**КОНСПЕКТ ЛЕКЦІЙ З ДИСЦИПЛІНИ**

**Лекція № 1**

**Questions to be discussed:**

1. Functions of Language.

2. Language as the Main Means of Communication

*Functions of Language*

There exist different points of view as to the nature of the language. Is it a biological, psychical or social phenomenon? And the scientists give various answers to this question. Some scholars (A. Muller, W. Schleicher) considered the language to be a biological phenomenon, other linguists (H. Steintal, W. Humboldt, A. Potebnya) consider it as a psychical phenomenon. Nowadays in modern linguistics there is a predominating point of view that the language is a social phenomenon. And there are certain grounds for this view. Language cannot be inherited; it can be gained in the course of human's life.

Functions of language can prove the fact that it is a social phenomenon because functions reveal the language essence. Thus they characterize the language. The main functions of the language are:

- communicative (as a means of communication);

- cognitive (as a means of thinking and cognition);

- emotive (for expressing feelings and emotions):

- metalingual (as a means of language investigation);

We should also distinguish the secondary functions of the language. They are:

- phatic (as a means of establishing the contact);

- conative (assimilation);

- voluntative;

- historical / cultural (the preservation of culture, history, etc.)

The cognitive function correlates with the representative or nominal function (as a means of naming the objects and phenomena). The emotive function is closely related to the poetic or aesthetic function (as a means of expressing the beauty).

These main and secondary functions are of great practical importance. For example, K. Buller studying the emotive function pointed out language means which help us to understand the emotional state of the speaker. They are:

word order;

intonation;

elliptic constructions.

There is no one common point of view as to the number of the language functions. For example such linguist as A.E. Suprun names three main functions:

language as a means of communication;

language as a means of preservation and transmission of human's experience;

language as a main means of thinking.

Z.D. Popova considers, for example, that the language has only one function — communicative. According to M.P. Kocherhan two main functions are distinguished: - communicative; - cognitive.

Both of them are of great importance. Some linguists consider that the communicative function is dominant. But all the linguists have something in common. All of them are sure that language functions have a social character and that's why sometimes they are called the social functions of the language. The notion of the language function is one of the main items in the concept of Prague Linguistic Circle based on K. Buller’s scientific work «Theory of Language. Structural Model of Languages From Buller's point of view, psychic abilities of a person — to think, to feel and to express one's will — give birth to three language functions: communicative, expressive and addressive. According to these functions three types of utterance are singled out — declarative, exclamatory and imperative. The communicative function is connected with intellectual thinking and with the way of communication.

Prague linguists rejected psychological explanation of the notion of function and developed the idea of language as a functional system. They defined language as a system of expressive means which serve a definite aim.

*Language as the Main Means of Communication*

Language interacts with every other aspect of human life in society. It can be understood only if it is analyzed through its relations with the society. It is a working system of communication in a definite period and in a certain community. Language is used as the product of the community's past and the source of its future development. The social character of the language is proved by the fact that children learn the language of those who bring them up from infancy, even adopted infants whatever their race and physical type and the language of actual parents, acquire the language of the adoptive parents.

Language interacts with every other aspect of human life in society, and it can be understood only if it is considered in relation to society. It is both a working system of communication in the period and in the community wherein it is used and also the product of its past history and the source of its future development.

In regard to the production of speech sounds, all humans are physiologically alike. It has been shown repeatedly that children learn the language of those who bring them up from infancy. Even adopted infants, whatever the language of their actual pa rents, acquire the language of the adoptive parents. Individual physiological differences, including shapes of lips, throat, size of larynx, etc. do not affect one's ability or aptitude to speak any particular language.

Almost all mammals and many other animal species make vocal noises and evince feelings thereby and keep in contact with each other through a rudimentary sort of communication, but those members of the animal kingdom nearest to humans genetically, the great apes, lack the anatomic apparatus necessary for speaking. The development of humans voice-producing mechanism has been linked to upright posture and the freeing of the vocal cords from the frequent need to hold one's breath in using the arms for loco motion. Certainly, speaking and hearing — as a primary means of communication — have a number of striking advantages: speech does not depend on daylight or mutual visibility, it can operate in all directions over reasonably wide areas, and it can be adjusted in loudness to cope with distance. Also, the physical energy required in speaking is extremely small in relation to the immense power wielded by speech in human life, and scarcely any other activity, such as running, walking, or tool using, interferes seriously with the process. Certain aspects of speech control are located in a particular part of the human brain (Broca's convolution), different from parts responsible for other activities. Whereas apes lack the anatomic structures that are necessary for the vocalization of human speech. Beyond doubt, biological factors played a substantial role in the human language development, though social factor shouldn't be neglected. Under it we mean the necessity of language in society. Language couldn't have come into being without the purpose for communication. Also children are in general brought up within the social group to which their parents and immediate family circle belong, and they learn the dialect and speaking styles of that group along with the rest of the subculture and behavioral traits and attitudes that are characteristic of it.

When individuals speak, they do not normally confine them selves to the mere emission of speech sounds. Because speaking involves at least 2 parties in sight of each other, a great deal of meaning is conveyed by facial expression, tone of voice, and movements and postures of the whole body but especially of the hands; these are collectively known as gestures. The contribution of bodily gestures to the total meaning of a conversation is in part culturally determined and differs in different communities. It is found that it is the visual accompaniments (gestures, laughter, screams of joy, fear, pain, disgust, triumph) similar to those of animals and of voice that elicit the main emotional response of the interlocutor,

A language is a symbol system. But there are other systems recognized and institutionalized in the life of mankind. They are musical notation and dance notation, «computer languages» (COBOL, Algol, FORTRAN, etc.), traffic and military signs, alphabets for deaf and blind, Morze's code and so on. These means of communication, however, are peripheral in use in comparison with language.

**Лекція №2**

**Questions to be discussed:**

1. Language and Other Communication Systems

2. Language as a System of Signs

3. The Notion of a Sign

4. Signs and Language Units

*Language and Other Communication Systems*

One of the most important problems connected with the term «language» is a wide range of its application. There exist innumerable definitions of the term, some take into account the general concept or «language», some concentrate on the more specific notion of «a language». Attention can be drawn to the formal features of phonology (or graphology), grammar, and semantics. The range of functions that language performs is also taken into consideration. Some definitions stress the similarities or differences between language and other forms of human, animal, or machine communication. The definitions can be highly technical in character or extremely general, reflecting the way in which the notion has been applied figuratively to all forms of human behavior, such as the «language» of music, cookery, or the cinema.

The problem is often ignored, as the question of identifying an individual language has no single, simple answer, because formal and social criteria are often in conflict.

A more useful approach to language, demonstrated by most modern linguists, is to identify the various properties that are thought to be its essential defining characteristics. The aim is to determine a human language, as opposed to non-human communication and other forms of human communication.

*Language as a System of Signs*

Many variants have been proposed to define language as a sign. For example, Henry Sweet, an English phonetician and language scholar, stated: «Language is the expression of ideas by means of speech sounds combined into sentences, this combination answering to the transformation of the ideas into thoughts».Language interacts with every aspect of human life in society and it can be understood only if considered in relation to society. Each language, at the same time, is a working system of communication in a definite period and community, the product of its past history, the source of its future development. Any account of language must consider it from these points of view.

The science of language is known as linguistics, which includes descriptive and historical linguistics. It is known as a highly technical subject; it embraces, both descriptively and historically such major divisions as phonetics, grammar, and semantics, dealing in detail with various aspects of language. For a full account of the theory and methods of linguistics, we must underline that the word «linguistics» was first used in the middle of the 19th century to emphasize the difference between a newer approach to the study of language that was then developing and the more traditional approach of philology. The differences were and are largely matters of attitude, emphasis and purpose The philologist is concerned primarily with the historical development of languages as it is manifested in written texts and in the context of the associated literature and culture. The linguist though he may be interested in written texts and in the development of languages through time, tends to give priority to spoken languages and to the problems of analyzing them, as they operate at a given point of time.

According to the widely adopted schema of the U.S. scholar Charles Morris, this theory must embrace three domains: pragmatics, the study of the language user as such; semantics, the study of the elements of a language from the point of view of meanings and syntax, the study of the formal interrelations that exist between the elements of a language themselves.

Semantics is one of the main fields of linguistic science. Yet, except for borderline investigations, the linguists' interest in semantic matters is quite distinct from the philosopher's concern. Whereas the philosopher asks the question «What is meaning?», the typical questions the linguist is likely to ask include: «How is the meaning of words encoded in a language?», «How is this meaning to be determined?», «What are the laws, governing change of meaning?» and «How can the meaning of a word be given, expressed, or defined?».

A few examples suffice to illustrate some of these problems, and to show how the linguist's approach differs from that of the philosopher. Words are arbitrary signs; to some authors, particularly to the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, this feature of arbitrariness represents an essential characteristic of all real languages.

These are several other issues that pertain to the question of meaning. Certain languages show a marked preference for very specific words, at least, in certain domains, while lacking the corresponding general terms, which are the only ones occurring in other languages. The Eskimos, for instance, have a number of words denoting various kinds of snow, but no name for the very familiar animal species of which the male member is bull.

*The Notion of a Sign*

We live in the world of signs and it's a well-grounded fact. Alarm-clock bell in the morning is a signal for a person to get up, Red light of the traffic lights is the sign of prohibition to cross the road, green one is the sign of permission. On the way to university you meet a friend and nod your head to greet him. You can shake hands as well. These are signs of respect, positive attitudes to a person. In the cloak-room you are given a counter and it means that a person will look after your coat. Even in the canteen you pay off money signs. To the signs belong different signboards on public and trade establishment, arrows that indicate the moment or location, different schemes and drawings. We meet these signs every day and it means that they play a great role in our everyday live.

Language is one of the sign systems. Scientists of ancient India and Greece had been speaking about the sign character of the language. Among them was Aristotle (384-322 B.C.). He affirmed that: «Language expressions are signs of mental expressions, and writing is the sign of the first ones». We come across the sign definition in Port Royal Grammar and later in works of linguists comparativists — W. Humboldt, A. Potebnya, F. Fortunatov, I. Boduen de Courteney, V. Porzhezinsky, V. Bogoroditsky and others. But in their researchers the term «sign» didn't get a special linguistic definition.

