

Communicative features of the folklore discourse

T. A. Druzhyna

The State Institution «South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky», Odessa, Ukraine
Corresponding author. E-mail: t.a.druzhyna@mail.ru

Paper received 28.10.16; Accepted for publication 10.11.16.

Abstract. The article deals with the definition of the folklore discourse and its dynamics, with the consideration of the specifics of the folklore discourse and folklore communication, with the formation of its sociocultural factors and the analysis of its communicative specificity (the communicative goal, the communicative oral strategies, the values of the discourse, the communicative participants and the type of communication, the communicative channel, the coded system and the genre content of this discourse).

Keywords: *discourse, folklore text, folklore discourse, modern folklore, folklore communication.*

The discourse approach to language has enabled the possibility of studying the existing linguistic phenomena, including folklore, in a new aspect. Being a type of discourse, folklore is characterized as a dynamic formation that responds to the changing sociocultural situation. The folklore discourse is presented as a collective communicative activity of a special type that is characterized by a social purpose and is caused by extralinguistic factors. The product of a collective communicative activity is an aesthetically textual unity that reflects a special perception of the world of a folklore group. The concept of reality represented in the folklore discourse contains behavioral standards in typical real-life situations. Being a contextual form of culture the folklore discourse adapts to new conditions of the being.

This paper considers the folklore discourse after Yu. A. Emer as “collective speech activity attributed to the sociocultural situation, historical conditions. A component of this speech activity is an aesthetically arranged traditional text which meets the social needs and reflects the collective knowledge that stabilizes the society” [3, p. 86-87].

There is a limited number of works dealing with the folklore discourse as an aspect of oral activity (M. O. Abdrashitova, S. B. Adonyeva, Yu. A. Emer, etc.). This fact is caused firstly by the folklore tradition of studying archaic texts, perceived as a model, a kind of a standard of folklore texts; and secondly by the idea of folklore as a literary system, which limits the methodology of the folklore language study. The cognitive and communicative aspects of the folklore study have remained in the background for a long time. Folklore was considered to be a form of literary art, and folklore genres were studied from the position of literary texts.

S. B. Adonyeva [1] offers to consider oral activity as a superordinate term in the context of verbal folklore, which has a pragmatic orientation that determines the specificity of folklore texts. Yu. A. Emer considers folklore in the discourse aspect, identifying the cognitive model of folklore communication generally and of separate folklore genres particularly. The discursive aspects of the folklore study enable to identify the principles of generation of a folklore text, the arrangements of folklore communication and the specifics of usage of various genres.

In the folklore discourse the identity of its members as the holders of traditional knowledge is fully reflected; whereas traditional texts contain collective knowledge; the author is not represented in the discourse. “It should be mentioned that in contrast to other discourses the

communicants form the worldview in which the collective discourse installation correlates to their personal settings, the collective worldview is the personal perception of each folklore group” [3, p. 76].

Thus, the folklore discourse is the type of linguistic activity that presupposes some certain attitudes and norms, which were proposed by a collective being at the same time personal for each participant in this discourse. Thus, the goal of the study is to highlight the key provisions of the allocation of the folklore as a special type of discourse and to clarify its communicative features. Thanks such a position the study will enable to realize and identify the features of the folklore discourse process, its communicative specifics.

The description of the folklore discourse as a type of oral activity can be based on a discursive model by analyzing its cognitive and communicative specificity – the basic characteristics of the discourse: the communicative goal, the communicative oral strategies, the values of the discourse, the communicative participants and the type of communication, the communicative channel, the coded system and the genre content of this discourse.

The goal of the folklore discourse is to transfer the collective knowledge that stabilizes life and takes part in socialization of an individual in a particular national-cultural group, in a particular social group. The folklore provides a social group with the possibility to express oneself, is a means of communication. The folklore discourse is a mechanism for regulating stability of a society or a social group. By means of the folklore discourse communication and conservation of norms, moral and ethical attitudes underlying the understanding of the world and of the society itself (consciousness of the people) are transmitted.

