

Председатель оргкомитета:

Кутузов Владимир Михайлович (д.т.н., профессор, ректор СПбГЭТУ «ЛЭТИ»)

Заместители председателя оргкомитета:

Гигаури Нина Константиновна (к.т.н., декан Гуманитарного факультета);

Шумков Андрей Арнольдович (д. ф. н., доцент, заведующий кафедрой иностранных языков);

Шульженко Татьяна Владимировна (доцент кафедры иностранных языков, руководитель направления «Лингвистика»)

Члены оргкомитета:

Преображенская Ольга Алексеевна (к. ф. н., доцент кафедры иностранных языков);

Журавлева Ольга Михайловна (к.и.н., доцент кафедры иностранных языков);

Степанова Наталия Валентиновна (к.ф.н., доцент кафедры иностранных языков).

Ministry of Education and Science
Of Russian Federation

St. Petersburg Electrotechnical University

Faculty of Humanities



Proceedings of the V Interacademic Scientific Conference

Current Issues of Linguistics

April 19th, 2016

Saint-Petersburg
2016

УДК 81.
ББК Ш10я43

Proceedings of the V Interacademic Scientific Conference 'Current Issues of Linguistics', Saint-Petersburg, April 19th, 2016. – 348 pp.

Conference Organizers:

Foreign Languages Department,
Saint-Petersburg Electrotechnical University

Organizing Committee

Chairman of the Organizing Committee:

Rector of St. Petersburg Electrotechnical University, D.Sc., Prof. **Vladimir M. Kutuzov**

Vice-chairmen of the Organizing Committee:

-Dean, faculty of Humanities, St. Petersburg Electrotechnical University, Associate Prof. **Nina C. Gigauri**

-Head of Foreign Languages Department, St. Petersburg Electrotechnical University, Associate Prof. **Andrey A. Shumkov**

-Head of “Linguistics” Program, Associate Prof. **Tatiana V. Shulzhenko**

Members of the Organizing Committee:

Associate Prof. **Olga A. Preobrazhenskaya**

Associate Prof. **Olga M. Zhuravleva**

Assistant Prof. **Nataliia V. Stepanova**

5. Николаева О.В. Интер-когнитивные взаимодействия в межкультурной коммуникации // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики Тамбов: Грамота, 2014. № 11 (41): в 2-х ч. Ч. II. С. 132-136.
6. Попова З. Д., Стернин И. А. Очерки по когнитивной лингвистике. Воронеж, 2001. 192 с.
7. Степанов Ю. С. Константы. Словарь русской культуры. Опыт исследования [Текст] / Ю. С. Степанов. - М.: Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1997. 824 с.
8. Троянова И.М. Когнитивная функция как одна из важнейших функций языка // Вестник Томского государственного педагогического университета № 2 / 2008. С. 56-58.
9. Уорф Б. Л. Наука и языкознание: о двух ошибочных воззрениях на речь и мышление, характеризующих систему естественной логики, и о том, как слова и обычаи влияют на мышление // Новое в лингвистике / под ред. В. А. Звегинцева. М.: Изд-во иностр. лит-ры, 1960. Вып. I. С. 169-182.
10. Baranyi P., Csapó Á. Definition and Synergies of Cognitive Infocommunications // Acta Polytechnica Hungarica. 2012. Vol. 9. No. 1. P. 67-83.
11. Benking H. Creating, Blending, Concerting, and Sharing Global Workspaces of the Mind : Sign and Symbol Grounding in the Cognitive Panorama (Space/Time) [Electronic Resource] / H. Benking. – URL : <http://benking.de/dialog/r-benking.htm>.
12. Evans N., Levinson S. C. The Myth of Language Universals: Language Diversity and its Importance for Cognitive Science // Behavioral and Brain Sciences. 2009. Vol. 32. P. 429-492.
13. Newby G.B. Cognitive Space and Information Space [Text] / G.B. Newby // Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology Archive. – 2001. – Vol. 52. – P. 1026–1048.