When F. de Saussure's book «The Course of General Linguistics» had appeared, scientists considered this question in a different way. F. de Saussure placed the language as the system of signs in one row together with any other sign system, which «plays a definite role in the life of society». «Language is the system of signs that express ideas and that's why we can compare it with writing, with alphabet for deaf and dumbs, with symbolic ceremonies, with forms of politeness, with military signals and so on. In this way we may think about the science that studies a sign's life in the life of society. We may call it semiology». Such science has really appeared, but it was called semiotics.

Semiotic science studies the structure and function of different sign systems.

Semiotics origin is connected with the works of Ch. Morris «Basic theory of signs» (1938), «Signs, language and behaviors», though the foundation was laid by American mathematician and logic Ch. Pires. F. de Saussure is considered a founder of linguosemiotics.

Sign is the basic concept of semiotics. Sign-material, sensory adopted subject in the process of speaking and cognition is used for getting, keeping, transformation and transference of information.

The main features of the sign are: 1) material character, i. e. sensory perception; 2) its ability to denote something which is beyond it (object, defined by the sign, is called denotate); 3) the absence of the causal links with the defined; 4) informative character (ability to convey information and to be used with a communicative purpose); 5) systemic character. As for systemic character, a sign receives meaning being an element of a sign system. So, signs create definite systems and their value is determined by its place in the system.

*Signs and Language Units*

The problem of correlation of the signs and language units exists only in billiteral theory. For representatives of billiteral trend everything in language is signs.

The smallest language unity is a phoneme. Since a phoneme is a one-sided unity, it can't be considered as a sign. This unity serves for building and differentiation of signs. Phoneme hasn't functions that are characteristic of signs.

A morpheme is a two-sided unity; it has a plane of expressiveness and content. For example in the word «рука», there are two morphemes. The root «pyк-» expresses the idea of the hand, and the flexion -a has three grammatical meanings: nominative case, singular, feminine.

However, these meanings are not realized by themselves, they come to being only in the whole word.

A morpheme can't come as a means of communication independently. Taking into consideration everything mentioned above, morpheme should be considered a half-sign.

A word is a two-sided unity with all sign functions, and there is a ground to consider a word a language sign.

A sentence is not a sign because it consists of signs and belongs to the structure standard.

However, words fulfill communicative functions in the sentence, precisely in the utterance, and some people think that a language unity of full value is only a sentence.

To agree with such point of view is very difficult because, first — a sentence-utterance is not the substitution of the subject of reality and expresses the whole, sometimes -a, very complicated situation; second —- when taking an utterance as a sign, it won't coordinate with the main features of a sign. So, in language one can distinguish a subsign, a sign and a supersign level. Phonemes belong to subsign level, words — to sign level, sentence — to a super-sign level.

**Лекція №3**

**Questions to be discussed:**

1. Originality of the Language as a System of Signs.

2. From the History of Language & Speech Research

*Originality of the Language as a System of Signs*

To learn the language as a system of signs is sensible when the specificity of the language is accounted for. Talking about language signs we should mention such a fact that the same notions in different languages are expressed by different words (Ukrainian: cmiл, German: der Tisch, English: table) and on the contrary, different notions are used by the same exponents (лyнa — місяць, эхо — відлуння, конец, — кінець). Such words as, ляп, хлоп, хіхікати belong to the motivated language signs. It is external motivation. We learn these words as secondary and inconsistent as for their symbolic origin. It is considered that language sings are conventional. The idea about the motivation of language sings is highly popular nowadays among the representatives of a theory of sound-symbols. Really if we conduct a psycholinguistic experiment in order to define size, age, inner qualities of unknown hu­man beings which are marked by words which do not exist «xa-papeкa», «зілюля», then in the first word Ukrainian speakers can find such features as, big, cool, bad — and in the other — small, young, good. Different sounds evoke different associations, for example, Ukrainians consider x, ж, ш, ф to be bad sounds and л to be a good sound. Sound motivation has an inner motivation, except for external motivation to which belongs morpheme motivation of difficult words such as, German: der Bestarbeiter, der Fernsehrapparat, der Regenbogen. In this case we talk not about signs and things marked by them, but about the motivation of same signs with the help of others.

The absence of parallelism between the meaning and the form known as asymmetrical dualism of S. Karcevsky is the specific feature of a language sign and is realized through:

the plane of expression or the defining is lineal and discreet, whereas the plane of meaning is cumulative;

the defining can correlate with a few defined, that is there exist such phenomena as, polysemy, synonymy, homonymy etc.;

the defining and the defined have an autonomous development, one of them can change and the other can remain stable.

The peculiarities of the language as a system of signs depend on the specific character of the language:

language appears naturally, develops all the time, becomes more perfect, it is capable of self-regulation when other sign systems are artificial and conventional. Languages are productive. Very often language sings change their meaning under the influence of extra lingual factors;

the language unlike other sign system is a universal way of communication. The rest of sign systems are secondary in their relation to the language. They have limited spheres of usage; language is a polyfunctional system of signs. Besides communicative function, which is typical of other sign systems, it contains representative, cognitive, pragmatic metalingual, and other functions. The language conveys not only information about some facts, but also the speaker's attitude to this information. Language is the instrument of thought, the means of cognizing the world;

language has a lot of layers. It is a very complicated hierarchical system, which has two ways of organization — paradigmatic and syntagmatic.

*From the History of Language & Speech Research*

Nowadays the more detailed research of the language phenomena has led the linguists to the necessity of distinguishing at least two objects: language and speech. The problem of language and speech is considered to be one of the most urgent problems in contemporary theory of Linguistics. Opposition «language — speech» is considered to be nearly the most prominent achievement of the Linguistics of the 20th century.

The necessity to differentiate these two notions was introduced by a Swiss scientist F. de Saussure, who put this opposition as the fundamental idea of his general linguistic theory.

The basic principles of his theory as presented in «The Course of General Linguistics» are:

differentiation of 3 notions: language, langue and parole (i. e. speech);

langue (lingual activities) which comprises everything which is connected with communication, and is divided into two parts: basic (language) and special (speech);

language is social by nature and independent of a man; speech includes individual aspects of lingual activities;

4 ) language is a form, not substation which belongs to speech; 5) language and speech are closely interrelated in general.

It's necessary to mention that the terms lingue activities, speech and language up to the present time do not have strict definitions.

A modern linguist now uses the definitions given by F. de Saussure, but there's a tendency to diminish the number of oppositional determiners.

For objective realization of language and speech relations it's necessary to consider all three possible approaches to the subject: philosophic, linguistic and pragmatic.

From the philosophic point of view language and speech are the phenomena of different levels. Language is general and abstract while speech is separate and concrete. From the linguistic point of view language belongs to psychological phenomenon, and speech — to psychophysical, as presented in the opposition of ideal — material.

Pragmatics considers the language as stable and generally accepted, while speech is occasional, unique, and dynamic.

From the historical point of view language is secondary and speech is primary. From the synchronic point of view the language is primary and the speech is secondary.

The opposition «speech — language» is of great value for the methodology of teaching native and especially foreign languages. Depending on what is the aim of teaching — speech or language — the teacher chooses the array of methods from language models to their realization or vice versa. Nowadays the teaching of language through speech (text) is becoming more and more popular. The pupils are given neither the data about the language structure nor the grammatical rules; while reading and analyzing texts they define the structure of language themselves. This approach comes from the Danish linguist O. Jesperson, who considered that language should be learned only through speech.

**Лекція №4**

**Практичне заняття№9,10.**

**Questions to be discussed:**

1. Language and Speech
2. Language and Thinking
3. The Process of Literary Language Formation

*Language and Speech*

Language and speech are quite different linguistic notions. According to F. de Saussure language has 2 aspects: the system of language and the manifestation of this system in social intercourse — speech. The system of language is a body of linguistic units — sounds, affixes, words, grammar rules and rules of lexical series. The system of language enables us to speak and to be understood since it is known to all the members of a speech community. Speech is the total of our utterances and texts. It is based on the system of language, and it gives the linguist the possibility of studying the whole system. Speech is the linear (syntagmatic) aspect of lan­guage; the system of language is the paradigmatic aspect.

It should be borne in mind, as well, that speed is always individual and is situationally oriented, whereas the system of language is its ground, it is social and potential entity,

*Language and Thinking*

Everyday experience suggests that much of our thinking is facilitated by language, which proves the closest relationship between language and thought.

The thinking which involves language is of a different kind: this is the reasoned thinking which takes place as we work out problems, tell stories, plan strategies, and so on. It is «rational», «directed», «logical», or «propositional» thinking which involves deductive (when we solve problems by using a given set of rules, as in an arithmetical task) and inductive (when we solve problems on the basis of data placed before us, as in working out a travel route) elements. Language seems to be very important for this kind of thinking. The formal properties of language, such as word order and sentence sequencing, constitute the medium in which our connected thoughts can be presented and organized.

The problem of relationship between language and thought is seen in terms of two extremes. First, there is the hypothesis that language and thought are totally separate entities, with one being dependent on the other. At the opposite extreme, there is the hypothesis that language and thought are identical — that it is not possible to engage in any rational thinking without using language.

Within the first position, there are two possibilities: language might be dependent upon thought, or thought might be dependent upon language. The traditional view supports the first of these: People have thoughts, and then they put these thoughts into words. It is summarized in such metaphorical views of language as the «dress» or «tool» of thought. The view is well represented in the field of child language acquisition, where children are seen to develop a range of cognitive abilities, which precede the learning of language.

The second possibility has also been widely held: the way people use language dictates the lines along which they can think. This view is also represented in the language acquisition field, in the argument that the child's earliest encounters with language are the main influence on the way concepts are learned. The most influential expression of this position, however, is found in the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis.

A third possibility, which is also widely held these days, is that language and thought are interdependent — but they are identical. The identity view that thought is no more than an internalized vocalization is no longer common. There are too many exceptions for such a strong position to be maintained: we need think only of the various kinds of mental operations which we can perform without language, such as recalling a sequence of movements in a game or sport, or visualizing the route from home to work. It is also widely recognized that pictorial images and physical models are helpful in problem-solving, and may be more efficient than purely verbal representations of a problem.

