

ISSN 2227-2844

ВІСНИК

**ЛУГАНСЬКОГО НАЦІОНАЛЬНОГО
УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ
ІМЕНІ ТАРАСА ШЕВЧЕНКА**

№ 14 (249) ЛИПЕНЬ

2012

ВІСНИК

ЛУГАНСЬКОГО НАЦІОНАЛЬНОГО УНІВЕРСИТЕТУ ІМЕНІ ТАРАСА ШЕВЧЕНКА

ФІЛОЛОГІЧНІ НАУКИ

№ 14 (249) липень 2012

Засновано у лютому 1997 року (27)
Свідоцтво про реєстрацію:
серія КВ № 14441-3412ПР
видане Міністерством юстиції України 14.08.2008 р.

Збірник наукових праць внесено до переліку
наукових фахових видань України
(філологічні науки)
Постанова президії ВАК України від 18.11.09 № 1-05/5

Журнал включено до переліку видань реферативної бази даних
«Україніка наукова» (угода про інформаційну співпрацю
№ 30-05 від 30.03.2005 р.)

Рекомендовано до друку на засіданні Вченої ради
Луганського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка
(протокол № 11 від 25 травня 2012 року)

Виходить двічі на місяць

ЗМІСТ

ДИСКУРСНИЙ АНАЛІЗ

1. **Бублик А. А.** Роль фразеологизмов, как важнейшего пути развития идиоматичности речи студентов..... 6
2. **Burdina S. V.** Encouraging classroom research at institutional level..... 10
3. **Вжещ Я. Л.** Интернет-дискурс: проблема визначення поняття, особливості структури..... 15
4. **Гура А. І., Літвінова М. М.** Особливості мовних стратегій конфлікту в німецькому політичному дискурсі..... 20
5. **Костик Є. В.** Соціокультурна компетенція студентів у процесі вивчення іноземної мови на немовних факультетах ВНЗ..... 28
6. **Ларченко І. В.** Дискурси відмови з настановою на гармонізацію стосунків..... 35
7. **Птіцина С. Ю., Літвінова М. М.** Лінгвостилістичні особливості пісенного дискурсу німецької молоді (на прикладі сучасної рок-поезії в аспекті перекладу)..... 43
8. **Тараненко О. Г.** К вопросу об одном итальянском заимствовании в современном английском языке..... 49

ЛІНГВІСТИЧНА ТЕОРІЯ

9. **Вікторова Л. В., Бочкар О. В.** Порівняльно-зіставне вивчення семантики номінативної лексики в румунській, польській та російській мовах 54
10. **Вінникова Т. С.** Транспозиція (трансляція) в науковій концепції Люсьєна Теньєра..... 62
11. **Гутникова А. В.** Субстантивация глагольной основы в диахроническом аспекте..... 67
12. **Іщенко Н. Г.** Прагматичне значення похідних іменників..... 78
13. **Орел А. С., Тищенко К. А.** Витоки праслов'янської фонології (лінгвоісторіографічний аспект)..... 84
14. **Романова Н. В.** Семантика асоціатів Angst: лінгвістичний аспект..... 91
15. **Rudakova T. O.** Anglo-American borrowing in the modern German language: reasons and factors determining its intensity..... 96
16. **Хомяк Н. В.** Механизм вторичной номинации..... 112

ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВСТВО

17. **Novikova A. A.** The biblical intertext in the M. Ondaatje's novel "The English Patient"..... 119
18. **Погорелова Д. А.** Роман В. В. Набокова «Приглашение на казнь» в критике русского зарубежья..... 126

19. **Поневчинська Н. В.** Створення образу поета в тексті англійської епіграми XVI-XIX ст..... 137
20. **Рудковська А. Ю.** Особливості граматико-морфологічної організації гетеродієгетичного наративу (на матеріалі французької готичної новели 19 століття)..... 142
21. **Demidov D. V., Yeliseyev S. L.** The idea of theatricality as a principle of social behavior in W. Shakespeare's drama..... 151