M.N. Trenikhina, N. A. Fedorischeva (Saint Petersburg Electrotechnical University «LETI»)

CULTUROLOGICAL ASPECT AS AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF SUCCESSFUL LEARNING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN COGNITIVE SPACE OF A DIFFERENT CULTURE

The aim of the given article is to describe the indissoluble connection between language and culture in cognitive space. To establish the manifestation of cognitive differences of native speakers, and to define the role of culturological aspect in intercultural communication.

Cross-cultural communication; cognitive space; cognitive-communicative approach; worldview; mentality; communicative behavior, language contacts.

T. Triberio (Foreign Languages and Literatures Department - University of Verona, Italy tania.triberio@univr.it)

CULTURAL-LINGUISTIC INTERFACE THROUGH A META-LINGUISTIC APPROACH. WIERZBICKA'S PROPOSAL AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

Wierzbicka's meta-linguistic approach as a means to disclose meanings and cultural values. This brief essay will examine possible interfaces between different linguistic fields, that is semantics, pragmatics and syntax, especially from a lexicographic perspective.

Wierzbicka, meta-linguistic approach, NMS, semantic primes, syntax, lexicographic translation.

This type of linguistic approach offers indeed an opportunity to ask ourselves a series of questions and issues open to discussion. As, for example:

- whether there could really be a further “semantic component” (or better semantic-pragmatic one) in the impersonal Russian structure;
- if this further “semantic component” does exist, to what extent it is culturally relevant in order to grasp the real, inner meaning of the so-called “impersonal expressions”;
- and then, how can the concept of “impersonality” undergo a process of lexicalization and/or grammaticalization; possibly through a non-canonical subject (dative case);
- to what extent a non-canonical subject (ex.: *dat. мне*) is to be considered impersonal;
- how can we take account of this “cultural inference” in the process of translation from Russian into another language, such as Italian or English;
- and then, to what extent “context of use” (pragmatic-semantic context) influences syntactic behaviour and properties (linguistic context).

We can for example consider the lexicographic translation (purpose of the dictionary is to provide, as far as possible, an equivalent):

должен [dólžen] pred.: должна, должнó, должны *dovere* (a) + inf.: я должен позвонить *debbo telefonare* [...].
[Dobrovól'skaja, 2001:170]

нужно [nužno] pred. nomin. **1** (+ *inf.*) *bisogna, è necessario*; ~ подождать *bisogna aspettare* **2** (+ *dat.*) мне ~ купить хлеба *ho bisogno di comprare del pane* [...].
[Dobrovól'skaja, 2001:470]

Both Italian translations are nominal sentences, which see, respectively, the use of verbs such as “(I) shall” [(io) *debbo*], “(I) need” [(io) *ho bisogno*] and which provide, in all cases, an Actant-Agent (the so-called “canonical subject”). How, then, the foreign user grasps the “further semantic component”, which, according to Wierzbicka, is included in the example for the lemma **нужно**? Beyond grammatical information that indicates the dative government (+ *dat.*), no information is given about the fact that modal expressions in Russian are far more used in their variant, so to say, impersonal.

A difference which affects, therefore, not only the way in which certain expressions are received and interpreted, but also the manner in which they are projected into the sentential syntax, both within the same language and in the process of translation from one language to another.

Wierzbicka compares Russian with modern English, dominated by nominative sentences to express the sense of necessity-duty and/or impossibility: Ex.: *I have to do it, I can not do it.*

To what extent then a meaning can be transferred from one language to another? To what extent it is independent of the language? [Wierzbicka, 1992]. As we may see, then, intercultural communication is not just a matter of understanding meanings but also morphological and syntactical constructions, if it is true that even grammatical constructions imply and encode meanings, which are “cultural revealing” (syntactic properties, locations, governments and so on) [Bertuccelli Papi, 1993; Dik, 1978; Halliday, 2013].

