

2.3. Phraseology as Integral Part of Linguistic Culture

Phraseology, created as a linguistic discipline rather recently, draws the increasing attention not only of linguists, but also experts in the field of teaching Ukrainian and Russian as foreign languages.

Phraseological units (PhU) are studied not only as proper linguistic phenomena, but also as a means of fixing experience and mentality of ethnos, and as a means of providing extralinguistic information connected with the person and as one of the ways of the people's culture reflection. To master the foreign language, it is necessary to realize that the informant of the target language is the informant of foreign culture, and to communicate with him, it is necessary to learn his culture, as assimilation of the foreign language is, first of all, assimilation of a new culture. According to such approach language acts as its important component and a form of expression of a national view at the world (Kryukova, 2005; Solodub, 1981; Sternin, 2015; Telia, 1996; Vagner, 2006; Vereshchagin, 1990).

In phraseological units, national identity of the language receives the brightest and direct manifestation as they are correlated directly with extra language reality. Revealing of national and cultural specifics of the phraseological units' semantics of one language can be carried out only in comparison with the phraseological unit of the student's native language, and allocation of common features of two languages promotes fast understanding of the national and cultural component in semantics.

In modern practice of teaching Russian and Ukrainian to foreigners the problem of mastering phraseology was always and still remains rather difficult in the methodical relation, in spite of the fact that the considerable attention is paid to learning phraseology in multinational audience both in scientific-theoretical and practical-methodical aspects (Chernova, 2004; Kornilov, 2005; Maslova, 2001; Pomortseva, 2009; Prokhorov, 2008; Shaklein, 2008; Shchukin, 2003; Ter-Minasova, 2000). Taking into consideration contemporary language teaching methods and pedagogical practice V. Vagner considers that the most important means of optimization of the educational process is nationally-oriented teaching/learning. It is the main methodical installation on the basis of which the principles of

consciousness, systematicity, functionality, communicative orientation is implemented, adequate forms and methods of training are defined (Vagner, 2006). According to N. Chernova's point of view "influence of the student's native language system on the formation of a new language system takes place in mastering each linguistic phenomenon of any level and throughout learning the target language therefore nationally-oriented language teaching methods can be attached to all language levels and at all stages of teaching/learning" (Chernova, 2004: 19).

Ability to understand and to use phraseological units in a speech in a correct way increases the general language culture, helps a free and figurative statement of thought, improves the ways of translation, and expands country-specific representations of foreign students.

Teaching/learning phraseology is considered especially attractive in the groups where three or even more languages are used and compared.

2.3.1. Exploring Phraseology in Multinational Groups of Students-Inophones

For the analysis of phraseological material in training inophones the target language, various methods can be implemented: semantic interpretation, the linguistic-cultural comment, and the comparative analysis of PhU used in the target language and the student's native language. Many linguists consider the comparative analysis as one of the leading directions of training phraseology. Comparative learning of phraseological units, being a linguistic basis of the language teaching methods of foreign phraseology, allows not only to predict the interference of a great number of PhU, but also to interpret language material in a methodical way, proceeding from specific goals and problems of the target language training.

Comparison of phraseological units of the target language and the student's native language has allowed the author to allocate several groups of PhU according to different degree of similarity: from full coincidence of semantics, stylistic colouring and initial image (an internal form) to phraseological units with no direct equivalents.

1. The first group of the compared phraseological units is formed by full equivalents. This group includes PhU, which despite some differences in component

structure, has identical meaning, high degree of figurativeness, stylistic colouring and can be used in identical situations. Let's consider the way of representing in phraseology of different languages the situation in which a speaker points out the impossibility of making a certain action: *RUS. когда **рак** на горе свистнет; UKR. як на камені **пшениця** вродить; ENG. когда **свиньи** начнут летать (when pigs begin to fly); CHN. в год **обезьяны** и в месяц **лошади**; ARB. Когда **осёл** поднимется на гору.*

Phraseological units of this group offer no special difficulties in semantization them when training Russian/Ukrainian as a foreign language. Such PhU have an identical invariant of sense and an identical internal form, but sometimes tiny nuances of sense can be behind the absolute identity. Bilingual dictionaries provide phraseological units which can, at first sight, be carried to absolute equivalents, and only careful analysis allows noticing insignificant differences which interpretation can have unexpected and important consequences, from the point of view of understanding national mentality.

