

УДК 378.016

**INTEGRATING PAST AND PRESENT METHODOLOGIES OF TEACHING
FOREIGN LANGUAGES**

David Gillespie, Svetlana Gural, Marina Korneeva

Tomsk State University

Queen Mary University of London

Email: dcgillespie41@gmail.com, Gural.svetlana@mail.ru, active_eng@mail.ru

***Abstract:** this article aims to analyse the grammatical uncertainties and areas of potential confusion with the shift in russian teaching methodologies from study of the language primarily as a tool for reading to the use of foreign language as a means of international communication and discourse. One of the major sections is devoted to the translation from english into russian of colloquial phrases and common idioms. The article also includes examples taken from professional translation practice.*

***Key words:** grammar, pedagogy, methodologies, integration.*

Analysis

The teaching of Russian to English-speaking students, and indeed, foreign students as a whole, has undergone a major transition in recent decades, reflecting the shifting socio-political realities and status of the Russian language in the world. When many British schoolchildren began studying Russian in the early 1970s, it was understood that Russian was a language, in sharp contrast to French, German and Spanish, for example, that was ‘useful’ for its use as a learning resource, but largely in a passive context. It was often compared to the study of Latin, whose case system offered above all an intellectual challenge, particularly ‘useful’ for training the mind in creating logical constructions. If French, German and Spanish could be used actively in verbal and written communication with native speakers of those languages, whereby travel to and residence in the countries where those languages are spoken, travel to the Soviet Union was severely restricted, and residence there, and therefore communication with Russian native speakers, was possible only for a very narrow (and usually officially selected) group of diplomats businessmen.

Indeed, as a school subject Russian was encouraged primarily for its ‘usefulness’ as a springboard to a future career in commerce or industry where rational thought would be particularly valued. A select few could be expected to enter the teaching profession in a school or university, but usually with Russian as an ‘add-on’, and a subsidiary one, to a fluency in French, German or Spanish. French, German and Spanish were regarded as languages that could be ‘actively’ used and enjoyed, with employment and residence prospects in the countries of Western Europe as well as South and Central America. Russian had been studied in only a few British universities until the 1960s (Oxford, Cambridge, some red-brick institutions such as Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool and Birmingham), and it was, of course, encouraged as an important discipline in the British Armed Forces during the Cold War. Russian was particularly encouraged as a modern language resource in the 1960s, and university departments were created in such major universities as Bristol, Bath and Lancaster, to name a few. It is therefore no accident that many if not most teachers of Russian in schools and universities (such as mine) in the 1960s and 1970s had learned their Russian in the armed forces.

In the early years of its study, Russian was above all a language of scholarly and specialist interest, given the practical geographical difficulties inherent in travelling to such a distant country. Therefore, the early grammar books explicitly enabled the reading of Russian literature, especially the ‘classical’ tradition of the nineteenth century. No school or university curriculum would be without analysis of the works of Alexander Pushkin, Fedor Dostoevskii,

Lev Tolstói and Anton Chekhov, with the works of Mikhail Lermontov, Fedor Tiutchev, Nikolai Nekrasov and Ivan Goncharov other possible subjects. The study of twentieth century Russian literature, especially Soviet literature, was something of a rarity given the views of Russian émigré writers and scholars who entered the teaching profession in the West after leaving the Soviet Union, especially during the ‘first wave’ of emigration after 1917. No less a figure than Vladimir Nabokov asserted that Russian literature had ceased to exist in 1917, and the study of Soviet literature was not worthy of serious study.

The early Russian grammars were therefore written with the aim of enabling the English native speaker to read the great literature of the nineteenth century. Neville Forbes published his Russian Grammar in 1914, stating: ‘The book is particularly useful to those who have completed an elementary course in Russian and are continuing their studies with the aid of a Russian novel or special reader.’ (1) Similarly, Boris Unbegaun in 1957 stressed that ‘this descriptive grammar contains only the minimum necessary for the understanding of the mechanism of modern literary Russian.’ (2) A few years later Borrás and Christian shifted emphasis on the study of Russian as not only a reading discipline but also as an active academic discipline, with writing in Russian as a primary focus: ‘This book is intended to help students with a good knowledge of Russian grammar to overcome some of the difficulties in writing consecutive Russian prose.’ (3)