On the other hand, these cases are far outnumbered by those where language seem to be the main means whereby successful thinking can proceed. To see language and thought as interdependent, then, is to recognize that language is a regular part of the process of thinking, at the same time recognizing that we have to think in order to understand language. It is not a question of one notion taking precedence over the other, but of both notions being essential, if we are to explain behaviour. Once again, people have searched for metaphors to express their views. Language has been likened to the arch of a tunnel; thought, to the tunnel itself. But the complex structure and function of language defies such simple analogies.

Similarly, it does not mean that if a language lacks a word, its speakers cannot grasp the concept. Several languages have few words for numerals: Australian aboriginal languages are often restricted to a few general words (such as all, many, few, one and two). In such cases, it is sometimes said that the people lack the concept of number and haven't the intelligence to count. But when these speakers learn English as a second language, their ability to count and calculate is quite comparable to that of English native speakers.

However, a weaker version of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is generally accepted. Language may not determine the way we think, but it influences the way we perceive and remember, and it makes mental tasks easy or difficult. Several experiments have shown that people recall things more easily if the things correspond to readily available words or phrases. And people certainly find it easier to make a conceptual distinction if it corresponds to words available in their language.

When people have begun to reflect on language, its relation to thinking becomes a central concern. Ancient Indian and Greek cultures independently viewed the main function of language as the expression of thought. Aristotle's statement «Speech is the representation of the experiences of the mind» passed also into Latin theory and thence into medieval doctrine. Speaking as the expression of thoughts by signs invented for this purpose, and words of different classes (parts of speech) correspond to the different aspects of thinking — was the account of rationalist writers on language in the 17th century. Nowadays certain groups of linguists adhere to H. Sweet's viewpoints of language. It gives so wide an interpretation to thought as virtually to empty the word of any specific content or gives such a narrow interpretation of language as to exclude a great deal of normal usage. A recognition of the part played by speaking and writing in social cooperation in everyday life has highlighted the many and varied functions of language in all cultures, apart from the functions strictly involved in the communication of thought, which had been the main focus of attention for those who approached language from the standpoint of the philosopher.

The medieval and rationalist views implied that man as a rational, thinking creature invented language to express his thoughts, fitting words to an already developed structure of intellectual competence. With the examination of the historic relations be­tween language and thinking, it became more plausible to say that language emerged not as the means of expressing already formulated judgments, questions, and the like but as the means of thought itself, and that man's rationality developed together with the development of his capacity for speaking.

The intermate connection between language and thought, as opposed to the earlier assumed unilateral dependence of language on thought, opened the way to recognition of the possibility that different language structures might in part favour or even deter­mine different ways of understanding and thinking about the world. The extent of the interdependence of language and thought — linguistic relativity, as it has been termed — is the fact that can hardly fail to be acknowledged. It can be easily proved with the bond between the ability to speak and the ability to conceptualize. A child learns both these skills together at the same time. A good deal of the flexibility of languages has been exploited in man's progressive understanding and conceptualizing of the world he lives in and of his relations with other men.

*The Process of Literary Language Formation*

It has already been pointed out that no 2 persons speak exactly alike, and within the area of all but the smallest speech communities there are subdivisions of recognizably different types of language, called dialects, that do not, however, render intercommunication impossible not markedly difficult. One speaks of different dialects of English, but no one would speak of Welsh and English or of Irish and English as dialects of a single language, although they are spoken within the same areas and often by people living in the same villages as each other.

The most widespread type of dialectal differentiation is geographic. As a rule, the speech of one locality differs at least slightly from that of any other place. Every dialectal feature has its boundary line (isogloss). Isoglosses of various linguistic phenomena rarely coincide completely, and by crossing and interweaving they constitute intricate patterns on dialect maps. Frequently, however, several isoglosses are grouped together. This grouping is caused either by geographic obstacles or by historical circumstances (political borders, migrations). Geographic dialects include local ones (e. g., the Yankee English of Cape Cod or of Boston, the Russian of Moscow or of Smolensk) or regional ones, such as Tucson Italian, South American English, etc. Regional dialects do have some internal variation, but the differences within a regional dialect are supposedly smaller than differences between 2 regional dialects of the same rank. The public is aware of divisions between dialects, usually associating them with names of geographic regions or their pronunciation; e. g., Southern English or Russian o-dialect, a-dialect.

Another important axis of differentiation is that of social strata. In many localities, dialectal differences are connected with social classes, educational levels, or both. More highly educated speakers and those belonging to a higher social class tend to use more featu­res belonging to the standard language, whereas the original dialect of the region is better preserved in the speech of the lower and less educated classes.

The above-mentioned social and regional dialect variations within languages are natural. Though some groups within a society that set a special value on group identity and group consciousness deliberately develop and foster private dialects (slang, jargon, criminal argots, pidgins and Creoles) that are known to insiders but are mysterious to those not belonging to this group. Say, «-agger» talk («wagger pagger bagger» meaning waste-paper basket, «rugger», etc.).

Language is a complex system, which constantly undergoes changes in its various elements. That is why, it is almost inconceivable that linguistic evolution could affect the same elements and even transform them in the same way in all localities where one language is spoken and for all speakers in the same locality. Related languages usually begin as dialects of the same language (e. g., Latin with modern Italian, French, Spanish, or Romanian).

When an innovation appears among only one section of speakers of a language, this automatically creates a dialectal difference. It may be spread within certain territories through contacts among people. In times of less frequent contact between populations, dialectal differences increase; in periods of greater contact, they diminish.

It should be noted that the notions of literary language and common language do not coincide. Literary language is opposed to colloquial, spoken language, while common language is opposed to dialect. The spread of a common language normally implies the existence of a literary language, though the latter may exist without the former. Several dialects of one language can exist with a corresponding literary language for each one; at the same time there may be no common language. It goes without saying that a common language can only arise when the actual prerequisites for a geographical division of labour exist and when, therefore, the need appears for a common medium of communication used not by a narrow circle of civilized people but by the broad masses of the population. Standard languages arise when a certain dialect begins to be used in written form, normally throughout a broader area than that of the dialect itself. The ways in which this language is used — in administrative matters, literature, and economic life — lead to the minimization of linguistic variation.

The social prestige attached to the speech of the richest, most powerful, and most highly educated members of a society transforms their language into a model for others. It also contributes to the elimination of deviating linguistic forms. Dictionaries and grammars help to stabilize linguistic norms. The base dialect for a country's standard language is very often the original dialect of its capital (Paris, London, Moscow), or its strong economic and cultural centre (Florence), or a combination of 2 dialects (Poland, Germany). In most countries, the majority of the population has at least passive command of the standard language used mostly in formal situations.

Every language has a history, and, in the rest of human culture, changes are constantly taking place in the course of the learned transmission of a language from one generation to another. Languages change in all their aspects, in their pronunciation, word forms, syntax, and word meanings (semantic change). These chan­ges are mostly very gradual in their operation, becoming noticeable only cumulatively over the course of several generations. Hence, Middle English follows Old English, New English — Middle English, Modern English — New English, etc. Languages may change through time and geographical movement. Language changing is harder for the individual and is generally a rarer occurrence, but it is more likely to be widespread in any mass immigration movement. Though certain tendencies against change may be practised to keep the language pure, they are not always successful.

So, the literary language begins at the same time as the written language becomes standardized. As it develops the literary language may diverge from the spoken language. This divergence can be overcome either by reforms carried out with the aim of uniting the literary and spoken languages, or by the "language revolution", i. e. the creation of a new literary language. Under favourable conditions the literary language may turn into a common language. This entire process marks the formation of a nation, A common language for a whole nation is a national language. Thus, common language normally arises out of the literary lan­guage of a dialect. But sometimes a common language may spring up without a literary language. A striking example of this is the Indonesian language. There were a number of literary languages

Indonesia in the Middle Ages, such as Javanese, but on the spoken Malayan language, which was the means of communication for the inhabitants of different parts of the archipelago. After 1945, the language policy of the Indonesian government was intended gradually to replace all local dialects by Indonesian. From the 1930s onwards, the common Indonesian language became the literary language; so in this case, the formation of a literary language did not precede but followed the birth of the common language.

Common languages are spreading more and more, and the languages of individual nations are becoming more monolithic all the time. But alongside the common languages, dialects continue to exist, while many languages in Africa, Asia and America exist only in dialects, without any common language. Every language is divided into several dialects.

**Лекція №6,7**

**Questions to be discussed:**

1. Language as a Cohesive Political Force
2. Language and Society
3. Bilingualism

*Language as a Cohesive Political Force*

Deliberate interference with the natural course of linguistic changes and the distribution of languages is not confined to the facilitating of international intercourse and cooperation. Language as a cohesive force for a state and for linguistic groups within nation — states has for long been manipulated for political aims. Multilingual states can exist and prosper, Switzerland, Finland, Sweden are good examples. But linguistic rivalry can be disruptive. Language riots have occurred in Belgium and India, Canada and Great Britain, Spain.

Most people are either monolingual or bilingual. But for contacts with other nations international languages are preferable. Latin was considered the international language of science, medicine, law, Catholic Church. Cultural, diplomatic, and military reputation of France made French the language of European diplomacy. Now there are 5 languages claimed as international. They function as UN official languages. English, Arabic, Russian, Spanish and Chinese are chosen for their role in world politics, number of speakers, rich cultural heritage written in them.

In the 19th century Polish-Russian doctor L.L. Zamenhoff invented Esperanto. He took linguistic data from many languages. But this and other artificial languages can't exist as international because they are not living and can't express different feelings, haven't got literary masterpieces written in them.

*Language and Society*

Language appeared in a group of people to satisfy their requirements to communicate. Society would never appear without communication. Language is exiting and altering together with the society. It reflects every social change in it. As a social phenomenon language is a tool with which the exchange of thoughts and experience is carried out. The existence of a society and an individual is impossible without a language.

Language and society is one of the central problems of linguistics. But there was a time when it was not the subject of special scientific investigation. F.F. Fortunatov, A.A. Shakhmatov and other Russian linguists, spoke not once about the necessity to farm so called inner linguists, in which the connections of a language with all extralinguistic phenomena would be examined. But only in the 20-30-ties years of the 20th century V.V. Vinogradov, E.D. Polivanov, P.O. Shor, G.O. Vinokur founded a new branch of linguistics — social linguistics. The term appeared much later, in 1952.