2. Partial equivalents are referred to the second group of the compared phraseological units. It is possible to find phraseological units which make identical meaning in the target language and the student's native language, but differ in various degree of figurativeness or stylistic colouring that points to the distinction of two cultures. Usually such phraseological units have identical meaning, but differ in the structure of lexical components and, therefore, an internal form. For example, in Russian and Ukrainian there is PhU *белая ворона* (*укр. біла ворона*) (about the person who differs from other people in the behavior, appearance). In the Russian and Ukrainian pictures of the world it can be used both in positive and negative meanings. In the Chinese picture of the world there is PhU *журавль среди кур* (*he li ji qun*) with a similar meaning, but different stylistic colouring as this unit is used only in a positive meaning. The Turkmen have the same PhU with a positive value only – *белый цыплёнок*.

Different degree of figurativeness can become the reason of difference in several phraseological pictures of the world: *RUS. ждать у моря погоды* (*UKR. виглядати*

над морем погоди) – *СНН. Цзян тай гунн дяо юй, юан чжэ шан гоу (старец Цзян ловит рыбу – сидит и ждёт, когда она сядет на крючок).* The image which is the foundation of the Chinese PhU is much brighter as this set phrase is tied to a legend according to which Jiang – a legendary wise man and a righteous person was a big fan of fishing and devoted to this hobby much time. At the same time fish, as if paying a tribute of his wisdom, went to him even on an empty hook. Different degree of figurativeness is caused by the fact that Eastern idioms gravitate to a sublime style, to poetry that quite corresponds to the status of moral and valuable estimates of life situations and certain behavior models of the person in them. The stylistics of the Russian and Ukrainian idioms of valuable sense is obviously lowered, many of them are noted by irony or a frank sneer, abound colloquial (sometimes abusive) vocabulary. For example: *драть как Сидорову козу* means to flog strongly, cruelly and ruthlessly, beat somebody. Figurativeness of comparison is based on figurative senses of words Sidor (this name was often connected with the idea of an angry or quarrelsome person) and a goat (an animal with a mean character according to national representations).

Such phraseological units can be translated with difficulties as different figurativeness disturbs understanding of the meaning and when translating they are filled with other images.

3. Phraseological units which have no equivalents in other languages can be referred to the third group. In Russian and Ukrainian languages as well as in any others, there is a large number of phraseological units which have no compliances at the level of sense in other languages. Such phraseological units often remain beyond the scope of bilingual phraseological dictionaries. For this reason, they have nothing to give as compliances, we can only translate them and explain their meaning. For example, in the Chinese language there are no equivalents for the Ukrainian and Russian phraseological units containing national-specific vocabulary (archaisms, toponyms, anthroponyms, etc.) in the structure: *RUS. коломенская верста, кладезь премудрости, кисейная барышня, дядя Стёпа, мальчик с пальчик, etc.; UKR. чугуйвська верста, пуна надривати, гав ловити, підносити гарбуза, як у віночку,*

аж гай гуде, нате й мій глек на капуста, etc. Such phraseological units need to be translated word-by-word, trying to keep their language features, stylistic colouring. Phraseological units which metaphors are based on the usual words having compliances in the student's native language can be also untranslatable: *RUS. заживёт как на собаке, мурашки по спине бегают, летать в облаках; UKR. виносити сміття з хати, хоч шаром покати, зуб на зуб не попаде, як курка лапою.*

So, difficulties of learning phraseological units with no direct equivalents are in the fact that people living in different social, territorial, environment conditions, having different history, religion, customs, the principles of morals, psychology, etc. even the most everyday occurrences and objects often cause unequal associations from which phraseological metaphors appear. Despite the difficulties of translation and understanding of Ukrainian and Russian phraseological units, they need to be included in the process of language training. This is one of the best ways of making foreign students more active, imparting them love to the target language, bringing up on the examples of Russian and Ukrainian proverbs and sayings.