The strategies of the discourse. The speech strategies are the stages of achieving the communicative goal of the discourse. The goal of the folklore discourse is collective experience storage and transmission (a special sort of information). The main strategies of the folklore discourse are informative strategy (data submission, recital of information) and valuation strategy (the evaluation of this information).

The values of the folklore discourse are also caused by its goal: the transfer of the collective experience to a social group. There are following values in the folklore discourse: academicism, collectivity, ideality of the worldview. The values of the folklore discourse are associated with the basic settings of the folklore: academicism and anonymity. Upon that, the academicism we understand as the capability of reproduction of the

existing and production of new texts according to the existing norms, attitudes and models which are handed down from generation to generation. The academicism as a value allows the folklore discourse to achieve the goal of the collective experience transmission. In a way, the setting on tradition is the mechanism of preservation of the society's cultural values. The nondifferentiation of the author is closely connected with such a peculiarity: the folklore communication is fundamentally focused not at the new information that is introduced by the author's individuality, but at the tradition, the conglomerate of some attitudes ("langue" in case of the language). As a result, the role of a personality is ultimately taken back to give place to a matrix and is reproduced with different variations.

The ideality of the worldview and normativity are interdependent and are the cause and the effect of each other. One of the main functions of the folklore discourse is to store and to transmit certain rules of behaviour, social and moral properties which regulate the stability of the society, its homogeneity. The folklore discourse is normative by its nature because it is a mechanism of preserving the norms, which are the moral and ethical base of the traditional group. Because of this normativity the folklore discourse reflects not the real, but some kind of an ideal model that correlates to all the standards of a particular social group. The ideality of the worldview as a basic value of the folklore discourse allows it to perform its major function: to transmit the norms and settings of a worldview to the next generations.

The communicants of the folklore discourse. Each communicant of the discourse conceives himself (within the folklore communication) as a member of a social group, speaking on behalf of the group. At the same time, all the collective attitudes and norms are personal for each communicant of the folklore discourse. A communicant of the folklore discourse is a member of a social group ("collective team"). He is consolidated in this group and ready personally to conceive the collective values and norms. The position of the addresser in the folklore discourse is complex and can combine several roles: the person reproducing the folklore text; the interpreter of this text: a co-author of a collective author. "...Most often than not the addresser plays the role of an interpreter or a storyteller, a singer – the text's reproducer [...] the addresser to a different extent, depending on a genre, can take part in the "creation" of the works being a co-author of a collective author. This is not about the conscious authorship [...], it is about the superinducement of changes to the existing text, the arrangement of individual notional accents, due to the specific communicative situation, the assignment of this text" [3, p. 36-39].

The addresser of the folklore discourse uses the existing model, the existing folklore texts for particular communication. Simultaneously being the author of this version, at the same time, he is only the reproducer of the existing ones. Thus, it combines the personal characteristics of the addresser, the determination and social group affiliation that determine the worldview of every member of this group. The primary characteristic of the addressee of the folklore discourse is also the accessory of a particular social group, within which the folklore communication takes place.

The type of the communicants in the folklore discourse depends on the specific folklore genre. For example, the genre of a riddle assumes that the group is proficient in the language code, which is a kind of sacred knowledge that identifies the members of the social group. There is a gradual acquisition of the riddles by the youngest members of the society. Therefore, we can identify the age hierarchy of the communicants, where there is a senior one – the knowledge carrier and junior ones – the knowledge followers. Therefore, the addresser acts as the master, passing the significant information to the addressee.

The communicative channel for the folklore discourse is traditionally oral and direct, i. e. contact communication. This fact is caused by the ancientness of the folklore that appeared long before the mediate communication channels. The academicism, which possesses an axiological yield in this model of communication, has consolidated an oral form of discourse as one of the "canons", the rules of the folklore communication. However, the cultural and historical changes, computerization and technocratization of the society have had a significant impact on the communication form of the folklore discourse since the mid-twentieth century. The invention of radio, television and the Internet communications has led to the distant type of communication in the folklore discourse. However, the main channel of communication is oral speech.