МЕТОДИКА ВИКЛАДАННЯ

22. **Бублик А. О.** Досвід країн Західної Європи у викладанні іноземних мов на початковому етапі..... 158
23. **Okunkova L. O., Korzhov S. Yu.** Arranging of students' independent work through video projects..... 164
24. **Пономарьова Г М.** Формування самостійності учнів у позакласній роботі з іноземної мови 169
25. **Сурженко О. П.** Методика системного обучения школьникова – основное условие эффективности усвоения знаний учащимися... 174

МІЖКУЛЬТУРНА КОМУНІКАЦІЯ

26. **Беззубова О. О.** Електронний лист як форма реалізації офіційно-ділової комунікації..... 179
27. **Borysenko N. S., Borysenko P. A.** Olfactics as a means of nonverbal communication across cultures..... 186
28. **Плахотнюк Н. О.** Архетип слова в сучасній проблематиці філософської антропології..... 190
29. **Stepykina T. V.** Image of America in Cultural and Philosophical Studies of the 19th-20th Centuries..... 196

ПЕРЕКЛАДОЗНАВСТВО

30. **Вознюк М. Ю.** Інтерпративна теорія перекладу..... 205
31. **Клименко О. С., Климова Н. І.** Особливості перекладу власних імен у творі М. Мітчелл «Віднесені вітром»..... 211
32. **Рудницька Н. М.** Релігійна ідеологія як чинник перекладу художнього твору..... 215

ПРИКЛАДНА ЛІНГВІСТИКА

33. **Вжещ Я. Л.** Звертання як засіб експлікації ввічливості в німецькій і українській культурі..... 221
34. **Кіреєнко К. В.** Концепт «кохання» в українській фольклорно-магічній картині світу 228
35. **Khomyak N. V.** Some aspects of language making..... 234
36. **Косенко О. П.** Лінгвістичні засоби маніпулятивного впливу в мас-медійних текстах..... 246
37. **Кошєєва Н. О.** Вплив найменувань топонімів з кольоровим компонентом на сучасну катойконімічну парадигму..... 251

38.	Маторина Н. М., Маторина В. В.	Возможности интерактивных методов обучения в современном лингвистическом образовании.....	258
39.	Титаренко И. С., Юнина О. Е.	Эмоциональный концепт «гнев» и средства его языкового выражения.....	264
40.	Чирікова Г. І.	Типи „несправжніх друзів перекладача” (на матеріалі німецької й української мов).....	270
41.	Стоянова І. Д.	Мовні засоби реалізації стратегії комунікативного маніпулювання у дискурсі антиутопії.....	276

РЕЦЕНЗІЇ ТА ВІДГУКИ

42.	Зеленько А. С.	Про предмет дослідження і вивчення на філологічному факультеті класичного університету (З приводу монографії А. С. Загнітка. «Теоретична граматики сучасної української мови»).....	283
	ВІДОМОСТІ ПРО АВТОРІВ.....		293

THE IDEA OF THEATRICALITY AS A PRINCIPLE OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR IN W. SHAKESPEARE'S DRAMA

In recent years the concept of theatricality of a literary work has increasingly become a subject of great scientific understanding. This is explained by the fact that in the cultural awareness of the XX century this concept revealed not only in its aesthetic and social sense, but in the philosophical and ontological one. Homo Sapiens replaced Homo Ludens, and role-based behavior formed the basis for understanding the nature of human personality.

The term "theatrical" and its derivatives are widely used for the description of manner, speech, gesture of person but calculated for achieving certain effect, deliberately showy, affected, sometimes artificial, yet colourful and appealing.

At the same time the meaning of the theatricality of a literary work can not be reduced merely to the characteristics of genres, species or linguistic nature. The idea of theatricality is disclosed, especially in the conceptual premise of the work and relies on the notion of life as a certain action, organized under the laws of social, psychological, or aesthetic views.

"Theatricality" is a desire to structure behavioural principles in accordance with the principles of theatrical performances. In this sense, the "theatricality" can be described as specific psychological characteristics of a particular character.

Thus, the aim of the article is to analyze the idea of theatricality as a principle of social behaviour on the example of W. Shakespeare's drama.

