«ФИЛОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ БІЛІМ БЕРУДЕГІ ҚАЗІРГІ ТЕХНОЛОГИЯЛАР»
республикалық ғылыми-әдістемелік конференция

Алматы, 6 желтоқсан, 2013 жыл

Республиканская научно-методическая конференция
«СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ТЕХНОЛОГИИ В ФИЛОЛОГИЧЕСКОМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ»

Алматы, 6 декабря, 2013 года

bitter- (ср.1) горький 2) горький, огорчительный) придает прилагательным экспрессивно-усилительное значение при основах качественных прилагательных ср.: bitterböse – 'злющий, очень сердитый' мотивирован производящей основой böse и значением полупрефикса, и придает прилагательному двойное выражения гнева.

Некоторые слова имеют яркою стилистическую окраску. Так, например значение лексемы der Groller – 'злопамятный, злобный человек', относящейся к книжной лексике мотивировано значением существительного der Groll – 'злоба, неприязнь'. Прилагательное gallig – 'раздражительный, ехидный, едкий' имеет производящую основу die Galle – 'жёлчь', так как в немецком языке жёлчь является образом гнева и раздражения. Устаревшая лексема griesgrämig имеет производящую адъективную основу gram – 'злобный'.

Итак, эмоциональное значение может являться неотъемлемым компонентом значения слова. Оно базируется на основе оценки, но не сводится к ней. В языке существуют разнообразные и многочисленные способы выражения эмоционального значения. Это, прежде всего, узуальная эмоциональная лексика и ряд суффиксов и префиксов.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА
1. Блейхер В.М., Крук И.В. Толковый словарь психиатрических терминов - Воронеж: НПО "МОДЭК", 1995. – 640 с.
2. Добровольский Д.О. Образная составляющая в семантике идиом// ВЯ. 1996. №1. С.71-93.
3. **Шнайдер А.С. Гнев – объектно-ориентированное эмоциональное состояние в немецкой   лингвокультуре   //   Вестник   Сибирского   государственного аэрокосмического университета имени академика М.Ф. Решетнева. - Красноярск. - 2006.– Выпуск 6 (13). - С.335 – 338**
4. Словарь словообразовательных элементов немецкого языка .Под рук. М.Д. Степановой. – 2-е изд., стереотип. – М.: Рус.яз., 2000. – 536 с.
5. Duden. Das große Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache in zehn Bänden. – Mannheim; Leipzig; Wien; Zürich. 1999, 481 S.
6. Dr. Heinz Küpper, Wörterbuch der deutschen Umgangsprache / Heinz Küpper . – 1. Aufl., 6. Nachdr . Stuttgart; München; Düsseldorf; Leipzig: Klett, 1977, 959 S.

***

PARLIAMENTARY DISCOURSES

K. Kenzhekanova Al-Farabi KazNU, PhD student

Key words: parliamentary discourse, genre, ministerial statements, speeches, debates, oral/written questions and Question Time.

Introduction

In many countries parliamentary proceedings are broadcast nowadays on radio and television, as well as reported in the press and in specialised publications. However, in spite of the growing visibility of parliamentary institutions, the scholarly interest for the study of parliamentary discourse has been rather low until recently.

Ever since the latter half of the 20th century parliamentary discourse and parliamentary rhetoric have gradually become the object of scholarly research in the fields of political sciences and sociology (Silk and Walters 1987, Morgan and Tame 1996, Olson and Norton 1996, Copeland and Patterson 1997), but only very recently have they become a truly interdisciplinary concern through the involvement of linguistic scholarship (Carbó 1992, Slembrouck 1992, Biryukov et al 1995, Ilie 2000, 2001, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2003d, 2004, 2005, ter Wal 2000a, Van der Valk 2000a, 2000b, Van Dijk 2000a, 2004, Wodak and Van Dijk 2000, Pérez de Ayala 2001, Wilson and Stapleton 2003, Bayley 2004). Whereas the research rooted in social and political sciences focuses primarily on the explanation of facts and interpretation of issues, political events and socio-political processes, linguistic research has benefited from the cross-fertilisation with the above-mentioned disciplines in its exploration of the shifting and multi-leveled institutionalised use of language, the communicative interaction of institutional agents, the interplay between parliamentary dialogue and the thinking processes of its participants, the interdependence between language-shaped facts and reality-prompted language ritualisation and change.