Social linguistics is a branch of linguistics examining the connections between a language and the facts of social life. It studies the influence of the social factor on the functioning of the languages and its reflection in the structure of the language, and the coexistence of the language.

The language situation includes:

social conditions of the language functioning;

spheres of its usage;

forms of its existence.

The social conditions of the functioning of a language are:

social-economic formations;

forms of ethnic unity;

level of the sovereignty;

form of the state automology;

level of the cultural development;

quantity of the people;

ethnic surroundings.

The spheres of language usage are the most important part of the language situation. They are:

spheres of economic activity;

spheres of socio-political activity;

spheres of everyday life;

spheres of education;

spheres of information;

spheres of aesthetic influence;

spheres of fiction;

spheres of folk art;

spheres of office-work;

spheres of private correspondence;

spheres of religious cult.

The cribles of language usage are the communication:

inside the family;

in the production community;

in the social community;

in the populated area;

in the temporary community of people;

among people;

international;

human.

The forms of language existence are divided into those which consolidate all speaking people (bookish forms, dialectal form and languages of international communication); and isolate them («feminine» and «masculine» languages, ritual languages, jargons, etc.).

So, language situation is the interrelations of different means of communication in a certain area.

There are difficult language situations in the countries of Asia, Africa and Europe. For example, China is inhabited by representatives of fifty nationalities speaking different languages.

In many countries, regional variation is not simply a matter of two dialects of a single language, but a matter of two quite distinct and different languages. Canada, for example, is an officially bilingual country, with both French and English as official languages. This recognition of the linguistic status of the country's French speakers, largely in Quebec, did not come about without a lot of political upheaval. For most of its history, Canada was essentially an English-speaking country, with a French-speaking minority group. In such a situation, bilingualism, at the individual level, tends to be a feature of the minority group. In this form of bilingualism, a member of a minority group grows up in one linguistic community, primarily speaking one language, such as Gaelic (as was the case for many years in parts of Scotland), but learns another language, such as English, in order to take part in the larger, dominant, linguistic community. Individual bilingualism, however, can simply be the result of having two parents who speak different languages. If a child simultaneously acquires the French spoken by her mother and the English spoken by her father, then the distinction between the two languages may not even be noticed. There will simply be two ways of talking according to the person being talked to. However, even in this type of bilingualism, one language tends eventually to become the dominant one, with the other in a subordinate role.

*Bilingualism*

Language is a subject to purposive interference. When people with different languages need to communicate, various expedients are open to them, the most obvious being second-language learning and teaching. This takes time, effort, and organization. That's why many agreements have been reached whereby one language is chosen for international purposes when speakers of several different languages are involved. In the Roman Empire the western half used Latin as a lingua franca, and the eastern half used Greek. Later, the cultural, diplomatic, and military reputation of France made French the language of European diplomacy. This use of French as the language of international relations persisted until the present century.

Since World War II the dominance of the English speaking peoples in science and technology and in international commerce as led to the recognition of English as the major international language in the world of practical affairs.

As an alternative to the recognition of particular natural languages as international in status, attempts have been made to invent and propagate new and genuinely international languages, devised for the purpose. Of these, Esperanto, invented by the Polish-Russian doctor L.L. Zamenhof in the 19th century, is the best known, Such languages are generally built up from parts of the vocabulary and grammatical apparatus of the better known existing languages of the world. These artificial languages have not made much progress, though an international society of Esperanto speakers does exist.

Language can also act as a cohesive political force, and has always been used for political ends. Multilingual states can exist and prosper. But linguistic rivalry and strife can be disruptive. A language can become or be made a focus of loyalty for a minority community that thinks itself suppressed or subjected to discrimination. The French language in Canada in the mid-20th century is an example. In the 19th and early 20th centuries Irish Gaelic came to symbolize Irish patriotism and Irish independence from Great Britain.

For the same reasons, a language may be a target for attack or suppression, if the authorities associate it with what they consider a rebellious group or even just a culturally inferior one. There have been periods when American Indian children were forbidden to speak a language other than English at school and when pupils were not allowed to speak Welsh in British state schools in Wales. Both these prohibitions have been abandoned.

So far, some of the relatively large-scale effects of culture contacts on languages and on dialects within languages have been surveyed. A continuous concomitant of contact between two mutually incomprehensive tongues and one that does not lead either to suppression or extension of either is translation. As soon as two speakers of different languages need to converse, translation is necessary, either through a third party or directly.

Before the invention and diffusion of writing, translation was instantaneous and oral; persons professionally specializing in such work were called interpreters. In predominantly or wholly literature communities, translation is thought of as the conversion of a written text in one language into a written text in another, though the modern emergence of the simultaneous translator or professional interpreter at international conferences keeps the oral side of translation very much alive.

The task of the translator is the same whether the material is oral or written, but, of course, translation between written texts allows more time for stylistic adjustment and technical expertise. The main problems have been recognized since antiquity and were expressed by St. Jerome, translator of the famed Latin Bible, the Vulgate, from the Hebrew and Greek originals. Semantically, these problems relate to the adjustment of the literal and the literary and the conflicts that so often occur between an exact translation of each word, as far as this is possible, and the production of a whole sentence or even a whole text that conveys as much of the meaning of the original as can be managed. Even between the languages of communities whose cultures are fairly closely allied, there is by no means a one-to-one relation of exact lexical equivalence between the items of their vocabularies.

In their lexical meaning, words acquire various overtones and associations that are not shared by the nearest corresponding words in other languages, this may vitiate a literal translation.

The translation of poetry, especially into poetry, presents very special difficulties, and the better the original poem, the harder the translator's task. This is because poetry is, in the first instance, carefully contrived to express exactly what the poet wants to say. Second, to achieve this end, the poet calls forth all the resources of the language in which he is writing, matching the choice of words, the order of words, and grammatical constructions, as well as phonological features peculiar to the language in metre, perhaps supplemented by rhyme, assonance, and alliteration. The available resources differ from language to language; English and German rely on stress-marked metres, but Latin and Greek uses quantative metres, contrasting long and short syllables, while French places approximately equal stress and length on each syllable. The transla­tor must try to match the stylistic exploitation of the particular resources in the original language with comparative resources from his own.

At the other end of the translator's spectrum, technical prose dealing with internationally agreed scientific subjects is probably the easiest type of material to translate, because cultural unification (in this respect, lexical correspondences, and stylistic similarity already exist in this type of usage in the languages most commonly involved, to a higher degree than in other fields of discourse.

Significantly, it is this last aspect of translation to which mechanical and computerized techniques are being applied with some prospects of limited success. Machine translation, whereby, ultimately, a text in one language could be fed into a machine to produce an accurate translation in another language without further human intervention, has been largely concentrated on the language of science and technology, with its restricted vocabulary and overall likeness of style, for both linguistic and economic reasons. Attempts at machine translation of literature have been made, but success in this field, more especially in the translation of poetry, seems very remote at present,

Translation on the whole is an art, not a science. Guidance can be given and general principles can be taught, but after that it must be left to the individual's own feeling for the two languages concerned.

Translation serves to extend the communicative value of a text. Sometimes people want to restrict it. Confidential messages, spoken and written, require for their efficacy that they be known to and understood by only the single person or the few persons to whom they are addressed. Protection of written messages from interception has been practiced for many centuries. Recent developments in telegraphy and telephony have made protection against unauthorized reception more urgent, whether of texts transmitted as speech or as series of letters of the alphabet- Codes and ciphers are of much longer standing In the concealment of written messages though their techniques are being constantly developed. An important by-product of such techniques has been the reading and interpretation of inscriptions written in otherwise unknown languages or unknown writing systems for which no translation exists.

**Лекція №8,9**

**Questions to be discussed:**

1. The Standard Language
2. Language Varieties. Accent and Dialect
3. Regional Dialects

*The Standard Language*

When we describe the sounds, words and sentences of English, we concentrate on the features of only one variety, usually labeled Standard English. This is the variety which forms the basis of printed English in newspapers and books, which is used in the mass media and which is taught in schools. It is the variety taught to those who want to learn English as a second language. It is also the variety which some people consider to be the only type of «correct» English and, as such, should be kept «pure». An extreme version of this point of view has been institutionalized in France where a body of scholars, known as the French Academy, regularly meets and decides whether a particular word, for example, is part of Standard French or not. In their attempts to keep the French language «pure», the Academy mostly decides against words which have been borrowed from other languages. Despite these decisions, terms such as le whisky and le week-end have become commonly used expressions in what we would normally think of as Standard French.

*Language Varieties*

We cannot ignore the fact that every language will have more than one variety, especially in the way in which it is spoken. This variation in speech is an important and well-recognized aspect of our daily lives as language-users in different regional and social communities. Let us consider the type of variation which has been investigated via a form of «linguistic geography», concentrating on regional varieties, and the factors involved in social variation in language use. First, we should identify that particular variety which is normally meant when the general terms English, French, German, and so on are used.

*Accent and Dialect*

Different speakers have different accents. An accent is simply a particular way of pronouncing a language, and it is important to realize that every speaker has an accent. It is not just the Glasgow bricklayer, the New York taxi driver, or the Jamaican pop singer who has an accent: every speaker necessarily speaks the language with some accent or other. The purely phonetic differences among accents are great enough that you can easily distinguish the accents of England, Scotland, Australia, North America and the Caribbean, and perhaps you can quickly spot a speaker who comes from Liverpool, Glasgow or New York. There are many pairs of English words which are pronounced identically by some English-speakers but differently by others.

