

FOLKLORE-PRAGMATIK: BILDUNG DES FOLKLORE-TEXTES AUS ZEITPERSPEKTIVE

Abduvahobova Mahina Azatovna

Der außerordentliche Professor, Ph.D. an der Uzbekistan State University of World Languages

Abstrakt: Die den Volkskundlern derzeit zur Verfügung stehenden Beschreibungen von Folklore basieren hauptsächlich auf der Definition von Folklore als einer bestimmten Form von Kreativität. Literatur ist der Folklore am nächsten, die dasselbe Material (Sprache) verwendet. Die moderne Klassifizierung der Folklore basiert auf den Prinzipien von Aristoteles: Folkloregenes werden in Analogie zu literarischen Genres in Typen, letztere in Gattungen gruppiert. Grundlage für eine solche Einordnung ist die Definition von Kreativität als Oberbegriff der Folklore. Gleichzeitig ist es unwahrscheinlich, dass irgendjemand daran zweifeln wird, dass ein bedeutender Teil der Folklore nicht mehr als jede andere menschliche Aktivität Kreativität ist. Die Richtung der Folklore-Aktion ist der Richtung des kreativen Akts entgegengesetzt. Ein Lied singen, einen Zaun bauen, ein Tuch weben - all dies sind Aktionen, die darauf abzielen, mit bekannten Technologien Neues zu schaffen. Kreativität in der traditionellen Kultur kann als Kreativität innerhalb bekannter Technologie (oder Handwerkskunst) definiert werden.

Schlüsselwörter: Folklore, Diskurs, Pragmatik, intertextuelle und vortextuelle Beziehungen, Folkloristen, Sprechakte.

FOLKLORE PRAGMATICS: FORMATION OF THE FOLKLORE TEXT FROM A TIME PERSPECTIVE

Abduvahobova Mahina Azatovna

The associate professor, Ph.D. at the Uzbekistan State University of World languages

Abstract. The descriptions of folklore currently available to folklorists are primarily based on the definition of folklore as a particular form of creativity. Literature is the closest phenomenon to folklore that uses the same material (language). The modern classification of folklore is based on the principles set by Aristotle: folklore genres are grouped into types, the latter into genera, by analogy with literary genres. The basis for such a classification is the definition of creativity as a generic concept about folklore. At the same time, it is unlikely that anyone will doubt that a significant part of folklore is creativity no more than any other human activity. The direction of the folklore action is opposite to the direction of the creative act. Sing a song, build a fence, weave a cloth - all these are actions aimed at creating new things using well-known technologies. Creativity in traditional culture can be defined as creativity within known technology (or craftsmanship).

Keywords: folklore, discourse, pragmatics, intertextual and pre-textual relations, folklorists, speech acts.

A folklore work may not be a creative act, but it cannot be a speech act. The definition of our subject may sound as follows: folklore is a special form of oral speech [4; 1]. But what is the specificity of folklore in relation to the general field of oral speech? Researchers involved in the analysis of oral speech determine its following characteristics: unpreparedness of the speech act; informal nature of communication; colloquialism; the spontaneous nature of the dialogue; personal nature of communication. B.M.Gasparov also highlights the factors associated with the visual channel of information transmission: kinetic (characterizing the movement of the speaker relative to the listener); spacial (determining the distance between different points of the body of the speaker and the listener); tactile, paraphonic [9].

All the proposed factors, with the exception of oral language, do not cover folk discourse as a whole. So, for example, the definition of the official or unofficial status of a speech event for folklore discourse is more likely to be a problem of analysis than its starting point; the same can be said about the preparedness / unpreparedness of speech [20]. A preference for privacy or publicity will characterize different genres of folklore in different ways.

Factors noted by B.M.Gasparov specify oral speech in relation to written speech, but do not allow us to single out the area of interest to us from the general field of oral speech, which forces us to determine a special indicator that would distinguish between oral spontaneous and folklore speech in principle [9]. As such an indicator, we will take the sign formulated by P.G.Bogatyrev, “setting on tradition” [3], because this indicator functionally characterizes the specifics of folklore speech. At the formal level, this feature is manifested in an increased, in comparison with spontaneous oral speech, stereotype of folklore statements, or their regulation, as K.V.Chistov [4]. Stereotyping covers all levels of folklore text - from prosodic to syntax. At the level of intonation, it manifests itself in an orientation towards repetitions of rhythm, at the level of vocabulary - on the stability of tropes, at the level of syntax - on the reproduction of a limited number of constructions, etc.

According to this parameter, the folklore phenomenon is in the same class as other cultural phenomena created by man: forms - tools, social behavior, buildings, the reproduction of which is preserved over time (in sociology, this is usually called habitus). These forms represent a set of technologies that are the most resistant to entropy processes and, therefore, the most costly in terms of energy. The above suggests, in turn, the fact that for the society the preservation of these technologies is a vital task.