The notions of discourse and genre

The notions of discourse and genre, however fuzzy and problematic, are central to the study of interaction practices in institutional settings like the Parliament. Current discourse-analytical approaches envisage discourse as "language use relative to social, political and cultural formations – it is language reflecting social order but also language shaping social order, and shaping individuals' interaction with society." (Jaworski and Coupland 1999: 3). This definition can certainly apply to parliamentary discourse, i.e. a discourse in which institutional facework, political meaning negotiation and power management are being articulated and publicly displayed.

Like discourse and institutions, genres and institutions are mutually constitutive and acquire legitimacy within a speech community. In spite of its controversiality, the notion of 'genre' can offer important insights into the nature, scope and functions of parliamentary discourse. Following Swales (1998/1990), genre may be regarded primarily as "a class of communicative events in which language (and/or paralanguage) plays both a significant and an indispensable role" (1998: 45) and "the members of which share some set of communicative purposes" (1998: 58). Furthermore, "these purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre" (1998: 58).

From a pragma-linguistic perspective, parliamentary discourse belongs to the genre of political discourse. As such, it displays particular institutionalised discursive features and ritualised interaction strategies, while complying with and/or circumventing a number of specific rules and constraints. The discursive interaction of parliamentarians is constantly marked by their institutional role-based commitments, by the dialogically shaped institutional confrontation and by the awareness of acting in front and on behalf of a multi-level audience. Parliamentary debates are meant to achieve a number of institutionally specific purposes, namely position-claiming, persuading, negotiating, agenda-setting, and opinion building, usually along ideological or party lines.

From a rhetorical perspective, parliamentary discourse belongs to the deliberative genre of political rhetoric, which is defined as an oratorical discourse targeting an audience that is asked to make a decision by evaluating the advantages and disadvantages of a future course of action. Elements characteristic of the forensic and epideictic genres are also present, even if occasionally and to a lesser extent. This confirms the Bakhtinian view that genres are heterogeneous. One of the major functions of Members of Parliament (henceforth MPs) is to contribute to problem-solving tasks regarding legal and political deliberation, as well as decision making processes. A major incentive for the parliamentarians' active participation in the debates is the constant need to promote their own image in a competitive and performance-oriented

institutional interaction. The MPs' discourse is meant to call into question the opponents' ethos, i.e. political credibility and moral profile, while enhancing their own ethos in an attempt to strike a balance between logos, i.e. logical reasoning, and pathos, i.e. emotion eliciting force.

Subgenres of parliamentary discourse

The genre of parliamentary discourse displays several subgenres, such as ministerial statements, speeches, debates, oral/written questions and Question Time.

A common feature of many European legislatures (for example in Germany and Sweden) is the interpellation or "short debate" by means of which an opposition party (or an equivalent number of MPs) can call a debate on a topical issue or a matter of public concern. Interpellations can be regarded as mini-debates on broad areas of a minister's responsibilities.

Oral ministerial statements are made after questions and urgent questions. Their purpose is to announce new policies or to provide specific information about current or urgent political matters. A minister speaks on behalf of the government to present their official views to Parliament. Statements can be on any subject ranging from a new policy announcement to an important national or international event or crisis.

Parliamentary speeches are traditional forms of political discourse. The Opening Speech is the first speech in a debate. The MP who has moved, or proposed, the motion outlines their view of why the Maslihat and Majilis should adopt the motion. Parliamentary speeches are supposed to display, apart from facts or events, also self-presentations and other-presentations.

A parliamentary debate can be described in general terms as a formal discussion on a particular topic which is strictly controlled by an institutional set of rules and presided over by the Speaker of the Parliament.

The rule apply parliamentary norms to questions, while still others define the issues on which questions could be asked. Unlike the questioning strategies in courtroom interaction, which are meant to elicit particular expected answers and to exclude unsuitable answers, parliamentary questioning strategies are not intended to elicit particular answers, but rather to embarrass and/or to challenge the respondent to make uncomfortable or revealing declarations.

