

РІВНЕНСЬКИЙ ДЕРЖАВНИЙ ГУМАНІТАРНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
Факультет іноземної філології
Кафедра практики англійської мови

ЛУЦЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ТЕХНІЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
Кафедра української та іноземної лінгвістики

НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ «ОСТРОЗЬКА АКАДЕМІЯ»
Кафедра індоєвропейських мов

Сучасні проблеми германського та романського мовознавства

Матеріали третьої міжнародної
науково-практичної конференції



Рівне
2018

ББК 81.0

С 91

УДК 81

РЕДАКЦІЙНА КОЛЕГІЯ:

Головний редактор:

Михальчук Наталія Олександрівна – доктор психологічних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри практики англійської мови (Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет).

Заступник головного редактора:

Бігунова Світозара Анатоліївна – кандидат психологічних наук, доцент (Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет);

ЧЛЕНИ РЕДАКЦІЙНОЇ КОЛЕГІЇ:

Постоловський Руслан Михайлович – кандидат історичних наук, професор, ректор Рівненського державного гуманітарного університету

Ніколайчук Галина Іванівна – кандидат педагогічних наук, професор, декан факультету іноземної філології (Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет);

Ковальчук Інна В'ячеславівна – кандидат психологічних наук, доцент, декан факультету романо-германських мов (Національний університет «Острозька академія»);

Губіна Алла Михайлівна – кандидат психологічних наук, доцент кафедри української та іноземної лінгвістики (Луцький національний технічний університет);

Воробйова Людмила Михайлівна – кандидат філологічних наук, професор (Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет);

Калініченко Михайло Михайлович – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент (Рівненський державний гуманітарний університет), старший судовий експерт ЛНДІСЕ

Сучасні проблеми германського та романського мовознавства: Матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції, 15 лютого 2018 року, Рівне. – 173, [2]с.

Затверджено вченою радою Рівненського державного гуманітарного університету (протокол № 1 від 25.01.2018 р.).

До збірника увійшли матеріали третьої Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції «Сучасні проблеми германського та романського мовознавства», присвячені актуальним напрямкам досліджень у галузі філології та методики викладання мов. Матеріали збірника можуть бути корисними для науковців, дослідників, лінгвістів, аспірантів, пошукувачів, викладачів та студентів вищих мовних навчальних закладів.

За достовірність фактів, дат, назв і т. п. відповідають автори статей. Думки авторів можуть не збігатися з позицією редколегії.

ЗМІСТ

СЕКЦІЯ 1. СУЧАСНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОЇ
КОМУНІКАЦІЇ ТА КОГНІТИВНОЇ ЛІНГВІСТИКИ

<i>Бáран Беата (Baran Beata)</i> Surzhyk as a Subject of Linguistic Studies	6
<i>Бігунов Д. О.</i> Компоненти комунікативної ситуації	10
<i>Верьовкіна О. Є., Друзюк М. А.</i> General Overview of Paradox Interpretation	14
<i>Стрельченко К. С.</i> Темпоральна динаміка взаємодій у концептуальному просторі <i>Mystery</i>	21

СЕКЦІЯ 2. ТРАДИЦІЙНІ ТА НОВІТНІ АСПЕКТИ
ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИХ ТА ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВЧИХ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ

<i>Антоненко Н.Є.</i> Phraseological units with the conjunction “or” in the English language	25
<i>Белова С.А.</i> Трудові школи німеччини як основа європейського реформаторського руху кінця ХІХ-поч. ХХ ст.	31
<i>Вовчук Н. І., Федюра М. Ю.</i> Функції неолексем в художній літературі (на матеріалі поезії Р.Рождественського та А.Вознесенського)	40
<i>Івашкевич Е. Е.</i> Пошук відповідності лексичної одиниці як запорука адекватного перекладу фахівцем художніх творів	45
<i>Михальчук Н. О., Антюхова Н. І.</i> Discourse Analyses of Abstract Nouns in “The Adventure of Oliver Twist” by Charles Dickens	54
<i>Панькова Т. В.</i> До питання про модальність складнопідрядного речення	61

Ромащенко І. В.