The change of technology - the change in social practice, no matter what part of it may concern - always has a social reorganization as its consequence. If this is so, then the reverse thesis should also be true - the preservation of technology without change is a way of preserving social relations [21]. Reproduction, oriented to the canon, controlled by society in terms of acceptable innovations, is a manifestation of tradition. Tradition manifests itself in a variety of areas of practice, and the practice of speech acts regulated by tradition is one of them. . In this regard, folklore is a special social institution for managing human behavior.

For a long time, what fell into the “bins of culture” [4], and, therefore, has already passed the “preliminary censorship of the collective” [3], has become the object of close attention of folklorists. In the late 1980s there was a paradigm shift in the social and humanitarian disciplines, which led to a change in the objects and methods of research. The “anthropological boom” also affected folklore: the interests of researchers swung away from the text as an imminent structure to “communication, social, cultural aspects of tradition” [14: 10]. The text itself begins to interest the researcher not by itself, but by virtue of its anthropocentricity, subjectivity, due to its ability to become a sign mediator creating and interpreting human discourses [17]. N.V.Drannikova also writes about this, who notes that “in the focus of attention of folklorists at the end of the 20th century. It turns out not to be a text, but pre-textual forms, intertextual and pre-textual relations, folkloristics is “anthropologized” [6: 43].

This gives the study of folklore writings a unique perspective. Any folklore education must be taken into account at all stages of its development: before the collective's so-called censorship [16], during the acceptance of the text, and after the censorship has been passed. The essay is based on an attempt to outline the essential elements in the "history of formation" of the folklore fact. The path to become a folkloric fact is not straightforward. The "requirements" to the text ("censorship") at various phases may turn out to be mutually exclusive (cf. social psychology's "filter theory") - passing one step does not guarantee passing the next.

Furthermore, multidirectional principles act simultaneously: on the one hand, a text that has passed the selection falls into the "bins of culture" [4], on the other hand, risks begin to collect in parallel, prompting routinization processes, as well as degradation and loss. Consider the "collective censorship" of each step using folklore non-fairytale prose works as an example.

The pretext era is an important part of the folklore fact development process. The narrative must meet certain conditions during the pretext stage. The story's central incident must be original, exclusive, and one-of-a-kind (from the point of view of the narrator). Regardless of the improbability of the incident, the individual or group must assess the account as true. In this scenario, we're talking about a unique form of truth: "testimony" truth. According to J.Austin's wise observation, a message is only considered evidence if the person's statement is of the performative type. "Reporting such a statement is judged not to be true" just in this circumstance.

"Reporting such a statement is considered not so much information about what was said - in order to minimise the spread of rumours that are invalid for the court - but about what was done, about some action of this individual" [2: 31–32]. The transformative power of testimony can create new cults (for example, reverence of a source due to the miraculous apparition of an icon on it), serve as a basis for propaganda and persecution of entire peoples [7: 216], and even trigger ritual murders [8: 181-183]. Despite the performative's essential truth, there are always people who challenge it. The accounts of peasants who unintentionally observed the miraculous apparition of an icon on a spring, for example, attract the attention of church authorities, who then launch an investigation into the miracle. The

Consistory's study always yields the same result: "the icon is neither revealed nor miraculous" [12: 236–240].

The pretext stage difference in points of view on the narration is not a flaw, but rather a unique character of the work. It's no surprise that L. Degh figuratively equates the legendary narration to a lawsuit: in the world of the "legendary," defenders and opponents of the faith struggle like the plaintiff and defendant in court [5: 3-4]. It's important to note that it's not just the listeners that have doubts about the content (in our example, the church authorities, who do not trust the peasants who witnessed the miraculous event). The conflict between "for" and "against" also happens in the mind of the narrator, who suffers from cognitive dissonance as a result of the novelty and originality of the story. The narrator begins to have doubts about the occurrence and "wavers" about it. Excessive story describing, a lack of structure, several repetitions, vows of the veracity of what is being recounted, misgivings about the nature of a miraculous event, the existence of a questioning opponent, and many other evidence of the narrator's "fluctuation" in the text. The narrator seems to purposefully include traces of his hesitation in the text, or at the very least does not try to hide them. Because of this, we believe the narrator is able to reconcile the text's two opposing modalities: improbability and (but) truth (for more details, [11; 12: 60-70]). It's telling that the subjective and intersubjective processes of experience sedimentation are already underway at this point [13: 114]. Variations and retellings of the story emerge as a result of sedimentation. The intersubjective sedimentation variants, which might occur "when numerous individuals have a common biography, a common experience" [13: 113], imply that this folklore construction has the potential to end up in "bins of culture."