Wierzbicka states: «I maintain that grammatical constructions embody certain meanings; and I try to reveal these meanings, to show exactly what they are, and how the use of a given construction can be predicted from its meaning» [Wierzbicka, 1988:7].

Linguistic differences are linked to cultural values (socio-cultural attitude that is reflected in the language) and therefore to *con*-textual ones. For this reason, the cross-cultural pragmatics is a new field of investigation. If we want to identify the cross-linguistically meaning we have to do it for sentences, not for lexemes isolated and we must therefore also consider grammatical patterns (language-specific), in order to identify the syntactic behaviour of each single word/expression.

Nowadays more and more it is argued the need for a pragmatic component in an integrated theory of linguistic ability. If we are interested just in the pragmatic context we may

argue that it should not be part of the grammatical descriptions (Chomsky's competence), but if we assume that to be adequate grammatical descriptions should specify the meaning of every single word of the language, we will then find that there are words for which you can specify the exact meaning only in reference to the contexts of use.

On this respect it might be interesting, for example, to try to find possible points of contact and intersection between pragmatics and semantics on one hand and pragmatics and grammar on the other hand [Bertuccelli Papi, 1993; Dressler-Merlini, 1987].

Certain phenomena of grammaticalization, such as the case of the above described predicatives, the shift of the Russian verb *to be* (*быть*) in the past, from the personal past tense *был* to the auxiliary neutral form *было* (in conjunction with predicatives, as *было нужно* = *it was necessary*, to express states/conditions) [Vinogradov, 1972:331], convey morphological information. These last, themselves, affect semantics and syntax, and bear pragmatic-functional values.

Change and restriction in the grammatical function of these forms has also led to a change in the semantic structure, identifying new syntactic links.

LITERATURE

- Bertuccelli Papi M., *Che cos'è la pragmatica*, Bompiani, Milano 1993
 Dobrovol'skaja J., *Grande dizionario russo-italiano / italiano-russo*, Ulrico Hoepli Editore, Milano 2001
 Dressler, W. U., & Merlini Barbaresi, L., *Elements of morphopragmatics*, LAUD A194, Duisburg 1987.
 Dik S., *Functional grammar*, North-Holland, New York 1978
 Halliday M.A.K., *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, Routledge – Taylor & Francis Group, NY USA 2013
 Vinogradov V.V., *Russkaja Grammatika*, Vysšaja škola, Moskva 1972
 Wierzbicka, A., *Semantic Primitives*, Athenäum, Frankfurt am Main 1972.
 Wierzbicka A. *The semantics of grammar*, Benjamins, Amsterdam 1988
 Wierzbicka A., *Semantic, Culture and Cognition, Universal human concepts in culture – specific configurations*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1992
 Wierzbicka A., *Cross-cultural pragmatics, The semantics of human interaction*, Trends in Linguistics, Mouton de Gruyter –Berlin-New York 2003
 Wierzbicka A., *Experience, Evidence & Sense*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2010
 Wierzbicka A., *Common Language of All People: The Innate Language of Thought*, «Problems of Information Transmission» 2011, Vol. 47, N. 4, pp. 378-397

УДК 802.0-085+808.2-085

С. Е. Тупикова (Саратовский национально-исследовательский государственный университет имени Н.Г.Чернышевского, e-mail: tupikovase@mail.ru);

Е. А. Семухина (Саратовский социально-экономический институт (филиал) ФГБОУ ВО «Российский экономический университет имени Г.В.Плеханова», e-mail: semuh@rambler.ru)

РЕЧЕВОЙ ЭТИКЕТНЫЙ ЖАНР «КОМПЛИМЕНТ» В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И ФРАНЦУЗСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Настоящая работа представляет собой сопоставительное исследование особенностей речевого этикетного жанра «комплимент» в английской и французской лингвокультурах. Выявляются специфические особенности данного жанра, его прагмалингвистические характеристики.