Study for foreign students in Soviet universities (Moscow, Leningrad, Voronezh, Minsk, Kiev, Yaroslavl) became possible in the late 1950s, then expanded throughout the 1960s until the end of the Soviet period, through various inter-governmental and inter-university cultural agreements and student exchange programmes. Consequently, the study of Russian shifted to a focus on mastering colloquial Russian as a tool and resource for actively socializing with Russian native speakers, in particular with added attention given in schools and universities to the spoken language. In 1993 Derek Offord announced this new emphasis: ‘This course book gives students the solid grammatical foundation which is essential if they are to read, write and speak Russian well.’ (4) In his continuation of this approach, in 1996 Professor Offord demonstrated that the study of Russian grammar was important not only in order to read Russian literature, but also to speak the language with fluency and confidence, as Russian was now being studied by thousands in British and American universities, and the vast majority of those students spending extended periods of time (usually over three months) in Russia: ‘Unlike conventional grammars, this book gives special attention to those areas of vocabulary and grammar which cause most difficulty to English speakers. It will be invaluable to those students seeking to improve their fluency and confidence in Russian.’ (4)

The use of Russian for social, cultural and now professional purposes is reflected in the latest grammar textbook, first published by Terence Wade in 1996: ‘This book is meant for English-speaking pupils and students of Russian at the post-introductory stage, and also a reference aid for teachers, translators and interpreters and others who use the language in a professional capacity.’ A Comprehensive Russian Grammar is soon to see its fourth edition, in a new redaction by the authors of this paper intended to reflect and analyze changes in modern usage, particularly in the digital and social-media conscious age. (5)

The new commercial and cultural realities of post-Soviet Russia have revealed new complexities in the development of grammar. One of the most obvious challenges is the ambivalence surrounding the concept of animacy. Although it is understood to say ловить омаров ‘to catch (live, i.e. animate) lobsters’, and therefore есть, покупать омары ‘to eat, buy (dead, i.e. inanimate) lobsters’, it is common to see in Russian restaurants such phrases as как разделать рака, краба (‘how to dress crayfish, crab’). The distinction applies mainly to crustaceans, but is not consistently observed, e.g. мы ели кальмаров, устриц (‘we were eating squid, oysters’), but мы готовили креветки (‘we were cooking shrimps’). ‘Kiwi’ when

denoting the fruit is inanimate: я вижу эти киви на полке ('I see the kiwi fruit on the shelf'), but animate when referring to the bird: я вижу этих бродящих киви ('I see the kiwi roaming').

Similarly, colloquial treatment of personal possessions, indicating increased emotional attachment, can change the status of inanimate objects, such as cars: phrases such as я вожу Форда ('I drive a Ford') is becoming common.

Words such as большинство, меньшинство, несколько can also raise also raise interesting pedagogical issues. They traditionally take a singular predicate, as in the following examples:

(i) In passive constructions: Большинство писем доставлено 'Most letters have been delivered'.

(ii) Where it has no post-positive dependent form: Большинство участвует в общественной жизни 'Most participate in public life'.

(iii) Where the dependent form is in the genitive singular or is the genitive plural of an inanimate noun:

Большинство населения пострадало от наводнения ('Most of the population suffered as a result of the flood');

Большинство телефонов в городе безмолвствует (Тендриakov) ('Most telephones in the town are silent');

When, however, большинство has a dependent form in the genitive plural of an animate noun, a plural predicate is possible:

Singular and plural nouns can also cause confusion. The singular of the object is regarded as the norm in constructions such as Все повернули голову 'Everyone turned their head(s)', where identical objects or parts of the body belong to or relate to each member of a group. A plural noun is recommended only when differentiation is essential: Все подняли руку 'Everyone raised their hand', cf. Все подняли руки 'Everyone raised their arms'. Otherwise the singular is the preferred form:

Собаки бежали, поджав хвост ('The dogs were running along with their tails between their legs');

Все со связанными за спиной руками (Рубakov) ('All with their hands tied behind their backs');

Мамаша, бабушка и папа в красных носках и с таким же красным лицом (Granin) ('Mum, Gran and Dad in red socks and with similarly red faces');

However, there are signs of the alternative use of the plural in modern Russian:

Мужики слушали его, одобрительно кивая головами (Dovlatov) ('The peasants listened to him, nodding their heads in approval');

Они стояли с раскрытыми ртами (Kunin) ('They stood with their mouths wide open');

Мы пожали друг другу руки (Рубakov) ('We shook hands');

Place names can also be a source of confusion, which may arise, for instance, in the case of towns in -ин and -ино, where only the former declines: в городе Пушкине 'in the town of Pushkin', cf. в городе Пушкино 'in the town of Pushkino'.

If we turn our attention to colloquial phrases and idioms, as a general rule the translation of English metaphors should be avoided, with a literal rendering preferred. Below is a list of common examples.