According to O. A. Kornilov, at the description of any phraseological unit of a foreign language it would be better to reflect the following parameters: a) meaning and internal form (literal translation of the original); b) approximate (or full) semantic equivalent in the native language (with emphasis on semantic asymmetry if it exists); c) etymology of the equivalent (if it is traced) (Kornilov, 2005).

When training Russian and Ukrainian phraseological units the role of etymology is extremely important, though isn't identical in relation to the target language and the student's native language. In Eastern languages a phraseological expression often represents the compressed in several hieroglyphs reference to a parable, legend or a historical event. In Russian and Ukrainian languages, the majority of etymological references opens an internal form of phraseological fusions. For this reason, for the student, who is not implemented in the historical and cultural context of Russian and Ukrainian civilization, information about the origin of this or that expression is the condition of the correct understanding of a set phrase general sense.

Thus, learning of phraseological systems allows doing generalizations which are beyond linguistics and concern the features of national figurativeness of thinking, moral and valuable priorities existing in the culture of the target language. The popular wisdom, imprinted in phraseological units and beauty of images by means of which it is expressed, is a direct reflection of beauty and wisdom of people's collective language consciousness (Kornilov, 2005).

The experience of work in multinational groups demonstrates that foreign students-philologists quite often inadequately perceive and use Russian and Ukrainian phraseological units in their speech, because they poorly possess the extralinguistic information concentrated in PhU. Difficulties of extralinguistic nature are caused by the difficulties arising in case of understanding the information concluded in native speakers' speech, therefore work at national-specific phraseology is extremely important process that depends on the ways of presenting phraseological units to foreign students.

From the point of view of national consciousness typical difficulties are shown, first of all, at perception of verbal images of the Russian and Ukrainian texts. In language teaching methods there is a fair opinion that the foreigner who has a language competence of the literary text completely understands only literal "grammatical" sense of the phrase while the language of art is a language of images, and images develop in reader's perception only when reading of the text goes beyond literalism (Dobrovolskiy, 1997). For example, for foreign students there are absolutely alien images (*RUS. избушка на курьих ножках; за тридевять земель; кто в лес, кто по дрова; по щучьему велению; Демьянова уха; ворона в павлиньих перьях; UKR. лис Микита; хатка на курячій ніжці; Баба-Яга кістяна нога; дід з кикоть, а борода з лікоть; аж дух сперло*) if they don't know that these images are connected with the Russian and Ukrainian folklore.

Relying on observations of Russian and Ukrainian linguists and methodologists as well as on the experience of teaching foreign students, it should be noted that the difficulties in learning phraseology in foreign audience are caused by the fact that the European and Eastern language systems have distinctions at all levels: phonetic,

lexical, grammatical, and also in the field of graphics. Lexical difficulties in respect of the content, first of all, are found in perception of semantic meanings of the words with no equivalents in other languages. As a part of phraseological units, national-specific and background words denoting names of objects and phenomena of national life we meet very often. Recognition and understanding of the mentioned lexical units at the perception of Russian and Ukrainian phraseological units by foreign students are provided with not only language knowledge, but also «background» knowledge of culture of the target language country.

Chapter III. Methodology of Forming Professional Intercultural Competence of Law Students

The recent lockdown regime has reaffirmed the topicality of reforming higher education to deal with global online learning and teaching. Primarily, it has an impact on the methodology of learning and teaching at all educational levels and stages and concerns all stakeholders including the public authorities, higher school administration, educational theorists and practitioners, employers, students, and their parents. Another important lesson taken is that in the globalized world a good second language communication competence is vital for every aspect of work and life, be it running a business or performing a job in an organization, reading morning international news, or chatting with friends from abroad. Even to get that coveted promotion or land a new job, it is quite necessary to have good communication skills. Under modern conditions of a highly competitive labor market where industries and businesses drastically have moved to virtuality and demand for hybrid experts is increasing day by day a well-developed professional intercultural competence is the sure-fire way to enhance law-students' career and respective advancement opportunities. In a recent interview Bill Gates pointed out “as new software innovations emerge, things will continue to change. “What is a virtual courtroom?” he asked. “What is a virtual legislature? How do you create logic? In some ways, you can create something more efficient and better than what was there before” (Bariso, 2020).

