

3. Richards Jack C. Reflecting Teaching in Second Language Classrooms / Jack C. Richards, Charles Lochard. – Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994. – 218 p.

4. Harmer J. The Practice of English Teaching / J. Harmer. – Pearson Education Ltd, 2007. – 448 p.

5. Simpson J. M. Choices and chances: The sociology role-playing game-the sociological imagination in practice / J. M. Simpson, V. L. Elias // Teaching Sociology. – 2011. – Vol. 4. – № 1. – P. 42–56.

M. O. Zaitseva¹

FEATURES AND IMPORTANCE OF POLEMIC DISCOURSE IN PEDAGOGICAL INTERACTION

Issues related to the specific use of linguistic resources in communicative processes become a subject of great interest among linguists. In their opinion, a text is a special communication unit. In order to provide for a thorough study of the text it is not sufficient to operate with conventional terms and concepts used in traditional linguistics. It is widely known that communicative approach to the study of the text requires that we should use a more thorough knowledge resulting from involving other disciplines (psychology, rhetoric, philosophy, sociology, etc.) as well as taking into consideration a lot of extra linguistic factors. Furthermore, the term «text» has many connotations, which prevents its free and unrestricted usage. It seems that the notion of «text» requires clarification and reconsideration. The communicative approach to language studying in general and text in particular necessitated the introduction of new paradigms in scientific concepts that caused the emergence of the term «discourse». Despite the complexity and diversity of this phenomenon, unfortunately, there is no complete and sufficiently precise definition of the term «discourse» and there is no classification of its types.

In recent decades, the active discussion of defining discourse has fallen within the pragmatic studies that include defining the recipient and the communicative situation (communicative principle). But at the same time the author influences upon the recipient through the text. Studying the mechanisms of interaction of linguistic and non-linguistic phenomena appears to be utterly

¹ Candidate of Philology, associate professor of foreign languages Department № 2, Kharkiv Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University.

important for development of the modern linguistics and pragmatics in particular. The explanation for such a statement lies within the impossibility of linguistic research as the isolated phenomenon. The artificial abstracting of the language phenomena from extra-linguistic reality that could be observed within the traditional linguistics, on the one hand, helped distinguish and identify a lot of language units, but on the other hand, exhausted itself and showed the limitedness of the existing theories. It seems obvious that pragmatic approach to linguistic research is not only logical but scientifically justified as well.

In terms of pragmatic orientation linguists researched and studied various discourses – advertising, political discourse, reasoned discourse, the discourse of conflict. However, there are no special linguistic studies of discourse of polemics as one of the most pragmatic form of discourse addressed. By the way, researching the above-mentioned type of discourse is important not only for proper linguistic research but also for solving a lot of problems in related sciences. For further development of linguistics it is essential to identify the specific characteristics of a polemical discourse. This may contribute to the further development of a typology of discourse, its research in the field of communication problems of linguistic and extra-linguistic elements of communication, building innovative models of verbal communication in various situations.

Recognition of a polemical discourse as a separate and independent type leads to the necessity of establishing those linguistic resources that contribute to debate. In many linguists' works, and in particular in works by T. V. Radzievskaya, the factors constructing the text were defined and listed. The combination of these factors is surely connected with the construction of a polemical text that determines its belonging to the polemical discourse while the linguistic units involved in its creation and influenced by these factors become polemical. While debating the author realizes two important goals – to persuade and to deny. Because under different communicative conditions the recipient turns out to be the carrier of various attributes, the language resources are selected so that they would match the image of the addressee. The recipient in polemics is an ideal simulated image who appears to be a bearer of positive attributes and properties. Thus, the essential feature of a polemical discourse is its bilateral nature. Perception of a polemical discourse involves evaluation of language means arranged therein in order to achieve the perlocutionary effect. The pragmatic (optional) meaning is interpreted as «the ability to

produce the original speech effect that does not result directly from the speech semantics “ [1 , c. 15]. This optional meaning specifies the pragmatic orientation of the text type that in its turn gives the expression “ ... logical and \ or emotional core ... , the general tone of the text, dictates the selection of linguistic and non-linguistic means ... » [2]. Pragmatic orientation is determined by the intention to achieve the maximum pragmatic effect.