Важливість врахування лінгвокультурного аспекту в організації науково-дослідної роботи здобувачів вищої освіти гуманітарних спеціальностей 66

Самборська І. М.

Онтологическая природа внутренней формы и ее роль в формировании семантики производного слова 69

СЕКЦІЯ 3. АКТУАЛЬНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ МЕТОДИКИ ВИКЛАДАННЯ ІНОЗЕМНИХ МОВ

Богатирчук Л. М.

Dialoge und Rollenspiele im Fremdsprachenunterricht 77

Бойко Н.Г., Конопльова Ю.О.

Використання діалогічного мовлення у формуванні комунікативної компетенції школярів на уроках іноземної мови..... 83

Вєтрова І. М.

Особенности впровадження нових підходів у методичній підготовці майбутнього вчителя англійської мови 90

Зубілевич М. І.

Іншомовний професійно-орієнтований текст як засіб формування комунікативних вмінь студентів-медиків 95

Людвиг Скотт (Ludwig Scott)

Debate in Education: Benefits and Implementation 103

Матвєйченко В. В., Москалець О. О., Денисова Н. Б.

Innovative School Practice in Pre-Service Teacher Training 107

Наумович О.П., Зімка В. Й.

Формування іншомовної компетентності учнів на уроках німецької мови шляхом розвитку навичок комунікативного письма 108

Скуратівська Н. В.

Рекомендації для ефективного навчання аудіюванню на уроках англійської мови..... 116

Судима Т.М.

Using movies to teach English 121

СЕКЦІЯ 4. ВИКОРИСТАННЯ ІННОВАЦІЙНИХ ТЕХНОЛОГІЙ В ПРОЦЕСІ МОВНОЇ ПІДГОТОВКИ СТУДЕНТІВ-ФІЛОЛОГІВ

Білоус Т.М.

Intercultural Competence as a Key Component of Foreign Language Teaching 123

Маккрола Джейсон Чарльз (Jason C. McKrola)

Overcoming Language Learning Anxiety: Lowering the Affective Filter through a Virtual Teaching Model..... 125

Михальчук Н.О., Набочук О.Ю.

The Idea of Understanding as a “Dialogue of Capabilities” 130

Триндюк В.А.

Використання Інтернет-ресурсів інституту Гете на заняттях з німецької мови 140

Федоришина В.О.

Special Education in Ontario : Roles and Responsibilities in Special Education..... 144

СЕКЦІЯ 5. ЗІСТАВНА ЕТНОЛІНГВІСТИКА ТА ТЕРМІНОЛОГІЯ В АСПЕКТІ МОВНИХ ТА КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНИХ КАРТИН СВІТУ

Байло Ю. В.

Особливості функціонування метафори у термінології..... 148

Івашкевич Е.З., Чала Ю.М.

Social Knowledge, Social Thinking, Social Prediction and Social Intuition in the Paradigm of Social Intellect of a Person 153

Івашкевич Е.З., Яцюрин А.О.

Унікальні характеристики особистості педагога та структура його соціального інтелекту 155

Потанчук С.С.

Соціо-оцінний концепт СОВІСТЬ у паремійних одиницях англійської та української мов 165

ІНФОРМАЦІЯ ПРО АВТОРІВ 170

References

1. Allhands J. Why use Google Classroom? Here's what you need to know [Electronic resource] / Joanna Allhands. – Arizona Republic, 2017. – Mode of access: <https://www.azcentral.com>. – Title from the screen.
2. Brookfield S. Self-Directed Learning: A Conceptual and Methodological Exploration / S. Brookfield // Studies in the Education of Adults. –1985. – 17(1) – P.19-32.
3. Childwise Research media monitoring report 2016 [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access: <http://childwise.co.uk>
4. Gladwell, M. Outliers / M. Gladwell. – Little Brown & Co., 2008. – 307 p.
5. Krashen, S. Principles and Practice / S. Krashen. – University of Southern California, 1982. – 202 p.
6. Zhang M. Teaching with Google Classroom / M. Zhang. – Packt Publishing, 2016. – 256 p.

Михальчук Н.О.,

Набочук О.Ю.

