

RECENZIJOS



Romanas V. Vasko – filologijos mokslų daktaras, profesorius. Kijevo nacionalinio lingvistikos universiteto rektorius, Germanų ir finougrių filologijos katedros profesorius. *Moksliniai interesai:* istorinė, tipologinė ir lyginamoji kalbotyra, kalbotyros istorija, germanų kalbos. *El. paštas:* dnister@ukr.net.

Roman V. Vasko: Doctor of Philology, Professor, Professor of the Department of Germanic and Finno-Ugric Philology, Rector of Kyiv National Linguistic University. *Research interests:* comparative and historical linguistics, linguistic typology, the history of linguistics, Germanic languages. *E-mail:* dnister@ukr.net.

Romanas V. Vasko

Kijevo nacionalinis lingvistikos universitetas

REVIEW OF THE MONOGRAPH BY MARIA
A. SHUTOVA “ETHNIC AND CULTURAL
STEREOTYPED PORTRAITS OF THE ENGLISH
AND UKRAINIANS (COGNITIVE AND
ONOMASIOLOGICAL RECONSTRUCTION OF
PHRASEOLOGICAL FORMULAE)”

Шутова М. О. Етнокультурні стереотипні портрети англійців і українців (когнітивно-ономасіологічна реконструкція фразеоформул) / Марія Олександрівна Шутова: [монографія]. – К.: Видавничий центр КНЛУ, 2016. – 293 с. – ISBN 978-966-638-312-2

Modern comparative linguistics that is anthropologically oriented (as well as cognitive linguistics in general, as I have already mentioned in one

of my previous publications [Vasko 2013, p. 3–8]), is characterized by the change of scientific view on the interpretation of word semantics which is of particular importance for etymology as a part of comparative historical linguistics and directs its study into the field of etymological analysis of the word in the unity of its meaning and form (semantic reconstruction). The development of cognitive and comparative linguistics involves research of the word etymological versions in a close contact with their cognitive perspective, particularly through the prism of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory by J. Lakoff.

Considering this statement of the problem, it is worth mentioning the assertion by E. Sweetser who claims that the complexity of semantic reconstruction as compared with phonetic reconstruction is explained not by the fact that such a task cannot be completed, but by the systemic aspect underestimation in the semantic change of the lexicon [Sweetser 1991, p. 23].

O. Trubachev and his followers were the founders of semantic reconstruction, but their studies were not completed with satisfactory results [Trubachev 2004].

New theoretical basis for the scientific synthesis of etymological analysis techniques as a necessary procedure of internal and external reconstruction (including the semantic one) in combination with the cognitive linguistics methods are being worked out in the works by O. Berezovich, L. Dronova, A. Korolyova, O. Tishchenko, S. Tolstaya et al. Nevertheless, rationale of numerous methodological guidelines initiated by W. von Humboldt are required. Language differences were derived by W. von Humboldt from the diversity of national world outlooks; different languages are not different designations of the same objects, but the variety of their visions, different interpretations of these objects. On the basis of contemporary neofunctionalism it is necessary to revise B. Serebrennikov's view that every language reflects the world in its own way, and to clarify: it interprets reality, and it is not its simple mirror reflection. Moreover, it is through the language that everything which had been created by the people before affects the individual, his/her consciousness, feelings etc.

Development of the effective approach to the reconstruction of the fragments of reality interpreted by languages is the main task of linguistic

science today. As noted by L. Dronova, objective difficulties of semantic reconstruction in modern linguistics are associated with scientifically incorrect usage of the etymological and conceptual analysis procedures and their mixing because of the researchers' non-differentiation between them which leads to their false identification.

In particular, L. Dronova states that implementation of conceptual analysis and semantic reconstruction is, as a rule, limited by the ascertainment of the proto-form external shape and its semantic content and by the attempts to link the proto-form meaning with the meaning of the lexeme in a modern language [Dronova 2012].

This methodical procedure distorts the objective results of the word semantic reconstruction and, therefore, confirmation of the assumption about the mental nature of the concept signified by this word (at least the superficial semantic link declared in many linguistic and conceptological works) cannot be a reliable proof for the verification of concept layers: conceptual, evaluative and figurative.

A felicitous procedure of semantic and onomasiological reconstruction of words and entire figurative phrases and, above all, disclosure of the cognitive mechanisms that are involved in the process of lexemes stereotyping and idioms meaning is offered in the peer-reviewed monograph by M. Shutova. The author employs methodological achievements of A. Bayburin, E. Bartminski, E. Berezovich, G. Györy, J. Hegedűs, E. Sweetser et al.