The type of communication in the folklore discourse can be both collective and individual, depending on the specificity of the folklore genre, the purpose and the subject of the communicants.

There are different semiotic code systems of the oral and written communication in the folklore discourse: the language, the tone, the music, and the means of fine art. In the written form of manifestation the graphic and colour means are used. Special aspects of the folklore linguistic realization are studied in detail in linguo-folkloristics (E. B. Artemenko, M. A. Bobunova, I. S. Klimas, S. E. Nikitina, I. A. Stepanova, A. T. Khrolenko, etc.). A peculiar feature of the folklore linguistic units is their aesthetic loading in the folklore communication ("the folklore language is a special form of the national language, much like literary language" [3, p. 45]).

A. T. Khrolenko separates capacity as the main property of the folklore word: "The secret of harmony ("transparency") of the folklore poetry is in its rare ability to create a variety of a small number of source elements. However, we should mention that in the folklore literature the basic elements are words, syntactic structures. They are semantically complex and therefore have constructive and expressive possibilities within the tradition" [2, p. 28-29]. This property of a folklore word is determined by such features as generalization, symbolism, connotation and evaluativity (A. T. Khrolenko, Yu. A. Emer).

Thus, the dynamics of the modern folklore discourse is characterized by two processes: a) fragmentation of folklore information, destruction of the narrative plot structure, a narrative collage instead of narration that meets the features of the modern culture that recognizes the value of symbolic effectiveness of the method and not of the plot; b) division of the folklore space into various folklore «subspaces»: school, prison, army, church folklore etc.

The specifics of the folklore discourse and folklore communication are not specific texts themselves or other phenomena as the object of folklore communication can be, in principle, any; it involves their collective perception and transmission, as well as their pragmatic function: the pragmatic side of folklore is manifested in the fact that it functions as a set of forms that allow an individual and the group to navigate in their cultural space.

The folklore discourse as a complex of the folklore texts has such specific communicative features: *the communicative goal*, which is collective experience storage

and transmission; *the main strategies* (informative and valuation); *the values* (academicism, collectivity, ideality of the worldview); *the communicative participants* are the members of a social group; *the type of communication* can be both collective and individual; *the communicative channel* is traditionally oral and direct; *the coded system* (the language, the tone, the music, and the means of fine art). The context determines the choice of the words, but the choice is relatively limited and selected word has already those communications that seamlessly connect in general folklore texts.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Адоньева С. Б. Прагматика фольклора / С. Б. Адоньева. – СПб., 2004. – 312 с.
2. Хроленко А. Т. Лексика русской народной поэзии / А. Т. Хроленко. - Курск, 1976. – 64 с.
3. Эмер Ю. А. Миромоделирование в современном песенном фольклоре : когнитивно-дискурсивный анализ : дис. ... доктора филол. наук : 10.02.01 / Ю. А. Эмер. – Томск, 2011. – 457 с.

REFERENCES

1. Adonyeva, S. B. Pragmatics of the folklore / S. B. Adonyeva. - St. Petersburg, 2004. – 312 p.
2. Khrolenko, A. T. The vocabulary of the Russian folklore poetry / A. T. Khrolenko. – Kursk, 1976. – 64 p.
3. Emer, Yu. A. The modelling in the modern folklore songs: cognitive-discourse analysis: Dis... The doctor of filol. sciences: 10.02.01 / Yu. A. Emer. – Tomsk, 2011. – 457 p.

Коммуникативные особенности фольклорного дискурса

Т. А. Дружина

Аннотация. Статья посвящена определению фольклорного дискурса и его динамики, рассмотрению специфики фольклорного дискурса и фольклорной коммуникации, формированию его социокультурных факторов и анализу его коммуникативной специфики (коммуникативная цель, коммуникативные речевые стратегии, ценности дискурса, коммуникативные участники, тип коммуникации, канал связи, кодовая система и жанровое наполнение данного дискурса).

Ключевые слова: дискурс, фольклорный текст, фольклорный дискурс, современный фольклор, фольклорная коммуникация.