Question Time becomes particularly confrontational when the questioning is carried out by members of the Opposition. This explains why Question Time has been described as "a face-threatening genre" by Pérez de Ayala (2001: 147), who shows that the high frequency of face-threatrening acts is counterbalaced by a wide range of politeness strategies. Each macro-question is analysed in terms of adjacency pairs, turns, moves and discourse acts. The histrionic and agonistic features of three parliamentary subgenres, i.e. speeches, debates and Question Time, are examined by Ilie (2003b), who makes a systematic comparison with corresponding subgenres of theatre performances, starting from the consideration that parliamentary dialogue contributes to revealing frames of mind and beliefs, as well as exposing instances of doublespeak and incompatible or inconsistent lines of action. Two rhetorical strategies are particularly investigated in the two discourse types, namely rhetorical questions and rhetorical parentheticals. According to syntactic criteria, a vast majority of parliamentary questions belong to the closed category of yes-no questions, which are meant to constrain the respondents' answering options. According to pragma-linguistic criteria, parliamentary questions often belong to the category of rhetorical questions, leading questions and echo questions, which are confirmation-eliciting and reaction-eliciting, rather than information-eliciting in that they single out and expose the opponent's weaknesses, often in an ironical or sarcastic tone.

Conclusion

Nowadays, genres and subgenres of parliamentary discourse are deeply being investigated. While investigation a lot of diversities are identified. The activity of parliaments is largely linguistic activity: they produce talk and they produce texts. Broadly speaking, the objectives

that this discourse aims to satisfy are similar all over the world: to legitimate or contest legislation, to represent diverse interests, to scrutinise the activity of government, to influence opinion and to recruit and promote political actors. But the discourse of different national parliaments is subject to variation, at all linguistic levels, on the basis of history, cultural specificity, and political culture in particular. The results of the study point to the fact that, when given the chance to carefully plan their talk in advance, the MPs used the first-person plural and positive self-campaign much more often. On the other hand, in their spontaneous talk, the MPs more often referred to themselves as individuals and resorted more readily to addressing others using negative presentation strategies. Their prepared talk was therefore crafted and tailored for political effect through the use of consciously employed persuasive strategies that relate to the choice of person. It is suggested that the comparison of pre-scripted and unscripted political talk can reveal underlying political ideologies.

....
1. Bayley, Paul (ed.). (2004). Cross-cultural perspectives on parliamentary discourse. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
2. Carbó, Teresa. (1992). Towards an interpretation of interruptions in Mexican parliamentary discourse. Discourse & Society 3(1): 25-45.
3. Chester, D.Norman and Bowring, Nona. (1962). Questions in Parliament. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
4. Ilie, Cornelia. (2001). Unparliamentary language: Insults as cognitive forms of confrontation. In R. Dirven, R. Frank and C. Ilie (eds.) Language and Ideology, Vol. II: Descriptive Cognitive Approaches, 235-263, 'Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
5. Stewart (eds.) Politeness in Europe. 174-188. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Мақала саяси дискурстың, соның ішінде парламенттік дискурс мәселесі жөнінде сөз етеді. Мақалада дискурс пен жанр мәселесі, парламенттік дискурстың түрлері мен оның негізгі прагматикасы толыққанды ашылған.

***

ӘСКЕРИ СӨЗДІКТЕРДІҢ ЛЕКСИКА-ГРАММАТИКАЛЫҚ ҚҰРАМЫ

С. Кулжабаева

әл-Фараби атындағы Қаз ҰУ-дың 4 курс студенті

Терминологиялық сөздіктер, яғни терминография мәселесі кейінгі кездері кеңінен зерттеле бастады, осыған орай әскери сөздіктерді де зерттеу назардан тыс қалмауы тиіс. Әскери сөздіктер жалпы термин атаулының бір мағыналық белгісіне толық сай келіп жатады. Мәселен, *ефрейтор, пушка, бомба, полк, адмирал, кадрлық офицер, жаяу әскер, жауынгер, рота кезекшісі, шабуыл, миналау жиілігі, қорғаныс аймағы, әскери құрама, отшашар танк* т.б. осы сияқты әскери терминдер әскери терминология жүйесінде бір мағынаны ғана білдіреді. Әскери терминология жүйесінде олар басқа мағынада қолданылмайды. Бұл – әскери терминдердің өзіндік бір белгісі.

Термин мәселесінде біраз пікірталас туғызып жүрген мәселе – терминнің стильдік ерекшелікке бейтараптығы, яғни эмоционалды-экспрессивті мәнді білдірмеуі. Әскери терминдер – әскери іс, әскери сала, әскери оқу орындары сияқты қолданылу ортасы бар терминдер. Осы ортада олар стильге бейтарап, басқа ортада әскери терминдер стильдік реңк беруі мүмкін, бірақ олардың әскери терминге қатысы жоқ. [1]