м. Рівне

THE IDEA OF UNDERSTANDING AS A “DIALOGUE OF CAPABILITIES”

Range of problems of correlation of real and ideal that helps us to answer all questions and forms of philosophical idea of understanding, puts a classic question about truth of knowledge of a man and its presentations in relations to surrounding reality. If for the paradigm of philosophy of the establishment of truth of presentations of the idea of understanding, it has direct connection with a reflection in relations to the method of cognition, that contains ideas about surrounding reality. Then for logic truth of presentations is always correlated with the analysis of reflection, that helps consistently to line up ideas taking into account a certain

sequence, sometimes it helps us to design a separate structural model on their basis. Thus, truth of conclusion has a great interest for logic, first of all, while establishment of truth of outside data goes out of its subject.

A fundamental difference in facilities of the analysis of presentations stipulates a difference and the interpretation of thinking of a man, and, in particular, in that there is a process of understanding. For philosophy the understanding is important because the contemporary are the certain methods of cognition of the reality a man, while for logic, understanding presents the form of judgement only, by transition facilities from one ideas to the others. If to analyze history of the development of logic and philosophy, it is not difficult to notice circumstances that makes possibility to study of conformities to law because the process of understanding arose up recently, but reason of it is exactly in raising of the problem of correlation between real and ideal, that it was carried out within the limits of German classic philosophy.

Before publishing of “Criticism of clean mind” of I.Kant (Kant, I., 1980) understanding was fixed to the area of ideal, that is why the origin of presentations as a result of understanding of a certain sense was explained or by the cases of correlation of individual experience, or by the ability involuntary to direct the “natural world of the mind” and find a truth, for example, by distribution of “effective substance and effective spirit” (Dekart, R., 1936). Exactly in German classic philosophy realization of that philosophical knowledge that belongs to the area of presentations must be explained by ideal as a moment of the reality which took place at first, as an objective side of understanding must be explained ideal as a moment of a reality, but not only as its thoughtful character or character of perception.

Possibility of quality transformation of philosophy and logic arises out of this moment, and predominates main relations between them. In philosophy after G.Gegel appears possibility of studying of cultural and historical laws of thinking and the activity of man, in which there is a maintenance of presentations of a man, that is a product of understanding, not only influences on his/her materially-

practical activity but also it appears determined publicly by historical facilities of the theory of understanding (Gegel', G.V., 1940).

In logic also there is clear realization of inherent method and there are positive possibilities for the analysis, for presentations in general. From one side, there is a possibility of formalization of different principles and researches' facilities (Frege, G., 1997), and, from the other, the expansion of the field of the usage takes place with the aim having been included into the philosophy. The last allowed B.Rassel to talk that "formal logic from middle of the nineteenth century every ten years creates more than it was created for all period from Aristotle to Leybnite" (Rassel, B., 1957). The application especially of logical facilities and methods of the analysis in philosophy was resulted in the origin of new direction of it, what L.Vitgenshtein called the background of Bright named the "most personal touch of philosophy of the XX-th century" (Vitgenshtejn, L., 1958), and that is related to the names of G.Frege, L.Vitgenshtein and others. Also it is quite another idea concerning understanding.

The phenomenology of understanding in the paradigm of logic in details was described by V.S.Bibler in the book "Thinking as Creativity: Introduction to the Logic of a Mind Dialogue". In basis of reasoning of V.S.Bibler put an idea, that theoretical work came true for logical thinking in the whole human consciousness. Also, if creation of new ideas, invention of new idealizing object takes place out of logic (in particular, at intuitional level), then it means that there can be only logical tautologies in logic, and only those "concepts are clear", only the ideas are known to the researcher. For this reason, V.S.Bibler said, in logic there could not be "I" and "alter-ego". In the sphere of leading to the "man it is known and clear only that it is known and clear", and a dialogue in such a case will be identical. But V.S.Bibler assumes that in logic can exist "I", that knows, and "I", that also does not know at all, "I", that understands, and "I" that does not understand, "I" that thinks after the certain set of logic, and "I" that criticizes and grounds this logic, and the same goes beyond his/her mind. Then such a dialogue shows a center of the logical form of a dialogue of "I" and "You", and that makes a background for

logic that creates possibilities for understanding a man himself (Bibler, V.S., 1975: 68–69).