Here are a few examples of such pairs:

farther and father: These are pronounced identically by most people in England (except in the southwest and parts of the north) and in Wales, by almost everyone in Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, and by many people in the south and on the east coast of the USA. Other speakers distinguish them;

whine and wine: These are distinguished by most Scottish and Irish speakers, by many Americans and Canadians, and by some New Zealanders. Almost everyone else pronounces them identically, and this type of pronunciation is gaming ground in the USA.

cot and caught: These are pronounced identically by almost all Canadians, by many Scots and by some Americans; everyone else distinguishes them. (By the way, this is often a useful way of distinguishing Canadians from Americans, but it won't; be for long: the difference seems to be rapidly disappearing in the States.)

horse and hoarse: These are distinguished by most people in Scotland and Ireland and by some Americans; almost everyone else pronounces them identically.

stir and stare: These are identical for most speakers from the Liverpool area and for many speakers in Manchester (England); they are different for everyone else.

poor and pour: These are different for most Scots and for many North Americans; most others pronounce them identically.

threw and through: These are different for most speakers in Wales and for a few people in England and in the USA; almost everyone else pronounces them identically.

dew and do: These are identical for most North Americans and for some speakers in East Anglia; most others distinguish them, though there are signs that the difference is beginning to disappear in other parts of England,

There is absolutely no doubt of the facts: for every one of these pairs, the two words are pronounced identically by some speakers and differently by others. Variation in the pronunciation of English is far greater than we might have expected from our personal experience.

Whether or not you think you speak Standard English, you will certainly speak with an accent. It is a myth that some speakers have accents while others do not. Some speakers may have particularly strong or easily recognized types of accent while others do not, but every language-user speaks with an accent The term accent, when used technically, is restricted to the description of aspects of pronunciation which identify where an individual speaker is from, regionally or socially. It is to be distinguished from the term dialect which describes features of grammar and vocabulary, as well as aspects of pronunciation. For example, the sentence You don't know what you're talking about will generally «look» the same whether spoken with an American or a Scottish accent. Both speakers will be using Standard English forms, but have different pronunciations. However, this next sentence Ye dinnae ken whit yer haverin' aboot — has the same meaning as the first, but has been written out in an approximation of what a person who speaks one dialect of Scottish English might say. There are, of course, differences in pronunciation (e. g., whit, aboot), but there are also examples of different vocabulary (ken, haverin') and a different grammatical form (dinnae).

While differences in vocabulary are often easily recognized, dialect variations in the meaning of grammatical constructions are less frequently documented. Here is an example, quoted in Trudgill (1983) of an exchange between two British English speakers (B and C), and a speaker from Ireland (A), which took place in Donegal, Ireland:

A: How long are youse here?

B: Till after Easter.

(Speaker A looks puzzled)

C: We came on Sunday.

A: Ah. Youse're here a while then.

It is clear that the construction How long are youse here in speaker A's dialect, is used with a meaning close to the structure How long have you been here, used in other dialects, rather than with the future reference interpretation made by speaker B.

Despite occasional difficulties of this sort, there is a general impression of mutual intelligibility among speakers of different dialects, or varieties, of English. The important point to remember is that, from a linguistic point of view, no one variety is «better» than another. They are simply different. From a social point of view, some varieties do, of course, become more prestigious. In fact, the variety which develops as the Standard Language has usually been one socially prestigious dialect, originally connected with a political or cultural center (e. g., London for British English, and Paris for French). Yet, there always continue to be other varieties of a language, spoken in different regions.

*Regional Dialects*

Like most other languages, English is spoken differently in different places: that is, it exhibits regional dialects. The existence of different regional dialects is widely recognized and often the source of some humor for those living in different regions. Thus, in the United States, someone from Brooklyn may joke about the Southerner's definition of sex by telling you that sex is fo' less than tin, in his best imitation of someone from the Southern states. The Southerner can, in return, wonder what a tree guy is in Brooklyn, since he has heard Brooklyn speakers refer to doze tree guys. Some regional dialects clearly have stereotyped pronunciations associated with them. Those involved in the serious investigation of regional dialects are fairly uninterested in such stereotypes, however, and have devoted a lot of research to the identification of consistent features of speech found in one geographical area rather than another. These dialect surveys often involved painstaking attention to detail and tended to operate with very specific criteria in identifying acceptable informants. After all, it is important to know if the person whose speech you are tape-recording really is a typical representative of the region's dialect. Consequently, the informants in many dialect surveys tended to be norms, or non-mobile, older, rural, male speakers. Such speakers were selected because it was believed that they were less likely to have influences from outside the region in their speech. One unfortunate consequence of using such criteria is that the dialect description which results is probably truer of a period well before the time of investigation. Nevertheless, the detailed information obtained has provided the basis for a number of Linguistic Atlases of whole countries or of regions. In a survey of the Upper Midwest of the United States it is found, for example, that the vast majority of informants in one area say they take their groceries home in a paper bag while the majority in another area say they use a paper sack. So, if an American English speaker takes groceries home in a paper sack, then he is not likely to have grown up and lived most of his life in Minnesota. It is worth noting that the characteristic forms of a dialect are not used by everyone living in the region. They are used by a significantly large per­centage of the people interviewed in the dialect survey.

**Лекція №10**

**Questions to be discussed:**

1. Language, Society, Culture
2. Ethnic background
3. Education, Occupation, Social Class
4. Social Dialects. Specialized Languages
5. Pidgins and Creoles.

*Language, Society, Culture*

The way you speak may provide clues, in terms of regional accent or dialect, to where you spent most of your early life. However, your speech may also contain a number of features, which are unrelated to regional variation. Two people growing up in the same geographical area, at the same time, may speak differently because of a number of social factors. It is important not to overlook this social aspect of language because, in many ways, speech is a form of social identity and is used, consciously or unconsciously, to indicate membership of different social groups or different speech communities.

It is common knowledge that one's mother tongue is intimately and in all sorts of details related to the rest of one's life in a community. This is true of all peoples and all languages.

There exists a close connection between language and culture (Culture is here being used in the anthropological sense.) According to the definition of culture given by the English anthropologist Sir Edward Burnett Tylor, culture covers a very wide area of human life and behaviour; and language is manifestly a part of it.

Although the faculty of language acquisition and language use is innate and inherited, and there is legitimate debate over the extent of this innateness, every individual's language is «acquired by man as a member of society», along with and at the same time as other aspects of that society's culture in which he is brought up. Society and language are mutually indispensable. Language can have developed only in a social setting, however this may have been structured, and human society in any form even remotely resembling what is known today or is recorded in history could be maintained only among people speaking and understanding a language in common use.

Language is transmitted culturally, that is learned. It must be emphasized that children very largely acquire their mother tongue by "grammar construction" from exposure to a random collection of utterances that they encounter.

If language is transmitted as part of culture, it is no less true that culture as a whole is transmitted through language. The fact that mankind has a history in the sense that animals do not is entirely the result of language.

Animal behaviour does not differ over widely scattered areas, e. g. bird songs are reported to differ somewhat from place to place within species, but there is little other evidence for areal divergence. By contrast with this unity of animal behaviour, human cultures are as divergent as are human languages over the world, and they can and do change all the time.

The greatest part of learned behaviour, which is what culture involves, is transmitted by vocal instruction, not by imitation. Through the use of language, any skills, techniques, products, modes of social control can be explained, and the end results of anyone's inventiveness can be made available to anyone else with the intellectual ability to grasp what is being said. Modern techniques for almost instantaneous transmission of the written and spoken word account for the great rapidity of scientific, technological, political, and social change in the contemporary world. All of this, whether ultimately for the good or ill of mankind, must be attributed to the dominant role of language in the transmission of culture.

The part played by variations within a language in differentiating social and occupational groups in a society are considered to be of great importance. Children are in general brought up within the social group to which their parents and immediate family circle belong, and they learn the dialect and speaking styles of that group along with the rest of the subculture and behavioral traits and attitudes that are characteristic of it. This is a largely unconscious and involuntary process of acculturation, but; the importance of the linguistic manifestations of social status and of social hierarchies is not lost on aspirants for personal advancement in stratified societies. The deliberate cultivation of an appropriate dialect, in its lexical, grammatical, and phonetic features, has been the self-imposed task of many persons wishing «to better themselves», to move up in the social scale.

Languages and variations within languages play both a unifying and a diversifying role in human society as a whole. Language is a part of culture, but culture is a complex totality containing many different features, and the boundaries between cultural features are not clear-cut. Potent are political restrictions on the movement of people and of ideas, such as divide Western Europe from Eastern Europe, may represent much more of a cultural dividing line than any other European frontiers.

The distribution of the various components of cultures differs, and the distribution of languages may differ from that of nonlinguistic cultural features.

*Ethnic background*

Within a society, other differences in speech may come about because of different ethnic backgrounds. In very obvious ways, the speech of recent immigrants, and often of their children, will contain identifying features. In some areas, where there is strong language loyalty to the original language of the group, a large number of features are carried over into the new language. More generally, the speech of American blacks, also called Black English, is a widespread social dialect, often cutting across regional diffe­rences. When a group within a society undergoes some form of social isolation, such as the discrimination or segregation experienced historically by American blacks, then social dialect differences become more marked. The accompanying problem, from a social point of view, is that the resulting variety of speech may be stigmatized as «bad speech». One example is the frequent absence of the copula (forms of the verb «to be») in Black English, as in expressions like They mine or You crazy. Standard English requires that the verb form are should be used in such expressions. However, many other English dialects do not use the copula in such structures and a very large number of languages (e. g., Arabic, Russian) have similar structures without the copula. Black English, in this respect, cannot be «bad» any more than Russian is «bad» or Arabic is «bad». As a dialect, it simply has features which are consistently different from the Standard.

Another aspect of Black English which has been criticized, sometimes by educators, is the use of double negative constructions, as in He don't know nothing. The criticism is usually that such structures are «illogical». In fact, far from being illogical, this type of structure provides a very effective means of emphasizing the negative part of a message in this dialect. It is basically a dialect feature, present in one social dialect of English, sometimes found in other dialects, but not in the Standard Language.

*Education, Occupation, Social Class*

It is important to know, for example, whether a group of speakers share similar educational backgrounds. In some dialect surveys, it has been found that, among those leaving the educational system at an early age, there is a greater tendency to use forms which are relatively infrequent in the speech of those who go on to college. Expressions such as those contained in Them boys throwed something are much more common in the speech of the former group than the latter. It seems to be the case that a person who spends a long time going through college or university will tend to have spoken language features which derive from a lot of time spent working with the written language. The complaint that some professor «talks like a book» is possibly a recognition of an extreme form of this influence. Related to education are differences in occupation and social class which have some effect on the speech of individuals. Every job has a certain amount of jargon' which those not involved in a similar occupation find difficult to understand. An extreme example of speech determined by occupation could be the waiter's call of Bucket of mud, draw one, hold the cow at a lunch counter — a variation on the customer's order for «a chocolate ice cream and a coffee without cream». A famous study by American sociolinguist W. Labov (1972) com­bined elements from place of occupation and socio-economic status by looking at pronunciation differences among salespeople in three New York City department stores, Saks (high status), Macy's (middle status) and Klein's (low status). Measurable differences were indeed found to exist. In British English, where social class differences in speech may be more widely recognized than in the United States, the use of [n] as opposed to [?] for the sound of -ing at the end of words like walking has been found to be much more common among working class speakers, in several regional varieties, than among middle class speakers.