Understanding life as a theatrical space in the English literary and artistic traditions undoubtedly begins with W. Shakespeare. The Bard was definitely influenced by the day-to-day theatricality which was in the air he breathed and the Monarch, the Queen Elizabeth I, "that greatest Glorious Quene of Faerie lond" (E. Spenser), set numerous examples as she showed herself to her people theatrically when occasion demanded, combining velvet-gloved menaces and golden promises with bloodshed and cruelties. Elizabeth's public appearances and speeches were well-considered and perfectly-paced, and the supreme moment of calculated theatrical bravura was her address to her troops at Tilbury when the Spanish Armada threatened the borders of her Realm.

Shakespeare's famous formula of the world as a theatre is repeated many times and many frets interpreted by further generations of writers and philosophers, was a kind of artistic axiom that defines the essence of both social and individual human relationship. Features of people's "role" behaviour in all spheres of life have become for Shakespeare the subject of special study of art. Almost in all of his dramatic works, the characters, one way or another, affirm the necessity for playing behaviour under specific situations and conditions.

The idea of theatricality as a principle of social behaviour is already defined in his early chronicles or historical plays. In “Richard III” we can see kind of “stage direction” – the main character plans the situation in advance, simulates it, replays and rehearses it first in his mind and then tries to implement a ‘director's intent’ into action:

For then I'll marry Warwick's youngest daughter.
What though I kill'd her husband and her father?
The readiest way to make the wench amend
Is to become her husband and her father:
The which will I; not all so much for love
As for another secret close intent,
By marrying her which I must reach unto [1].

Thus, Richard clearly estimates his marriage and, therefore, deliberately “builds up” the situation suitable for him. The image of Richard is complex, multisided and has multifaced. “That’s his way of great acting talent, the talent of transformer” [2, p. 610], which carries out the game in order to achieve the goal. He feels that he is a great actor on the stage of life, that he is a professional in the known role, so that only a connoisseur and a talented player, who is on the par with Richard, can appreciate his acting skills. Richard is well aware of this and he “revels in his virtuosity, giving him a sense of superiority over others’ [2, p. 611]. He, as a director of the play, creates his own role and actions, but remarkably, by his virtual situations the others do, without realizing that they just play up to Richard in his life’s drama. For example, Richard sends Buckingham ahead, who without knowing it, does everything well, as has already been given to him by self-seeking Richard. Later everyone can see Richard’s “faces” in Iago, Edmund and Macbeth masks, who also demonstrate mastery of orchestrated action.

Slightly different idea of theatricality of human behavior can be traced in the two parts of the historical play “Henry IV”. Prince Henry is “working” on himself, like an actor rehearsing his new part, thus creating his own image:

I know you all, and will awhile uphold
The unyoked humour of your idleness:
Yet herein will I imitate the sun,
Who doth permit the base contagious clouds
To smother up his beauty from the world,
That, when he please again to be himself,
Being wanted, he may be more wonder'd at,
By breaking through the foul and ugly mists
Of vapours that did seem to strangle him [3].

Prince Henry feels perfectly well every situation and knows how to present and conduct himself in any of them: “Well, gentlemen, we must now take the form of fair people with a clear conscience”.

The real theatre in the theatre” can be seen in the episode in which Falstaff and Prince Henry act out the performance, when the Prince meets with Henry IV. In this situation Falstaff and Henry are both directors and actors of their little play.

The problems of playing, pretence and everyday lie are constantly interpreted by different sides in the works by Shakespeare. Hence the idea of a mask, face and guise appears. His characters are constantly unraveling each other, trying to distinguish sincerity from hypocrisy, loyalty from treachery, love from hatred. The playwright, on regular basis, puts such words as “mask”, “play”, “scene” in the cues of his characters.

In the early tragedy “Romeo and Juliet”, the heroine before taking the poison delivers, for this moment, quite a sublime monologue:

Farewell! God knows when we shall meet again.
I have a faint cold fear thrills through my veins,
That almost freezes up the heat of life:
I'll call them back again to comfort me:
Nurse! What should she do here?
My dismal scene I needs must act alone [4].