Morphology and word-formation are levels that provide the most adequate means for the sender of information to express his/her ideas, and the word appears to be the most loaded unit because the word itself makes the communication activity possible. The word in polemics has several functions: to deliver the contents, to express modes of vision, to assess because “ a polemical text ... by its nature is directed against any mental setup and is based on the principle of «opposing the opposition “ , i.e. as an expression of a certain attitude to the phenomenon in terms of its acceptance \ rejection “ [1, c. 40]. The pragmatic aspect in a polemical discourse determines the selection of linguistic means, their organization ,delivery mode. In the center of this aspect there is a person (according to the anthropological principle), who strives within his/her speech activity to combine the extra-linguistic situation and its linguistic interpretation with the addition of his/her assessment of the situation. Therefore, given the complex nature of semantic relations and pragmatic information, a polemicist is not satisfied with «the traditional» lexical means, but aims at achieving the maximum perlocutionary effect with help of various semantic transformations and experiments in the field of semantics. Thus, the process of selection of lexical items that can adequately convey communicative intent and thus provide the necessary perlocutionary effect, a polemicist is guided by the pragmatic principle of relations between a particular linguistic unit and an extralinguistic situation. The selection of the semantic resources undergoes various transformations (the expansion of the meanings and the restriction of the meanings), actualization of this or that meaning of a lexical unit, term-establishing processes and terminating the existence of some terms. Amended meaningful lexical unit modifies its evaluative and emotional significance of the recipient’s information considerably. Analyzing the emotional significance, we should focus on the concepts of “ emotion “ and «emotiveness.»

In polemical articles the leading and most relevant linguistic resources are used to enhance the «emotional content» and introduce «emotiveness .» The resulting emotions enforce the desired perlocutionary effect. Even neutral language units often acquire additional (pragmatic) meaning that is expressed implicitly (in the subtext or by the surrounding context) . The obtained emotional

meaning with the additional meaning of assessment of the text is due to the use of language of two types: emotionally neutral resources and the elements containing evaluation due to interacting with the context surrounding units.

In the polemical discourse all the available language tools are used to achieve the illocutionary goal. It will not be an exaggeration to say that the pragmatic potential of the language resources is fully realized in the polemic texts. It is essential that we should observe and analyze the actualization of the pragmatic potential in each language system.

In conclusion, we should state that the proposed scheme facilitates studying of the existing theories on the advanced level, understanding the theory and practice of discourse analysis. The author tried to analyze functioning of language resources in a polemical discourse. Although these resources are widely used in polemics they are not exclusively available only in a polemical discourse, they continually vary, interact with other resources. It allows to assume that these linguistic units make the polemical discourse different from other types of discourse.

REFERENCES:

1. Радзиевская Т. В. Текстовая коммуникация / Т. В. Радзиевская. – М.: Наука, 1992. – С. 80–109.
2. Девкин В. Д. Немецкая разговорная речь / В. Д. Девкин // М.: Наука, 1979. – 300 с.

С. М. Романюк¹
Т. Є. Малєва²

INTERCULTURAL PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE AS AN INDISPENSABLE COMPONENT OF LAWYERS' TRAINING PROGRAMS WITHIN THE UKRAINE-EU INTEGRATION REFORMS

Integration of Ukraine with the European Union requires radical changes and improvements in all spheres. Education, in particular higher professional

¹ Доцент, кандидат філософських наук, доцент кафедри іноземних мов №2 Національного юридичного університету імені Ярослава Мудрого.

² Старший викладач кафедри іноземних мов №2 Національного юридичного університету імені Ярослава Мудрого.