*Social Dialects*

In modern studies of language variation, a great deal of care is taken to document, usually via questionnaires, and certain details of the social backgrounds of speakers. It is as a result of taking such details into account that we have been able to make a study of social dialects, which are varieties of language used by groups defined according to class, education, occupation, age, sex, and a number of other social parameters.

*Specialized Languages*

*Jargon.* Sometimes, as in the case with criminal argots, the function of special languages is deliberately to mislead and obstruct the rest of society and the authorities in particular; they may even become wholly impenetrable to outsiders. But this is not the main purpose of most specialized varieties of language. Professions whose members value their standing in society and are eager to render their services to the public foster their own vocabulary and usage, partly to enhance the dignity of their profession and the skills they represent but partly also to increase their efficiency. An example of this is the language of the law and of lawyers.

The cultivation and maintenance of specialized types of language by certain professions should not be regarded as trivially or superficially motivated. In general usage, languages are necessarily imprecise, or they would lack the flexibility and infinite extensibility demanded of them. But for certain purposes in restricted situations much greater precision is required, and part of the function of the particular style and vocabulary of legal language is the avoidance, so far as may be possible, of all ambiguity and the explicit statement of all necessary distinctions. That is why legal texts, when read out of their context, seem so absurdly pedantic and are an easy target for ridicule. Similar provision for detail and clarity characterizes the specialist jargons of medicine and of the sciences in general and also of philosophy. Indeed, one might regard the formulas of modern symbolic logic as the result of a consciously developed and specialized written language for making precise the relations of implication and inference between statements that, when couched in everyday language, are open to misinterpretation. Some would go as far as to say that traditional metaphysics is no more than the result of misunderstanding everyday discourse and that the main purpose of Philosophy is to resolve the puzzles that arise from such misunderstandings.

The use of specialized types of language in fostering unity is also evidences in the stereotyped forms of vocabulary employed in the playing of certain games. Tennis scores use the sequence dove, 15, 30, 40, and game», cricketers verbally appeal to the umpire when a batsman may be out by calling «How's that?» and the ways of being out are designated by stereotypes, «run out», «leg before wicket», «stumped», and so forth. The esoteric language of horse racing and its associated wagering of money are well known, though not readily understood by outsiders.

The ancient but persistent recognition of the power of language is apparent in the respect for correctness in the use of language in any sphere of life having supernatural connections. Those credited with such connections employ special formulas and rigidly prescribed modes of diction; examples of the language of magic and of magicians are widespread, romging from the usage of shamaus and witch doctors to the ritual «abracadabra» of the mock magic displayed by conjurors at children's parties.

The efficiency of religious worship and of prayers is frequently associated with the strict maintenance of correct forms of language, taught by priests to their successors, lest the ritual should become invalid. In ancient India the preservation in all its supposed purity of the language used in the performance of certain religious rituals (Sanskrit) gave rise to one of the world's most important schools of linguistics and phonetics. In the Christian churches one can observe the value placed by Church of England and. Episcopalian churchmen on the formal English of the Authorized Version of the Bible and The Book of Common Prayer, despite recent attempts at replacing these ritual forms of language by forms taken from modern spoken vernaculars.

*Pidgins and Creoles*. Some specialized languages were developed to keep the outsider at bay. In other circumstances, languages have been deliberately created to facilitate communication with outsiders. This happens when people speaking two different languages have to work together, usually in some form of trade relations or administrative routine. In such situations the so-called pidgins arise, more or less purposively made up of vocabulary items from each language, with mutual abandonment of grammatical complexities that would cause confusion to either party. Pidgins have been particularly associated with areas settled by European traders; examples have been Chinook Jargon based on an American Indian language and English and formerly used in Washington and Oregon, and Beach-la-mar, an English-based pidgin of parts of the South Seas.

Sometimes, as the result of relatively permanent settlement and the intermixture of two speech communities, a pidgin becomes the first language, or mother tongue, of later generations, ultimately displacing both the original languages. First languages arising in this way from artificially created pidgins are called Creoles. Notable among Creoles is the language of Haiti, Haitian Crede, built up from the French of the settlers and the African language of the former slaves; it shows lexical and grammatical features of both sources.

Creoles differ from pidgins in that, as first languages, they are subject to the natural process of changes like any other language; and despite the deliberately simplified form of the original pidgin, in the course of generations Creoles develop their own complexities. The reason is plain to see. The restricted uses to which they were devised did not require any great flexibility. Once such a language becomes the first or only language of many people, it must acquire the resources to respond adequately to all the requirements of a natural language.

*Language and Gender*

Perhaps one of the most obvious social divisions in society is that between men and women, and this division, not surprisingly, is often strongly represented in speech. In some languages, the difference is so great that men and women actually use different words, different pronunciations or different grammatical forms. Nowadays gender is defined as a complex of social, cultural and Psychological phenomena, which correlate with the biological sex of an individual. Gender analysis has been widely developed, on the material of the English language. Gender peculiarities; in English have been traced on different levels of the language use. According to various empirical investigations women, for example, seem to adopt local norms of usage much more rapidly than men; in that sense they are less conservative language users. On the other hand, men seem to be more frequent users of nonstandard (even if they are capable of using standard) language forms. Perhaps working class associations and the symbolic masculine value such usage has are the two main reasons for greater male use of nonstandard.

Women, at least historically in American English, seem to prefer the use of verbal qualifiers such as perhaps, it seems to me, maybe, from my point of view, in my opinion, and so on. This usage may derive from such old sex-related stereotypes as those which hold that women must be indecisive, fragile, and tentative (to be feminine) and men should be bold, strong, self-assured, and plain-spoken (to be masculine). It will be interesting to observe changes in these and other sex-related behaviors during this period of radical changes in the status of women in British and American society.

According to some studies, women show a wider range of intonation contours than men, particularly «extra high» in excitement and delight. Other studies show that women are almost exclusively in charge of certain adjectives (delightful, precious, darling) when performing such verbal tasks as «appreciating» or «praising».

Here are a few examples taken from the video courses that show the differences in male and female behaviour:

Female Coach: ...we need you for the game next weekend.

Teenager: Do you think we can win?

Female Coach: I'm sure we can; we'll have to try our hardest,

Male Coach: ...we need you for the game next weekend.

Teenager: Can we whip them, coach?

Coach: There ain't no way we can lose if we hustle.

Girl: Tom, I really had a lovely time at the dance.

Boy: Yeah, I had a great time too.

Men and women do indeed speak rather differently in English, quite apart from the obvious fact that they tend to talk about different things: women spend more time talking about clothes and children, while men talk more about cars and sports. Here are a few of the differences, which have sometimes been reported; be warned, however, that some of these reported differences are controversial:

1. Women are said to make frequent use of a number of admiring terms rarely used by men: divine, cute, adorable, thrilling, and others.

2. Women are said to make finer discriminations than men in certain areas, such as colour terms — that is, women are much more likely to use precise terms such as burgundy, ecru, chartreuse, crimson and beige.

3. Men are said to swear much more than women. Well, this may have been true a generation ago, but, if the language of female students is anything to go by, it's not true any more, though a few of the coarser expressions are perhaps still mainly used by men. (What do you suppose you'd say if you dropped a jar of mayonnaise, leaving a disgusting puddle of oily goo and glass shards on the floor?)

Women are said to use more tag questions than men — that is, they're more likely to say things like It's nice, isn't it?, as if to seek confirmation. (This claim is particularly controversial.)

Men interrupt far more than women. This usually comes as a surprise to men, who are convinced it's the other way round, but extensive research has demonstrated the truth of my statement beyond any possible doubt.

Women use more baby-talk than men.

Very generally, women's discourse is cooperative, while men's is competitive. That is, women in conversation usually seek to sympathize with one another and to support and admire the ideas and contributions of others. Men, in contrast, tend to try to outdo one another, to score points and to top what the others have said.

Finally, women are more likely than men of the same social group to use (overt) prestige forms, and are likely to report themselves as using more prestige forms than they actually do. Men do just the opposite: they use fewer prestige forms, and they report themselves as using even fewer than they do use.

Feminists have often pointed to these differences as evidence of the subordinate position of women in our society: women are expected to be «ladylike», to defer to the pronouncements of men, to seek approval from men before asserting anything of substance, and to confine their discussions to topics considered trivial by men. Undoubtedly, the feminists are right in their interpretation. Some feminists, however, have gone further, and vigorously attacked what they see as the built-in sexism of English (and other languages).

On the whole, gender marked communicative behaviour is reflected in numerous stereotypes which usually do not coincide with real gender peculiarities. Besides such stereotypes function as a norm regulating our gender marked speech behaviour and our perception of the representatives of the opposite sex.

*Age and Language*

Age is another important factor in language variation and in language change. Student groups, for example, develop age-related patterns and vocabulary that appear to be closed to outsiders (in this case, to older or younger people). We are all aware of such restricted items in the vocabulary, but there are clearly age-related features of pronunciation and grammar as well. In less than one generation, for example, the use of fun as a pre-nominal adjective (in such expressions as that was a fun party, we had a fun time, she's a fun girl) has become ordinary spoken English for those below a certain age. To older speakers it sounds ungram-matical. The examples below reflect definite age differences:

Older Man: Those are cool wheels you have there, man. Far out! Boy: Is he for real?

Older Man: You don't dig my lingo? I mean, you don't dig where I'm coming from?

Girl: That's a heavy trip!

(cool — sl. крутий; wheels — sl. автомобиль; to be for real — sl. говорити щиро, не жартувати; to dig — sl. розуміти; lingo — sl. мова; to be coming from — sl.мати на увазі).