Representatives of cognitive and comparative linguistics claim that their most difficult task is to determine the universal ways of conceptualizing the world on which new lexemes' meanings develop, usually under different cultural conditions. Different ways of conceptualizing the world are explained by these researchers not only through the exponents of different cultural meanings within the national world view, but primarily as a result of the creative human thought in terms of cognitive limitations; and semantic change is considered the mechanism where cognitive function of the language is clearly revealed [Gyori, Hegedűs 2012].

This is the point of research in constructing national onomasiological portraits (E. Berezovich's term) of the English and Ukrainians. M. A. Shutova reconstructs cognitive and semantic mechanisms involved in the process of stereotyped thinking of both ethnicities. These mecha-

nisms are most clearly reflected in idioms which have become social relic verbal forms that the British and Ukrainians use in everyday life describing different everyday situations.

The author's theoretical and methodological monograph framework meets up-to-date trends of comparative historical studies performed at the intersection of historical and cognitive linguistics where the reproduction of the proto-form meaning is associated with reconstruction of the nomination motive being the basis of its continuants meaning development independently in each language as well as in comparison.

The author's referring to E. Berezovich, M. Ruth, O. Levchenko et al. expresses the idea that "the linguistic portrait of an ethnic group can be modelled on the basis of a certain set of motives reconstructed by means of cognitive and onomasiological analysis of the existing language resources that in one way or another describe national character, mentality, ritual behaviour of their culture [...]. Such kind of human experience is formed by various codes (verbal, behavioural, mythological, ideological and symbolic). They are the motivators of portrait characteristics fixed in conventional idioms which have stereotyped different situations of people's life" (p. 103–105 of the monograph).

As a result of cognitive and onomasiological reconstruction of the idioms with the main motive "the man and his life" encoded in their internal form, the researcher found out 9 profile stereotyped portrait characteristics of the English and Ukrainians. In particular, reconstructing idioms with the components *soul* / *дыуа* (*soul*), *heart* / *серце* (*heart*), the author revealed such motive-profile of the English and Ukrainians as "benevolence", but with the emphasis on its rationality (restraint), reasoning for the first nation, and affectivity (openness, sincerity) for the second one. Maria Shutova makes these assumptions on the basis of the versions' interpretations given in the Etymological dictionary by E. Klein which states that the lexeme *soul* in English originates from OE. *sāwol* and is reconstructed from Proto-Germanic **saiwalō* "that is related to a lake or sea", as well as from **saiwa-z* "lake, sea". According to the Old Germanic concepts, the lakes were supposed to be the place for living souls after death. Although, as noted by M. Shutova, following other researchers, etymology of the lexeme *soul* has not been fully clarified yet. On the other hand, contemporary English Dictionaries offer *spirit* as a synonym to *soul*,

which, according to E. Klein, originates from OE. *spirit*, *esprit*, *spirit* via L. *spiritus* “breathing, breath, breath of life, soul, mind, spirit, courage”. These lexemes are reconstructed from the PIE **spies-* “to blow” meaning “breath”, and later, from the middle of the 14th century it acquired the meaning inherent to the lexeme *mind* “character; thinking and feeling; state of mind; source of human desires” which originates from the OE. *ge-mynd* (“memory, remembrance”) and is reconstructed from PIE **men-* “to think, remember, have one’s mind aroused, apply oneself to”. Probably this meaning was associated with a person who is endowed with mind and mentality.

Main observation from the reconstruction of these idioms’ motive is such stereotype virtue as prejudice. The author refutes stereotypes about the English as they “have no soul”, citing their own autostereotypes reflected in constant unchangeable idioms that indicate kindness of the English which comes from the bottom of their hearts. Herewith, she notices that “the English soul is more streamlined, rationalized, organized by the mind [...]”, than, for example, “the Ukrainian soul which always has an irrational element. The Ukrainians are more inclined to open communication than the Westerners. To confirm these assumptions M. O. Shutova gives such an example from A Ukrainian Phraseological Dictionary as *шурока, відкрпума (е) (е) дууа / серпе* which has no matches in the English language (p. 169–172 of the monograph). The researcher argues her findings by revealing the importance of the adjectival parts of the idiomatic formulae *good, kind, honest, simple* [Merriam Webster Dictionary Online] which disclose the semantic meaning of “kindness”, but not “openness and sincerity”. As a result, the ethno-cultural stereotype of “sincerity” in the Ukrainian language is revealed through the adjective of “openness” of soul (p. 178 of the monograph).