And she really plays it, and dies in this game. Shakespeare deliberately “dramatizes” such scenes, in which defeated lovers rush into death, “romanticizing” the life and death on the Earth, though suicide remained a damnable act, forbidden by a canon of the Everlasting.

It is obvious, that in Shakespeare’s tragedies the idea of theatricality often obtains quite a sinister character, as in general English tragedy was distinctly marked by the bloody and sombre influence of Seneca. The mask, guise is the only way to survive in the cruel world – those, who have not worn the mask are absolutely defenceless, and therefore, are doomed to death sooner than others.

A classical example of the idea of “theatre totality” is “Hamlet”, in which Shakespeare displays almost all the variants of human theatrical behaviour in the life.

First comes Claudius with his version of “putting on” a mask on his face. This character is a professional politician, manipulative, secretive, suspicious and calculating, and he needs a mask as a means of prudent control of the situation. That is why at the first appearance in the play, Claudius declares his behaviour as necessary duplicitous:

The memory be green, and that it us befitted
To bear our hearts in grief and our whole kingdom
To be contracted in one brow of woe,

Yet so far hath discretion fought with nature
That we with wisest sorrow think on him,
Together with remembrance of ourselves.
Therefore our sometime sister, now our queen,
The imperial jointress to this warlike state,
Have we, as 'twere with a defeated joy,
With an auspicious and a dropping eye,
With mirth in funeral and with dirge in marriage,
In equal scale weighing delight and dole,
Taken to wife: nor have we herein barr'd
Your better wisdoms, which have freely gone
With this affair along. For all, our thanks [5].

Another variant of the social mask is Polonius – the pragmatism of his social behaviour is not connected with large-scale ambitious goals. His mission is just to survive physically, and get as comfortably as possible in the world he lives in. Polonius's psychology is the psychology of conformist, and does not allow any human sincerity. His mask is the one of social mimicry, the mask of the chameleon:

Hamlet: - Do you see yonder cloud that's almost in shape of a camel?
Lord Polonius: - By the mass, and 'tis like a camel, indeed.
Hamlet: - Methinks it is like a weasel.
Lord Polonius: - It is backed like a weasel.
Hamlet: - Or like a whale?
Lord Polonius: - Very like a whale [5].

And Prince Hamlet himself wears a mask, in which he finds a kind of protection of his inner world from the external one. It is a mask of a madman, that gives the hero the possibility of absolute freedom of social behaviour as madmen are socially inadequate and their conduct is not socially regulated. Only they are allowed to say and do what they want. It turns out that sincerity, integrity and honesty should be also dressed up in masks.

In the system of tragedy's characters Ophelia is the most vulnerable, because she does not wear any mask. She is the embodiment of sincerity and artlessness, psychological openness, and, consequently, the absolute confidence to the world. Alas, her best qualities make her "unviable" in her own way in the place like Elsinore, which is not a place where innocence thrives.

A special attention in "Hamlet" is given to the theatre itself, its peculiarities and influences. On the nature of the theatre Shakespeare dwells when the Prince meets a group of travelling actors. Having watched a stage fragment when the actor expresses Hecuba's suffering at the time of Troy fall, Hamlet exclaims:

Now I am alone.
O, what a rogue and peasant slave am I!
Is it not monstrous that this player here,
But in a fiction, in a dream of passion,
Could force his soul so to his own conceit
That from her working all his visage wann'd,
Tears in his eyes, distraction in's aspect,
A broken voice, and his whole function suiting
With forms to his conceit? And all for nothing!
For Hecuba!
What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba,
That he should weep for her? What would he do,
Had he the motive and the cue for passion
That I have? He would drown the stage with tears
And cleave the general ear with horrid speech,
Make mad the guilty and appal the free,
Confound the ignorant, and amaze indeed
The very faculties of eyes and ears [5].

Hamlet realizes a strong effective power of the theatre as a catalyst not only of emotional, but also of social processes and a profound emotional impact the actions produced on him stimulates Hamlet's decision to act – “to be” – to be active in this life.