Bad egg: someone or something that disappoints expectations: непутёвый человек

Chalk and cheese: two extreme opposites: как день и ночь

Cliff-hanger: a suspense situation: событие с трудно предсказуемым исходом

Down the pan: irreversibly ruined or lost: пойти прахом

Elephant in the room: an obvious topic that is being ignored because of its awkward nature: что-то очевидное но игнорируемая, на что никто не обращает внимания

Jack of all trades, master of none: know a little about a lot of things but not be an expert in anything: на все берется да ничего не удается

Knight in shining armour: someone who saves a situation: принц на белом коне

Little bird told me, a: an anonymous person told me: сорока на хвосте принесла

Movers and shakers: charismatic and influential people: влиятельные люди

One for the road: a final drink before leaving for somewhere: посощок

Pipe dream, a: an extremely unrealistic desire or goal: несбыточная мечта

Red herring: a deliberately deceiving thing: ложная улика

Shot in the arm: a quick but highly effective improvement of something: толчок к росту, развитию

Shot in the dark: an uneducated guess or attempt: попытка вслепую

The life of Riley: an easy life: жить припеваючи

McCoy, the real: something genuine, original: подлинный

Frog in the throat, a: a sore throat that causes you to talk strangely: хрипота

Hair of the dog that bit you: usually alcohol related, it refers to having a drink to cure a hangover: опохмелка

Two pennies' worth: a opinion on a matter (not usually requested): мое скромное мнение

Wet behind the ears: a novice: молокосос.

Finally, special mention should be made of the use of similes and proverbs, which are very common in English and the translation of which should always err on the side of caution and clarity, as in the following examples

Similes

As busy as a bee: busy: вертеться как белка в колесе

As cold as any stone: cold: холодный как лёд

As cool as a cucumber: relaxed, cool: спокойный

As daft as a brush: daft: глуп как пробка

As dead as a dodo: dead and gone: мертвый и похороненный

As dead as a doornail: dead and gone: без всякого сомнения мертвый

As easy as pie: easy: проще простого

As fast as greased lightning: fast: с быстротой молнии

Proverbs

A chain is only as long as its weakest link: a team is only as effective as its weakest part: где тонко – там и рвётся

Birds of a feather flock together: similar types of people stick together: рыбак рыбака видит издалека

Butter wouldn't melt in his mouth: a cool person who is relaxed in all situations: он воды не замутит

Curiosity killed the cat: an expression used to tell someone not to be nosey: любопытной Варваре на базаре нос оторвали

Cut off your nose to spite your face: to cause damage to yourself just to harm another: назло мужу сяду в лужу

Forewarned is forearmed: if you know about a negative situation, you can be prepared for it: знал бы где упасть, соломку бы подстелил

He who laughs last laughs loudest: literal: Смеётся тот, кто смеётся последним

If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen: if you can't handle a situation then get out of it: Волков бояться – в лес не ходить

Many a true word spoken in jest: people often say truths as if they are jokes: в каждой шутке есть доля правды

Speak softly and carry a big stick: let your actions be stronger and more forceful than your words: мягко стелить, жёстко спать

Sticks and stones may break my bones but words will never harm me: I don't take offence easily: хоть горшком назови, только в печку не ставь

The early bird catches the worm: starting something early will get the best results: кто рано встаёт, тому Бог подаёт

You can't get blood out of a stone: some things are simply impossible: из стекла бриллиант не сделаешь

You can't teach an old dog new tricks: an old/experienced person can't learn new ideas/methods: Старого учить – что мёртвого лечить

Conclusion

Methodologies for the teaching of Russian as a foreign language in English-speaking countries (and probably not only there) have been profoundly affected by the socio-economic and cultural changes of the past three decades. Russian as a 'grammar-heavy' language requires a robust pedagogy, one that in modern conditions must integrate both the passive reading ability emphasised in grammars of the 20th century, and the more communicative approach demanded by modern sensibilities. It seems reasonable to assume that Russian grammar and syntax will continue to develop and adapt in the context of globalization in the digital age. In the teaching of English to Russian students, especially idiomatic expressions and sayings from popular discourse, caution should be used when approaching metaphors, which are more widely-used in English and Russian, and where appropriate a more literal rendering should be attempted.