Making use of various etymological hypotheses and ascertaining the internal form of the idiomatic formulae’s key component that preserves the relics of the original semantics has enabled the author to explain the motivational basis of the other 8 portrait features motives of the English and Ukrainians. Among these dominant features are the conservatism of the English and the preservation of national traditions of the Ukrainians, the English stereotype being “a successful nation” and the Ukrainian one being “belief in success”.

The definition of the internal form of the word and types of the primary motivation for semantic-conceptual field of ethno-cultural stereotypes (identifying the impact of cognitive factors on the possibility of their semantic development) that are important for cognitive interpretation, are based in the monograph on the process of internal reconstruction, relative chronology of linguistic facts in their correlation with a specific historical and cultural situation.

The author of the monograph uses K. Kavelin's (a Russian historian, psychologist, and anthropologist) methodical approach to reconstruction procedure. Having studied the works of the ancient Greek historian Fukidid who used the method of reconstruction, K. Kavelin suggested that the historians draw the conclusions about the spiritual significance of something in the past from the material remains in the present. K. Kavelin also reconstructed features of the Russian way of life; in particular he resumed the literal sense (onomasiological motive) of relationship between people: their rituals, customs, psychology etc.

Maria A. Shutova justifies the reliability assumption of the idiomatic formulae's motivational bases of reconstruction for modelling stereotypical portraits of the British and Ukrainian ethnic representatives relying on researches of S. Tolstaya who, investigating the problem of semantic reconstruction and semantic overlap, finds motivation as a key for the disclosure of etymological sources and sometimes a decisive factor for the specific etymological decision making.

Continuing further reflection on the depth of theoretical and methodological basis of M. A. Shutova's monograph let me quote a precise idea of P. Parshin from his work "Teoreticheskie perevoroty i metodologicheskiy myatezh v lingvistike XX veka" (Theoretical revolution and methodological mutiny in the XX cent. Linguistics // Voprosy Yazykoznanija. – 1996. – № 2. – P. 39): "the nineteenth century was the century of the method (it is the discovery of the comparative historical method by the first generation of comparativists – R. Vasko), the twentieth century was the century of the theory, it is the linguistics' theoretical development the revolution was reflected upon; it is the XXI century the tasks of methodological revolution remain to [...]."

Presumably, the author of peer-reviewed monograph "Ethnic and cultural stereotyped portraits of the English and Ukrainians (cognitive and

onomasiological reconstruction of phraseological formulae)” did not mean participating in the methodological revolution, but in any case, her work is a worthy continuation of new scientific ideas developed by her research adviser prof. A. V. Korolyova. It is a pioneer study in depth of theoretical and methodological development of the stereotypes base research from the standpoint of cognitive and comparative linguistics.

Two chapters of the monograph demonstrate theoretical and methodological approaches. In the first chapter ethno-cultural stereotypes are considered multidisciplinary subject where each science has its own theory of their study. Having synthesized in peer-reviewed monograph theoretical principles of the ethnic and cultural stereotypes’ interpretation in different spheres of human knowledge, M. A. Shutova formulated new theoretical basis for their consideration in such three areas, as 1) signs of physical reality – traditional social culture (ethnic groups, national characters and mentality that acquired the status of stereotyped communicative behaviour); 2) signs of mental sphere (conceptual and frame formations) – the structures of the language speakers’ consciousness (in this study of the English and Ukrainians); and 3) idiomatic verbal signs – set idiomatic formulae – products of collective social and cultural experience of the English and Ukrainian ethnic groups representatives (p. 19 of the monograph).

Founded on this ethnic and cultural stereotypes’ interpretation, the proposed new methodological basis for their analysis (presented in the second section of the monograph) is grounded on Karl Popper’s evolutionary epistemology and methodological achievements of cultural semiotics by A. Bayburin, L. Strauss, L. Bruhl et al., cognitive onomasiology represented in several aspects: semantic, motivational, onomasiological, cultural and symbolic (studies of E. Bartminski, E. Berezovich, O. Levchenko, M. Ruth, S. Tolstaya et al.) comparative onomasiology (by V. Manakin). Accordingly, motivation as a correlate of the method of nomination leads the researcher to the onomasiological parameters of comparison. For *tertium comparationis* she has chosen the onomasiological motive since it is invariant to its various implementations multiplicity not only within one national tradition. Each definite realization of the motive is always the updating of one aspect of its semantic meaning (p. 147 of the monograph). The declared methodological approach is, in fact, innovative in cognitive and comparative linguistics.