Also V.S.Bibler offers the algorithm of understanding the text, pushing off from the idea of logic. Understanding is the internal form of the text and it is possible to understand a text as the motion of concepts. The method of reading the text (after expression of V.S.Bibler, by its “theoretical structures”) in its internal form was offered earlier by Dekart and Leybnitc, by Spinoza and Edging. But only Gegel gave readers a shoot by means of the development of logical technology to see the author in the text that helps a reader within the limits of a traditional structure of the text to understand ideas after internal motion, submitting to logic of “dialogue of capabilities” (Bibler, V.S., 1975: 139). In such a way Gegel suggests to read any text twice. At first the text for a reader seems the simple system of sentences (accordingly as so called judgments, conclusions). In basis of such reading there is a “subjectively predicative structure of sentences”. As a result of the second reading the text is understood by this or that concept being formulated. In this case “subject-attributive structure” of the text disappears (Bibler, V.S., 1975: 145–146). Therefore for Gegel a “logical subject” (the piece of thinking) coincides in an eventual account with the “subject of logic” (by the absolute subject of thinking). A logical subject (so called “absolute spirit”) remains in unchanging form, the author of the text recognizes only himself /herself, and every “intermediate logical subject” is only the attribute of absolute subject, that is not included into the sphere of logic. Therefore the chart of understanding has not only a “subject that is a subject in its character”, and, rather, it is “predicative-predictable subject”: one predicate shows a context of logical subject, then there is converting into another logical predicate, that, as well as the first one, acts as a part of the “subject”, and so “to the end, from which everything was beginning” (Bibler, V.S., 1975: 151–152). Such motion is on the chart of any text, in opinion of V.S.Bibler, and it will assist understanding of the text’s logical form and to understand the construction of subject-subject structure of the concept. In such a

way a reader by means of so-called “motion of concepts” comes to complete, deep understanding of a certain text.

In a logical way also L.Vitgenshtein carried out his researches. In the center of his studies there are values of every separate sentence, that in their totality brings us to understanding the whole text. This idea is near to the points of view of Hegel and V.S.Bibler. So, L.Vitgenshtein proposes a concept “understanding of understanding”. Going into detailed maintenance of such double from the point of view of formal logic understanding, L.Vitgenshtein wrote: “I ask, or is there understanding a process that answers motion during a sentence? What structure does this process have then? The same, approximately, as well as a sentence? Or is this process something amorphous, by something such as though I read a sentence and felt here dental pain? I think that a realtor of understanding is not the special psychological process that yet, in addition, shows results in perception of a sentence. If I hear and read a sentence, then in my mind played off, undoubtedly, different processes, designed a character of a sentence, associations and others like that. But all these processes do not interest me. I understand a sentence, if I apply it. Understanding, thus, is not quite a special process, and only it is operating with the sentence. A sentence exists here not in order that some other sentence is operated with it, because that I do is really an operation” (Vitgenshtejn, L., 1958: 189).

Thus, to understand a sentence, after L.Vitgeshtein, means to be able to reconstruct it and to operate, do actions with it. But, from our point of view, if you are reconstructing a sentence it is possible not to understand it (as an example, we will point the usage some lingual structural models by people but they can not use them in concrete situations of co-operation and communication: the deep understanding often means deep understanding of this structural model and it is quite not necessary for us to use it in the situations of intermingling with a native speaker). On the other hand, logic examines any understanding in such a way, that it is organically related to personal factors, also with the subjective options of a man. In this case the process of understanding is preceded the process of

formulation hypotheses in this structural model and it is not quite necessary for its usage in the situations of intermingling with native speakers.

From the other point of view, logic examines any understanding of the person, that is organically related to the personal factors and qualities according to the subjective options of a man. In this case the process of understanding is preceded the process of formulation the hypotheses.

There is an enormous amount of situations in that concrete spheres of decisions or tasks which you haven't known yet. In such terms there is a fully specific problem how to find the concrete method of decisions, to make the necessary system of operations, this or that or another plan of their realization. Methods, by means of which a man opens the new methods of rebuilding the decisions, show us the way of understanding unstereotype plans and programs. These methods are named heuristic ones.