Comprehending the enormous political, social and psychological potential of theatre Shakespeare, through Hamlet as his mouthpiece expresses his views on the nature of the actor's art. For the playwright, it is evident, that acting is based primarily on good Technique, which comes from mind: “For anything so overdone is from the purpose of playing, whose end, both at the first and now, was and is, to hold, as ‘twere, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own image, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure. Now, this overdone, or come tardy off, though it make the unskilful laugh, cannot but make the judicious grieve” [5].

Its climactic expression the idea of theatricality in “Hamlet” gets in the scene of “The Mousetrap”:

King: What do you call the play?

Hamlet: “The Mousetrap”. – Marry, how? – Tropically. This play is the image of a murder done in Vienna: Gonzago is the duke's name; his wife – Baptista; you shall see anon; 'tis a knavish piece of work... [5].

This “theatre in the theatre” method is used not only with the idea of “exposing” Claudius – i fact, Shakespeare opens up the possibility of the psychoanalytic research of human consciousness by means of theatricality – a device that will be widely used in art and literature of the XXth century.

Not without reason the English writer John Fowles, referring to Shakespeare's creation as a pretext to his novel "The Magus", constantly creates theatrical situations in which the protagonist, Nicholas d'Efren realizes his own nature [6].

Shakespeare was the pioneer of a writer who reproduced, showed life through the game, stating that it is the world with its own laws, rules and issues.

References

1. **Shakespeare W.** Richard III [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <http://shakespeare.mit.edu/richardiii/full.html>.
2. **Смирнов А.** Примечания. к Шекспиру. «Ричард III»: Полн.собр.соч. в 8 томах / Под ред. А. Смирнова. – Т.1. – М. : Искусство, 1957. – 717 с.
3. **Shakespeare W.** Henry IV [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/s/shakespeare/william/henryiv1/act1.html>.
4. **Shakespeare W.** Romeo and Juliet [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : http://shakespeare.mit.edu/romeo_juliet/full.html.
5. **Shakespeare W.** Hamlet [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <http://shakespeare.mit.edu/hamlet/full.html>.
6. **Fowles J.** The Magus [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу : <http://www.scribub.com/limba/engleza/books/John-Fowles-The-Magus212147217.php>

Демидов Д. В., Єлісеєв С. Л. Ідея театральності як принципу соціальної поведінки у драматургії В. Шекспіра

Пропонована стаття досліджує поняття „театральності” як специфічну психологічну характеристику персонажа і презентує аналіз робіт У. Шекспіра для розуміння ідеї театральності як принципу соціальної поведінки. Доведено, що особливості людської „рольової” поведінки у всіх сферах життя стали для Шекспіра предметом окремого мистецького вивчення. Майже у всіх його драматичних творах, персонажі, так чи інакше, підтверджують необхідність для розігрування поведінки в конкретних ситуаціях і умовах.

Ключові слова: театр, театральність, соціальна поведінка, психологічні характеристики, драматургія.

Демидов Д. В., Єлісеєв С. Л. Ідея театральности как принципа социального поведения в драматургии В. Шекспира

Предлагаемая статья исследует понятие „театральности” как специфическую психологическую характеристику персонажа и представляет анализ работ В. Шекспира для понимания идеи театральности как принципа социального поведения. Доказано, что особенности человеческого „ролевого” поведения во всех сферах жизни стали для Шекспира предметом отдельного художественного изучения. Почти во всех его драматических произведениях, персонажи, так или

иначе, подтверждают необходимость для разыгрывания поведения в конкретных ситуациях и условиях.

Ключевые слова: театр, театральность, социальное поведение, психологические характеристики, драматургия.

Demidov D. V., Yeliseyev S. L. The idea of theatricality as a principle of social behavior in W. Shakespeare's drama

The proposed article investigates the term “theatricality” as a specific psychological characteristic of a character and presents the analysis of W. Shakespeare's works to comprehend the idea of theatricality as a principle of social behaviour. It is proved that features of people's “role” behaviour in all spheres of life have become for Shakespeare the subject of special study of art. Almost in all of his dramatic works, the characters, one way or another, affirm the necessity for playing behaviour under specific situations and conditions.

Key words: theatre, theatricality, social behaviour, psychological characteristics, drama.

Стаття надійшла до редакції – 10.04.2012

Прийнято до друку – 25.05.2012