On the whole little is known about the patterns of linguistic change that affect older people. It is plain that our voice quality, vocabulary, and style alter as we grow older, but research into the nature of these changes is in its earliest stage.

*Плани семінарських занять:*

**Семінар № 1,2.**

Предмет лінгвокраїнознавство. Загальні відомості про мову (структура та історія англійської мови). Основні поняття лінгвокраїнознавства.

1. *Основні поняття лінгвокраїнознавства. Мовна картина світу*.
2. Підготуйте доповідь за темою: «Language as a System of Signs» (The notion of a sign; signs and language units; originality of the language as a System of signs).
3. Підготуйте доповідь за темою: «The Origin of Language» (From the history of language and speech research; language and speech; language and thinking).
4. Підготуйте доповідь за темою: «The Process of Literary Language Formation» (Language as a cohesive political force; the standard language; language varieties; accent and dialect; regional dialects).
5. Підготуйте доповідь за темою: «Language, Society and Culture» (Language and culture; language and society; bilingualism; ethnic background; education, occupation, social class; social dialects; specialized languages; language and gender; age and language).
6. Підготуйте доповідь за темою: «Language Structure».
7. *Перекладіть українською мовою та поясність значення наступних слів*:

* A1, aularian, Auntie, au pair;
* b & b, bed-sitter, the Bill of Rights (Br.), bitter, Bloody Sunday, blue, the BM, boot sale, BR, Britain, Britannia, the British Empire, the British Isles, the British Council, the British Lions, busker;
* the Cabinet, Camford, Canary Wharf Tower, careers office, chancellor (Br.), the Channel Tunnel, Coat of Arms of the UK, coffee bar, commuter, corner shop, county, cream tea, cricket, croquet;
* daffodil, Dame, direct-grant school, DIY (do-it-yourself), double-decker, don, dub, ducks and drakes;
* Easter egg, egg-and-spoon race, Eton (College), Eton suit;
* fish and chips, fish and chip shop, Fleet Street, fool, Foreign Secretary, freefone (freephone);
* Gaelic coffee, GCSE, the Globe Theatre, the Gunpowder Plot, Guy Fawkes’ Night;
* Haggis, Halloween, harp, Heathrow, highrise, high tea, the High street, hopscotch, the House of Commons, the House of Lords, the Houses of Parliament, Humpty Dumpty;
* Inn, Inner London, IQ, Irish coffee, Iron Lady.

**Семінар № 3,4,5.**

Розповсюдження англійської мови у світі. Культурокумулятивна функція мови. Особливості виражальних засобів національних мов.

1. *Функції англійської мови у сучасному світі. Групи національних варіантів англ. мови. Мова лінгва-франка, піджини та їх роль у процесі комунікації.*
2. Підготуйте доповідь про функції англійської мови у сучасному світі.
3. Підготуйте доповідь об існуючих у лінгвістиці суперечливих поглядах на роль англійської мови у сучасному світі та аргументуйте вашу позицію по цьому питанню.
4. Підготуйте доповідь о трьох групах національних варіантів англійської мови.
5. Підготуйте доповідь о мові лінгва-франка, піджинах, та їх ролі у процесі комунікації.
6. Підготуйте доповідь о том різновиді англійської мови, який ви вважаєте найбільш актуальним.
7. *Перекладіть українською мовою та поясність значення наступних слів*:

* Kilt, Kensington Palace, Kensington Gardens;
* Lager, Ladies’ Day, the Land of Cakes, Life Guards, life peer, Lombard Street, London Underground, London taxi, lunch;
* Meals on wheels, milk float, Muppet Show;
* National Health Service, nimby, 999, No 10, No 11;
* Official Birthday, old boy, old boy net, oranges and lemons, Oxfam;
* Parcel Force, Peter Pan, PG, pillar box, plaid, ploughman’s lunch, postman, post office, the Privy Council, PT, pub (public house), punt;
* The Record Office, registered post, Rolls-Royce, the Round Table;
* Safeway, Saint David’s Day, Saint Patrick’s Day, sandwich, school-leaver, Scotland Yard, semidetached house, single (Br.), Square Mile, stout, subway;
* Takeaway (food), tam-o’shanter, terraced house, Time Out, tower block, tutor;
* U (certificate), UB40, UCCA Handbook, Union Flag, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
* Value added tax (VAT), Westminster, Westminster Abbey, window tax, woolsack;
* X-rated, YHA, Yorkshire pudding.

**Семінар № 6,7,8.**

Соціолінгвістична ситуація у Великій Британії та США. Відображення національної своєрідності життя народу в лексиці мови.

1. *Британський та Американський варіант англійської мови (BrE/AmE). Мови Великої Британії та США. Регіональні та соціальні діалекти. Діалект кокні та “арпі”.* 
   1. Підготуйте доповідь о мовах Великобританії.
   2. Підготуйте доповідь о регіональних діалектах Великобританії.
   3. Підготуйте доповідь о соціальних класах і соціальних діалектах Великобританії.
   4. Підготуйте доповідь об «арпі» або о діалекті кокні.
   5. Наведіть приклади з книг, кінофільмів, тощо ілюструючи особливості одного з регіональних або соціальних діалектів Великобританії.
2. *Перекладіть українською мовою та поясність значення наступних слів*:

* Admission Day, Alabama, Alaska, the Aloha State, the American Broadcasting Company, the American Civil War, the American College Testing program, American dollar, American eagle, American Express, American football, apartment building, area code, Arizona, Arkansas, Attorney General;
* the Badger State, barbecue, baseball, the Beehive State, the Big Apple, Black Monday, Black Tuesday, the Bluegrass State, Blue Pages, Boxing day, Boy Scouts of America, Broadway, Brooklyn, the Brooklyn Bridge, brownie, brownstone, the Buckeye State;
* California, campus, the Capitol, the Centennial State, chamber coach, chicken McNuggets, Christmastime, Coat of Arms of the USA, Colorado coach, Columbia, Columbia Pictures, Columbus Day, community college, condominium, Congress, Connecticut, convenience (food) store, the Cornhusker State, the Cotton State, cowboy, the Coyote State;
* Delaware, delicatessen, the Democratic Party, department, department store, dial-direct call, Dick and Jane, Disneyland, downtown, drugstore, duplex;
* Eggnog, egg-rolling, 800 number, the Empire State Building, the Empire State of the South, the Equality State, the Evergreen state;
* The Flickertail State, Florida, 4-H Club, four freedoms, freeway;
* Garage sale, the Garden State, the Gem State, general delivery letters, general equivalency diploma, General Motors Corp., Georgia, the Golden Gate, the Gopher State, graduate school, the Grand Canyon, the Grand Canyon State, the Granite State, guidance counselor;
* Hawaii, the Hawkeye State, high school diploma, Hollywood, the Hoosier State;
* IBM, impeachment, installment plan, interstate highway, I owe you (IOU), jack-o’-lantern, Joe Yale, junior high (school), junk food, the Keystone State, King size (bed), Labor Day, layaway, Levis, license plate, life-saving service;
* The Ma State, Macy’s, the Magna Carta, magnet school, mall (shopping mall), Maryland, Massachusetts, Medicaid, Medicare, melting pot, Mickey Mouse, mobile home, mocking bird;
* NASA, nightstick, 911, noughts-and-crosses, the Old Line State, one-way (ticket);
* Oskar, the Palmetto State, pancakes with maple syrup, Paramount Studios, peace pipe, Pennsylvania, person-to-person call, phone booth, pink slip, principle, Prohibition, pumpkin pie, PWA;
* Rain check, ranch house, refund, report cards, Rockefeller Center, Rolling Stone, roomette, round-trip ticket;
* Salad bowl, the Show Me State, the Silver State, sleeping compartment, sling, Smokey (the Bear), The Sooner State, squatter, Standard Oil Co., starter home, state trooper, station-to-station call, Statue of Liberty, students loans, the Sunflower State, the Sunshine State, supermarket;
* tag day, toll way, totem, trailer (house), the Treasure State, trick or treat, TV Guide;
* the United States of America, valedictory, vanity plate, Vietvet, the Volunteer State, Wall Street, waterbed, Western Union (Telegraph Co.), the White House, World Trade Center;
* Yale University, Yankee, Yellow Pages, Zip code.

**Семінар № 9,10**

Соціолінгвістична ситуація у Канаді, Австралії, Нової Зеландії. Відображення національної своєрідності життя народу в лексиці мови.

1. *Канадський (CanE), Австралійський (AuE), Ново Зеландський (NZE) варіант англійської мови. Лексичні та орфографічні особливості. Регіональні та соціальні діалекти.*
2. Підготуйте доповідь о мовах Великобританії.
3. Підготуйте доповідь о лексичних особливостях CanE.
4. Підготуйте доповідь об орфографічних особливостях CanE.
5. Підготуйте доповідь о регіональних діалектах CanE.
6. Підготуйте доповідь о діалекті провінції Квєбєк.
7. Підготуйте доповідь о мовах Австралії.
8. Підготуйте доповідь о соціальних діалектах австралійського варіанту англійської мови.
9. Підготуйте доповідь о статусі британського варіанту англійської мови в Австралії.
10. Підготуйте доповідь о змінах у статусі австралійського варіанту англійської мови.
11. Підготуйте доповідь о відношенні австралійців до «арпі».
12. *Перекладіть українською мовою та поясність значення наступних слів*:

* Acadia University, the Act of Union, Alberta, Alderson, Alouette;
* Banff National Park, Bay Street, Bloc Quebecois, the BNA Act, the British north America Act, Bytown;
* Calgary, Calgary redeye, Canada, Canada Council, Canada day, Canadiana, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Canadian Dollar, Canadian goose, the Canadian National Flag, the Canadian Pacific Railway, Caribana, Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Coat of Arms and Canada, Confederation, Confederation Day, Cree, Dominion Day;
* Edmonton, French Canadian, Goose bay, Green Chamber, the Grey Cup, the Group of Seven, the Halifax Explosion, the Halifax Gazette, High Commissioner, Holy Trinity Anglican Cathedral, igloo, In(n)uit, inukshuk;
* James Street, Kitchener, komatik, the Liberal Party, mana, Manitoba, Manitoulin, Maple Leaf, maple syrup, Maritimes, Massey Ferguson, Medicine Hat, the Meech Lake Accord, the Metro, Montreal, Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, the Montreal Olympic Stadium, Montreal’s International Marathon, Mount Logan, Mountie, musk ox;
* National Hockey League, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, New France, Ninstints, Oka (Oyka), Ontario, Ottawa Capital Region;
* Peace Tower, pemmican, Prairie Provinces, the Progressive Conservative Party, provincial premiere, quarter, Quebec, Queen’s Park, Red Chamber, red-haired Anna, the Rideau Canal, Rideau Hall;
* Saint-Catherine Street, Sask. (Saskatchewan), Sherbrooke, shopping mall, the Stanley Cup, Thanksgiving Day, Toronto, Ville Marie de Montreal, Winsor, Wood Buffalo, the Yukon.