In the third practical chapter of the study its theoretical and methodological basis is approved. The assumption that ethno-cultural stereotypes are the conjunctive link that connects perception (consciousness) – abstraction, thinking – specification and language – verbalization is confirmed. Ethnic and cultural stereotypes are constants of the linguistic model of the world. Social idea of the environment, fixed in the definite verbal structures, is weaved into the conceptual view of the world by means of ethno-cultural stereotypes. Unlike the prototype, the content of which is neutral, ethno-cultural stereotype is always meaningful and socially, culturally and nationally marked. Ethno-cultural stereotyped images can be individual, but familiar to a large amount of people due to their regular repeatability and reproducibility by the speakers. The ethno-cultural stereotypes serve as the verbal idiomatic symbols for every definite ethnic group due to the onomasiologically motivated content (the structure of “collective cultural memory”, which is the lingual and mental cultural space that contains information on how people perceive the world and evaluate its role and their place in it).

Having been developed under various natural, social conditions etc., the English and Ukrainian ethnic groups have accumulated common and distinctive features of the national characters, the way of thinking, behaviours that are reflected in idiomatic formulae. Herewith, the researcher emphasizes the situational and historical conditions of these entities. M. A. Shutova identifies ethnic and cultural stereotypes as the speakers' persistent expressions that have remained stable and serve as the samples of folklore, and are the result of typing and reality idealization, that correlate with standards of mental perception by all members of the English and Ukrainian communities.

The research prospects and the suggestions for improving the text of the monograph include some etymological observations and comments that are not always convincing. Besides, the final paragraphs in the conclusions are too pessimistic. I would like to recommend verifying all etymological hypotheses. The author should still work on the presentation of the material in numerous tables and schemes, the computer performance is not perfect. I can also recommend arranging the language unit in the methodology chapter that is too complicated to understand.

Finally, I'd like to assume that high level of heuristic and theoretical study, considerable amount of the lexicon material (which is used to exemplify the facts) assure scientific reliability of the monograph main results.

References

- Байбурин А. К. Некоторые вопросы этнографического изучения поведения / А. К. Байбурин // Этнические стереотипы поведения. – Л.: Наука, 1985. – С. 7–21.
- Бартми́нский Е. Базовые стереотипы и их профилирование / Е. Бартми́нский // Стереотипы в языке, коммуникации, культуре: [сб. ст.] / сост. и отв. ред. Л. Л. Федорова. – М.: РГГУ, 2009. – 598 с.
- Березович Е. Л., Гулик Д. П. Ономаσιологический портрет “человека этнического”: принципы построения и интерпретации / Е. Л. Березович, Д. П. Гулик // Встречи этнических культур в зеркале языка в сопоставительном лингвокультурологическом аспекте / [отв. ред. Г. П. Нещименко]. – М.: Наука, 2002. – С. 232–253.
- Васько Р. В. Переорієнтація семантичного навантаження латинських найменувань об'єктів, предметів, понять у романських мовах / Р. В. Васько // Проблеми зіставної семантики: [зб. наук. ст.] / [відп. ред. А. В. Корольова]. – К.: Вид. центр КНЛУ, 2013. – Вип. 11. – С. 3–8.
- Дронова Л. П. Реконструкция в компаративистике и когнитивной лингвистике / Любовь Петровна Дронова // Вестник Томского государственного университета. Серия Филология. – Томск: Издательство Томского государственного ун-та, 2012. – № 4 (20). – С. 24–31.
- Корольова А. В. Когнітивна лінгвокомпаративістика : від реконструкції прамовних форм до реконструкції структур свідомості / А. В. Корольова // Вісник Київського національного лінгвістичного університету. Серія Філологія / [гол. ред. Корольова А. В.]. – К.: Вид. центр КНЛУ. – 2014. – Т. 17. – № 2. – С. 94–101.
- Толстая С. М. Мотивационные семантические модели и картина мира / Светлана Толстая // Русский язык в научном освещении. – М.: Языки славянской культуры. – 2002. – № 1 (3). – С. 112–128.
- Трубачев О. Н. Приёмы семантической реконструкции / Олег Николаевич Трубачев // Труды по этимологии. Слово. История. Культура. Т. 1. – М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. – С. 123–153.
- Трубачев О. Н. Реконструкция слов и их значений / Олег Николаевич Трубачев // Труды по этимологии. Слово. История. Культура. Т. 1. – М.: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. – С. 107–122.
- Györy G. A cognitive approach to the methodology of semantic reconstruction / Gabor Györy, Irén Hegedűs // Current Methods in Historical Semantics / [ed. by Kathryn Allan, Justyna A. Robinson]. – Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2012. – P. 313–334.
- Sweetser E. From Etymology to Pragmatics. Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure / Eve Sweetser. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. – 188 p.