Heuristics is, in its turn, so called "aim methods" by means of that there are concretely-semantic methods of decisions and understanding is reached with their help. Often it is enough to point out a heuristic method which is examined different subjects, such as abbreviates the revision of different variants of decisions, or find out a lot of possible ways in the "labyrinth" of search, but, indisputably, any heuristic method contains a hypothesis, that allows us to consider the processes of formulation the hypotheses by different heuristic processes due to that the search of decisions comes true. In such a way L.L.Gurova considers that hypotheses can be as incomprehensible after the origin, for example, such one that is not provoked by maintenance of predominant process, so logically argued, reasonable, realized and it is as plain as a pikestaff (Gurova, L.L., 1976). Hypotheses, as a rule, are analyzed in psychological literature as a component part of search of decisions which is important in a main degree, and, sometimes it is the only form of making decision. Therefore hypotheses follow to examine a factor of synthesis of intuitional and discursive processes. According to such understanding hypotheses that touch one article of reasoning are not testify to their absolute opposition, but

demonstrate co-ordination, unity, promoting because understanding can be attained.

From one side, the process of formulation of hypotheses can be realized in an intuitional form, and their verification which is stipulated by logical and discursive processes. From the other side, a hypothesis can be examined as a rational component of decisions, then its verification does not come true after the successive logical stages of reasoning, but oriented exceptionally on intuitional prognostication on the basis of that a hypothesis is considered well-proven or erroneous. Also any hypothetical process can be investigated by means of construction of graphic models on the basis of geometrical intuition. Studying the process of formulation of hypotheses during realization of heuristic decisions of tasks, we underline that the existent researchers sanctify us to study the processes of formulation of hypotheses, but in a full degree some detailed features do not expose them.

A lot of empirical researchers show us higher approaches in relations between studying the hypothesis in a psychological aspect distinguishing the main functions of hypothesis, that consists in correlation at the investigated presentation with character of the reality. The process of formulation, verification (verifications) and confirmation, or changes of hypotheses, is examined as the independent link in the structure of process of decisions of different tasks. The table of contents of this process is in so called determination of substantial features of the known information and gradual clarification of ideas on the ways of tasks' decisions. This process determines in the structure of tasks' decision, thus spectrum of the tasks is used for a study and description of this process, also it grows constantly. Self name of the phenomenon of the "process of formulation and verification of hypotheses" underlines its prolonged in time, and also it is fixing on the different stages of tasks' decisions. Different descriptions of process of formulation and verification of hypotheses are the decisions of tasks related to the productivity, in particular they are tasks of understanding so called "problem situations", cognitive tasks as "formation of concepts", "being of decisions" and

“designing theorems”, and tasks that have social context. The last ones are called tasks of “evaluation of hypotheses”.

Logic was not able to answer all questions that expose essence of the phenomenon of understanding. We consider that in logic there is absent an effective methodological soil for the comprehension of the definition of “understanding” that created pre-conditions for the development of integral theory of understanding in psychological science as one of the most principal reason of such position.

As the example we should like to show the criteria of understanding English proverbs. Thus, the **criteria for delimiting proverbs and sayings** according to their understanding can be divided into two types.

1. A **meaningful (semantic) criterion**, under which we mean partial/general opposition. Thus, many linguists pay attention to the fact that proverbs have a synthesizing meaning, they have a generalized character (Zhukov, V.P., 1991, Permyakov, G.L., 1988, etc.). In addition to the mandatory existence of a generalization of the regularities of the reality, the value of proverbs is often evaluative and prescriptive, under which we understand the instructive content.

So, the meaning of proverbs may contain: a) statement of phenomena and properties: *All work is noble (Будь-яка праця благородна)*; b) their evaluation: *Doing is better than saying (Не мели язиком, а роби ділом)*. *A good beginning makes a good ending (Який початок, такий і кінець)*; c) a prescription, a rule: *Never put off till tomorrow what you can do today (Не відкладай на завтра те, що можна зробити сьогодні)*. *Do not wait for a rainy day to fix your roof (Не треба чекати дощового дня, щоб полагодити дах)*.