**Семінар № 11,12.**

Фонові знання та їх мовні репрезентанти. Прогрес суспільства та його відбиття у мові. Лінгвокультурні чинники у міжкультурному спілкуванні.

1. *Прогрес суспільства та його відбиття у мові. Інтернаціоналізація лексики у Європейських мовах.*
2. *Перекладіть українською мовою та поясність значення наступних слів*:

* Aborigine, accaroid, Advance Australia Fair, ALP, Anzac, Anzac Day, the Ashes, Aussie, Aussieland, Australasia, Australia, the Australian Council, Australian Day, Australiana (ballot), the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, the Australian Capital Territory, the Australian Colonies Government, the Australian Democrats, Australian dollar, the Australian Labor Party, Australian Rules (football), Ayers Rock;
* Ballarat, Bananaland, bar(ra)gan, Bjelke Blue, Black Line, bluey, Bondi Beach, Botany Bay, Bradman, Bungle Bungle National Park, bunyip, bush, bushwhacker;
* cabbage tree hat, Camel Riding, Captain Cook Memorial Water Jet, Carlton, the Coat Hanger, Coat of Arms of Australia, Cockington Green, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, the Commonwealth of Australia, Commonwealth star, coolardi, coolgardie, corrob(b)orree, Cradle Mountain Lake St. Clair National Park, the cultural cringe, Currumbin Sanctuary;
* Dad’s Dave, Daintree National Park, Darling Harbour, didjeridoo, Dream Team, the Dry;
* Emu bobber, Esky, the First Fleet, First Fleeter, Flying Doctor Service, galah session, Gold Coast, Grabben Gullen pie, Granny Smith, the Great Barrier Reef, gum;
* Hobart, the House of Representatives, humpy, Islanders, Jacky Howe, Jack the Painter, the Kakadu National Park, kangaroo, kangaroo bar, Kangaroo Island, kangaroo-paw, Kata Tjuta (The Olgas), Kelly, Kindergarden of the Air, koala, kookaburra;
* Lichfield National Park, Ligion Street, the Lodge, the luck of Eric Connoly, lyrebird, the Ma State, Ma Staters, Melbourne, Melbourne Cup Day, mia-mia, milk bar, music sticks;
* National Flag of Australia, the National Folk Festival, the National Party of Australia, New South Wales, Norfolk Island, 111;
* opal, the Order of Australia, other side of Bullamakanka, the outback, OZ, penny, Phar Lap, Phillip Island, pink-eye, Port Athur, proprietary, QLD, Quantas, Queensland, the Queen City of the South;
* Redbrick (University), RFDS, the Royal National Park, Sandgropers, shearers’ gang, the Senate, Skyfire, the Snowy River, South Australia, squatter, sugarbag, Surf Carnival, Sydney, Sydney Grammar School, the Sydney Opera House, Sydneysiders, Tasmania, Tassie, Twelve Apostles;
* Vegemite, Victoria, Wallabies, wallaby, waltzing matilda, Waltzing Matilda, Wattle Day, Werribee Park, Western Australia, wilga, yarn, Yarralumla.

**Семінар № 13,14,15.**

Культурно-історична мінливість мови і мовлення. Історія країн у етноспецифічній історичній лексиці. Вертикальний контекст як історико- філологічний аспект тексту.

1. *Культурно-історична мінливість мови і мовлення. Історія країн у етноспецифічній історичній лексиці. Вертикальний контекст як історико- філологічний аспект тексту.*

**Самостійна робота**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **№**  **з/п** | **Зміст** | **Кількість**  **годин** |
| 1. | Підготуйте доповідь за темою: «The Process of Literary Language Formation» (Language as a cohesive political force; the standard language; language varieties; accent and dialect; regional dialects).  Підготуйте доповідь за темою: «Language, Society and Culture» (Language and culture; language and society; bilingualism; ethnic background; education, occupation, social class; social dialects; specialized languages; language and gender; age and language).  Підготуйте доповідь за темою: «Language Structure». | 25 |
| 2. | Підготуйте доповідь об існуючих у лінгвістиці суперечливих поглядах на роль англійської мови у сучасному світі та аргументуйте вашу позицію по цьому питанню.  Підготуйте доповідь о трьох групах національних варіантів англійської мови.  Підготуйте доповідь о мові лінгва-франка, піджинах, та їх ролі у процесі комунікації.  Підготуйте доповідь о том різновиді англійської мови, який ви вважаєте найбільш актуальним. | 25 |
| 3. | Підготуйте доповідь о мовах Великобританії.  Підготуйте доповідь о регіональних діалектах Великобританії.  Підготуйте доповідь о соціальних класах і соціальних діалектах Великобританії.  Підготуйте доповідь об «арпі» або о діалекті кокні.  Наведіть приклади з книг, кінофільмів, тощо ілюструючи особливості одного з регіональних або соціальних діалектів Великобританії. | 20 |
| 4. | Підготуйте доповідь о мовах Великобританії.  Підготуйте доповідь о лексичних особливостях CanE.  Підготуйте доповідь об орфографічних особливостях CanE.  Підготуйте доповідь о регіональних діалектах CanE.  Підготуйте доповідь о діалекті провінції Квєбєк.  Підготуйте доповідь о мовах Австралії.  Підготуйте доповідь о соціальних діалектах австралійського варіанту англійської мови.  Підготуйте доповідь о статусі британського варіанту англійської мови в Австралії.  Підготуйте доповідь о змінах у статусі австралійського варіанту англійської мови.  Підготуйте доповідь о відношенні австралійців до «арпі». | 20 |
| 5. | Переклад слів українською мовою, пояснення їх значення | 10 |
| ***Разом*:** | | **100** |

**Питання до іспиту**

1. Предмет лінгвокраїнознавство
2. Загальні відомості про мову (структура та історія англійської мови)
3. Мова та її варіативність
4. Акцент та діалект
5. Мова, культура, суспільство
6. Функції англійської мови у сучасному світі
7. Групи національних варіантів англ. мови*.*
8. Мова лінгва-франка, піджини та їх роль у процесі комунікації.
9. Регіональні та соціальні діалекти Великої Британії
10. Регіональні та соціальні діалекти США
11. Регіональні та соціальні діалекти Канади
12. Діалект Кокні та «арпі»
13. Регіональні та соціальні діалекти Австралії та Нової Зеландії
14. Американський (AmE) варіант англійської мови. Лексичні та орфографічні особливості
15. Британський (BrE)варіант англійської мови. Лексичні та орфографічні особливості
16. Канадський (CanE) варіант англійської мови. Лексичні та орфографічні особливості
17. Австралійський (AuE) варіант англійської мови. Лексичні та орфографічні особливості
18. Діалект провінції Квебек
19. Мови Великої Британії
20. Мови Австралії та Нової Зеландії. Зміни у статусі австралійського варіанту англійської мови
21. Прогрес суспільства та його відбиття у мові

**Контрольна робота**

1. *Give the definitions for the following terms:*

* a lingua franca;
* a pidgin language.

1. *Explain the meaning of the following words in English:*

Woolsack – scholarship -

Westminster Abbey – the Record Office -

Union Flag (the Union Jack) – Red Arrow (bus) -

Takeaway (food) – the Privy Council -

Tam-o’shanter - Petticoat Lane –

1. *Match the following words and word-combinations to their correct meaning*:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Cockney | One of two local Scots languages, also just called Gaelic. |
| 1. Scots Gaelic | A Londoner generally, but more accurately someone born in a particular small area of east London, within hearing the bells of Bow church; the speech of the working class areas of the Greater London. |
| 1. Accent | A particular type of English distinguished by its vocabulary and its grammar. |
| 1. Dialect | The way he or she pronounces words. |
| 1. Standard English | The accent taught at public schools. |
| 1. Oxford English | British variant of the English language, a synonym for BBC English and RP. |

**Test # 1.**

1. *Give the definitions for the following terms:*

* a lingua franca;
* a pidgin language.

1. *Match the following words to their correct meaning*:

Cockney One of two local Scots languages, also just called Gaelic.

Scots Gaelic A Londoner generally, but more accurately someone born in a particular small area of east London, within hearing the bells of Bow church; the speech of the working class areas of the Greater London.

Accent A particular type of English distinguished by its vocabulary and its grammar.

Dialect The way he or she pronounces words.

Standard English The accent taught at public schools.

Oxford English British variant of the English language, a synonym for BBC English and RP.

1. *Choose BrE words, translate them into Ukrainian:*

Accumulator / battery; adopt / nominate; air hostess / flight attendant; banknote / bill; beetroot / beet; booking office/ ticket office; clever / smart; teller / cashier; bus / coach; crossroads / intersection; nation / country; cupboard / closet; truck / lorry; main street / high street; liquidizer / blender; porridge / oatmeal; Ltd. / Inc..

1. *Explain the meaning of the following words in English:*

Woolsack – scholarship -

Westminster Abbey – the Record Office -

Union Flag (the Union Jack) – Red Arrow (bus) -

Takeaway (food) – the Privy Council -

Tam-o’shanter - Petticoat Lane –

1. *Give the pronunciation forms for RP and GenAm.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Word** | **RP/BBC English** | **GenAm.** |
| 1. | address, n |  |  |
| 2. | advertisement |  |  |
| 3. | adult, adj, n |  |  |
| 4. | ate (past form from eat) |  |  |
| 5. | attitude |  |  |
| 6. | borough |  |  |
| 7. | cigarette |  |  |
| 8. | complex |  |  |
| 9. | costume |  |  |
| 10. | courage |  |  |