Bibliography

1. Russian Grammar by Neville Forbes, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1914 (second edition 1916, third edition 1964).
2. Russian Grammar, by B. O. Unbegaun, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1957.
3. Russian Syntax: Aspects of Modern Russian Syntax and Vocabulary, by F. M. Borras and R. F. Christian, Oxford, the Clarendon Press, 1959 (second edition 1971).
4. Modern Russian: An Advanced Grammar Course, by Derek Offord, Bristol, Bristol Classical Press, 1993
5. Using Russian: A Guide to Contemporary Usage, by Derek Offord, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996 (second edition 2005).
6. Psikhologiya i pedagogika kontekstnogo obrazovaniia, edited by A. A. Verbitskii, St Petersburg, Nestor-Istoriia, 2018.
7. Antropotsetricheskie nauki v obrazovanii: kollektivnaia monografiia, edited by E. P. Komarova, Voronezh, Nauchnaia kniga, 2019.
8. A Comprehensive Russian Grammar, by Terence Wade, 1992, second edition 2000, third edition 2010, edited by David Gillespie, fourth edition 2020, edited by David Gillespie, Svetlana Gural' and Marina Korneeva, London and New York, Wiley-Blackwell
9. Aristova I.V. Teachers Readiness Formation For Development Of Systems Thinking On The Basis Of Conceptual Pedagogical Model / E.P. Komarova, N.A. Sapozhkova, I.V. Aristova, I.K. Yartseva // Language and Culture. - 2020. - №51. - С. 119-128.
10. Baklashova, T.A. Challenges Of International Students Adjustment To A Higher Education Institution / T.A. Baklashova, A.V. Kazakov // International Journal of Environmental and Science Education. - 2016. - Т.11, №8. - С. 1821-1832.
11. Sapozhkova N.A. Modeling Of Socio-Economic System / E.P. Komarova, N.A. Sapozhkova // Антропоцентрические науки: инновационный взгляд на образование и развитие личности: материалы VII Междунар. науч.-практич. конф. – Воронеж: Научная книга, 2018. - С. 304-305.

12. Biryukova N.V. FORMATION OF PROFESSIONAL ORIENTATION OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS TO MEDICAL PROFESSION BY USING ICT TOOLS // N.M. Molodozhnikova, N.V. Biryukova, J.B. Lazareva, N.N. Stroiteleva, O.V. Galustyan // International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning. - 2020. - Т. 15, № 1. - С. 231-239.

13. Mazkina O.B. PEDAGOGICAL FUNCTIONS WITHIN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS / E.A. Levanova, M.V. Sleptsova, O.V. Khripunkova, O.B. Mazkina // Espacios. - 2018. - Т.39, №43. - С. 22.

УДК 811.112.2'367367

СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ ОСОБЕННОСТЕЙ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ЛЕКСИКИ АВТОМОБИЛЬНОГО ДИСКУРСА В АНГЛИЙСКОМ И НЕМЕЦКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

В.В. Гладких, Е.Г. Скребова, М.И. Лысунов, А.В. Варлыгин
ВУНЦ ВВС «ВВА имени профессора Н.Е. Жуковского и Ю.А. Гагарина» (г. Воронеж)
E-mail: voenprof.gv@yandex.ru, yaiu@mil.ru

***Аннотация:** в статье представлено сопоставительное исследование терминологической лексики автомобильного дискурса в английском и немецком языках, на материале одной из ведущих, динамически развивающихся сфер – автомобилестроения.*

***Ключевые слова:** автомобильный дискурс, коммуникативная ситуация, социальное пространство, термин.*

На сегодняшний день не существует единого мнения по поводу определения понятия «дискурс». Этот факт объясняется тем, что типология дискурса, как любая другая классификация, может строиться на различных основаниях. Можно даже сказать, что разновидностей дискурса столько, сколько видов деятельности человека, поскольку каждый вид деятельности порождает свой собственный вид дискурса с присущей ему лексикой и стилистикой. Поскольку дискурс проявляется и функционирует в процессе коммуникации, а коммуникация всегда происходит в определенном социальном пространстве, для дискурсивного анализа характерно рассмотрение не дискурса вообще, а конкретного дискурса. Исходя из этого, в данной статье предлагается рассмотрение особенностей процессов терминообразования автомобильного дискурса в английском и немецком языках. В этом направлении интерес представляют как исследования, проводимые на материале одного языка, так и исследования контрастивного характера, требующие вовлечения нескольких языков. Анализ лексики конкретного естественного языка с привлечением экстралингвистических критериев, позволяет выявить ассоциации, образные представления носителей языка о явлениях окружающей действительности. Работы сопоставительного характера демонстрируют их сходство и различия. Изучение языкового отражения инноваций в области автомобильной терминологии сопоставляется с анализом соответствующих областей дискурса. При отборе материала для исследования в научно-техническом дискурсе можно выделить два подхода: узкий и широкий. В первом случае в качестве источников исследования используются только тексты, непосредственно созданные специалистами. Такие тексты относятся к числу научно-технических и обладают существенной спецификой. При широком подходе к отбору источников для исследования коммуникации в области,