Unlike proverbs, the sayings do not contain generalizations, they consider only a concrete case, expressing a partial meaning. For example: *Slow but sure (Повільно, але вірно)*.

2. **Structural criterion (complementary one)**. Unlike G.L.Permyakov, under the structural criterion in this case we do not mean the distribution of the sentence – the proverb/phrase – the saying, but a number of additional grammatical

and syntactic data types of statements. According to the communicative concept of V.P.Zhukov, proverbs and sayings are always sentences (Zhukov, V.P., 1991).

In turn, the proverbs are complete statements in a form of narrative (*The devil finds work for idle hands to do. Чорт знайде роботу для ледачих рук*) or inductive (*Bear and forbear. Виявляй терпіння та витримку*) sentence with a closed structure. In this case, the verb in English proverbs is in a form of the Present Indefinite Tense. In series of English proverbs it can be singled out special syntactic structures, not typical for each occasions. Such sentences are most often elliptical and, as a result, they differ in particular laconicity: *Business before pleasure (Спочатку діло, потім розваги). No sooner said than done (Сказано – як зав'язано)*.

Unlike proverbs, syntactic schemes are more diverse. So, V.P.Zhukov distinguishes narrative sayings (*Great cry and little wool. Шуму багато, а толку мало. Chief cook and bottle washer. І швець, і жнець і на дуді гравець.*), stimulating, emotionally-modal and exclamation sayings (*No sweat! З легкістю*), also questionable testimonials (Zhukov, V.P., 1991). In English, questionnaires with the component “human activities” were not found.

An additional feature that helps to distinguish proverbs and sayings in their external form is the presence of some English words in the form of words that replace the subject of reasoning mentioned in the proverb. So, the pronoun is reliably enshrined in the proverb and can not be freely replaced by another pronoun or name. So, proverbs, along with sayings and winged expressions, refer to persistent phrases, that is, communicative units are characterized by constancy at all levels of speech. The structure of the completed sentence causes the similarity of proverbs and sentences with other types of constant phrases, as well as a number of structural and semantic characteristics common to all categories. However, each type is characterized by distinctive, specific features that allow differentiated approach to the distribution of constant phrases into independent discharges.

References

1. Bibler, V.S. (1975) *Myshlenie kak tvorchestvo: Vvedenie v logiku myslennogo dialoga [Thinking as Creativity: Introduction to the Logic of a Mind Dialogue]*. M. : Politizdat [in Russian].
2. Vitgenshtejn, L. (1958) *Logiko-filosofskij traktat [Logico-philosophical treatise]*. M. : Politizdat [in Russian].
3. Gegel', G.V. (1940) *Lekcii po e'stetike : Sochineniya v 14-ti t. [Lectures on aesthetics: Pieces in 14 books. Into Russian the translation have been done by B.G. Stolpner]*. M. : SOCE'KGIZ [in Russian].
4. Gurova, L.L. (1976) *Psixologicheskij analiz resheniya zadachi [Psychological analysis of the problem's solution]*. Voronezh : Univers [in Russian].
5. Dekart, R. (1936) *Pravila dlya rukovodstva uma [Rules for the leadership of the mind. Into Russian from latin the translation have been done by V.I. Pikov]*. M. : SOCE'KGIZ [in Russian].
6. Zhukov, V.P. (1991) *Leksicheskij sostav poslovic i pogovorok [Lexical content of proverbs and sayings. Dictionary of Russian proverbs and sayings]*. M. : Prosveshhenie [in Russian].
7. Kant, I. (1980) *Kritika sposobnosti suzhdeniya [Criticism of Judgment. Into Russian the translation have been done by N.M. Sokolov, M.V. Popov]*. Sofiya : NaBan [in Russian].
8. Permyakov, G.L. (1988) *Osnovy strukturnoj paremiologii [Fundamentals of structural paremiology]*. M. : Nauka [in Russian].
9. Rassel, B. (1957) *Chelovecheskoe poznanie: ego sfera i granicy [Human knowledge: its sphere and boundaries. Translated from English]*. M. : Izd-vo inostr. lit-ry [in Russian].
10. Frege, G. (1997) *Logicheskie issledovaniya [Logical researches]*. Tomsk : Vodolej [in Russian].