It is high time for academicians and practitioners in education to summarize what

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЮРИДИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
імені ЯРОСЛАВА МУДРОГО



НАВЧАННЯ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ ЗА
ПРОФЕСІЙНИМ СПРЯМУВАННЯМ У
КОНТЕКСТІ СУЧАСНОЇ ОСВІТНЬОЇ
ПАРАДИГМИ: ПРИЄДНАННЯ
ДО СВІТОВОЇ СПІЛЬНОТИ

*До 215-річчя Національного юридичного університету імені
Ярослава Мудрого та 20-річчя кафедри іноземних мов № 2*

Харків - 2020

Contents

Introduction.....	5
1. Recent trends in linguistic studies.....	9
1.1. Communicative-pragmatic theory and constative-interrogative microdialogue.....	12
1.2. Types of constatives in constative-interrogative microdialogue.....	18
1.2.1. Constatives with the perlocutionary purpose of convincing the truth of the utterance.....	22
1.3. Semantic and pragmatic peculiarities of reply questions in constative-interrogative microdialogue.....	26
1.4. Specific nature of legal discourse.....	31
1.4.1. Correlation of concepts “legal discourse” and “legal text”.....	34
1.4.2. Resources of grammar in creating persuasiveness/suggestiveness in legal discourse...36	
1.4.3. Lexical resources in creating persuasiveness/suggestiveness in texts of legal discourse.....	41
1.4.4. Arrangement of linguistic means in texts of legal discourse.....	43
2. Linguoculturological features of teaching foreign languages to students of law schools.....	46
2.1. Language personality in context of interaction between language and culture.....	47
2.2. Implementing linguoculturological concept in education of law students.....	56
2.3. Phraseology as integral part of linguistic culture.....	66
2.3.1 Exploring phraseology in multinational groups of students-inophones.....	67
3. Methodology of forming professional intercultural competence of law students.....	72
3.1. Foreign language for legal purpose course programs: theory and practice.....	74
3.1.1. Paradigm of developing legal foreign language course programs.....	75
3.1.2. Interdisciplinary approach to forming professional intercultural competence.....	84
3.1.3. Student-centrism: paradigm shift in forming professional intercultural competence...92	
3.2. Formation of foreign language communicative competence of future lawyers.....	99
3.2.1. Listening comprehension as leading modality of teaching foreign languages for law students.....	105
3.2.2. Autonomous learning for improving listening comprehension.....	114
4. Pedagogical conditions of formation of professional foreign language competence of law students.....	127
4.1. Professional orientation of foreign language teaching.....	128
4.2. Motivation for law students: educational and professional.....	134
4.3. Formation of socio-psychological climate in student groups.....	136
4.4. Self-study work as method of teaching foreign languages to law students.....	142
5. Psychological background of teaching foreign languages to students majoring in law.....	145
5.1. Psychological principles of mastering foreign languages through communication.....	146
5.2. Psychological difficulties and their resolving in process of mastering foreign languages by law students.....	156
5.2.1. Circumstances and factors leading to emergence of psychological barriers in foreign language acquisition.....	158
5.2.2. Strategies that mitigate and help to overcome psychological barriers.....	160
6. Modern technologies of teaching foreign languages at law schools.....	166
6.1. Use of innovative technologies for teaching/learning foreign languages at law schools.....	167
6.2. Implementation of Internet and Web-technologies for Teaching/Learning Foreign Languages at Law Schools.....	173
6.3. Information and communication technologies in teaching translation and interpreting.....	182
Conclusions.....	190
References.....	196