The second stage is the stage of folklore text formation. Text, past the "censorship of the collective", exists in tradition during a wide variety of options. According to the concept of B.N. Putilov, there is a certain hierarchy of event variants that differ in the degree of deviation from the "main" line: variants, variations, editions, versions, independent works [18; 19: 211]. In tradition, not retelling is carried out, but a story - the process of text formation is not suspended (as a rule, quasi-memorials about an event appear). The presence of various versions of the event testifies to the relevance of the information contained in the texts of legends, about the living nature of the tradition: "Any phenomenon is viable only as long as it is capable of changing the structure" [10: 102].

Over time, one of the versions may receive official recognition - they begin to print it in the local press, broadcast it at school in local history lessons, etc. An officially fixed plot (often in the written word) undergoes minimal variation, which can be compared with "vibration" in very limited limits [15]. The plot is so formed and known to everyone that it is not necessary to talk about the process of text formation. Informants retell known information to everyone. The official recognition of an event and, accordingly, the fixation (often in writing) of the only true plot can lead to routinization, conservation, and even degradation of the oral tradition. At the stage of the pretext of the folklore fact, there was a kind of struggle for the "truth" of the story about the incredible event. At the third stage, the struggle for truth is

crowned with victory. This, in turn, destroys the balance of the incredible and the true necessary for legendary texts: a miracle turns into history, a legend into a legend.

Analysis of the text itself, without regard to its "anthropocentricity" and "subjectivity" [17] significantly impoverishes (sometimes makes it almost impossible) the understanding of the processes taking place in the tradition.

References

1. Artemenko, E.B. (1995). The structure of the folklore text in its relation to language and speech. // Language and ethnic mentality. Petrozavodsk, pp. 95-106.
2. Austin, J. L. (1986). Word as action // New in foreign linguistics. Issue. XVII. Theory of speech acts. / General ed. B.Yu. Gorodetsky. Moscow, Pp. 22–129.
3. Bogatyrev, P.G., Yakobson, R.O. (1971). Folklore as a special form of creativity. // Bogatyrev P.G. Questions theories of folk art. Moscow, S. 369-83.
4. Chistov, K.V. (1988). Oral speech and problems of folklore.// History, culture, ethnography and folklore of the Slavic peoples. 10th International Congress of Slavists. Moscow, Pp. 326-340.
5. Degh, L. (2001). Legend and Belief. Dialectics of a Folklore Genre. Indiana University.
6. Drannikova, N.V. (2015). "Folklore": to the question of the history of the use of the term and its meaning in Russian science //Proceedings of the Karelian Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences. No. 8. S. 39–45.
7. Dundes, A. (2003). "Blood libel", or the legend of ritual murder: anti-Semitism through the prism of projective inversion // Dundes A. Folklore: semiotics and / or psychoanalysis. Sat. Art. / Comp. A.S. Arkhipova. M., 2003. S. 204–231.
8. Ellis, B. (1991). 'Contemporary Legend' – Cracks or Breakthroughs? // Folklore. Vol. 102. no. 2. P. 183–186.
9. Gasparov, B.M. (1998). Oral speech as a semiotic an object. // Scientific notes of TSU. T. 442. Tartu, Pp. 63-87.
10. Kerbelite, B. (2006). New possibilities of structural-semantic classification of fairy tales // Problems of structural-semantic indicators: Collection of articles. / Ed. A.V. Rafeeva. Moscow, Pp. 93–113.
11. Lipatova, A.P. (2011). Archival files about supposedly appearing icons as a source of ethnographic research // Ethnography of Altai and adjacent territories Proceedings of the international scientific conference. Edited by Shcheglova T.K. Barnaul, Pp. 236–240.
12. Lipatova, A.P. (2019). Variation of the legend. Moscow.
13. Luckman, T. (1995). The Social Construction of Reality. Treatise on the sociology of knowledge. Moscow.
14. Neklyudov, S.Yu. (2018). Folklore at the "anthropological turn" // Folklore and Anthropology of the City. Pp. 9–13.
15. Neklyudov, S.Yu. (2003). Living speech and the language of folklore.// Slavic ethno-linguistics and problems of studying traditional folk culture. Proceedings of the International Conference on the 80th Anniversary of Acad. N.I. Tolstoy. Moscow.

16. Pocheptsov, G.G. (1997). Communicative aspects of semantics. Kiev.
17. Poselyagin, N. (2012). Anthropological turn in Russian Humanities // BFO. No. 113 (<http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2012/113/po5.html>).
18. Putilov, B.M. (1993). Folklore and folk culture. SPb. Pp. 4-14.
19. Putilov, B.N. (2003). Folklore and folk culture; In memories. SPb.
20. Todorov, T. (1991). An introduction to fantasy literature. / Per. from fr. B. Narumova. M.
21. Zaitsev, A.I. (2001). Cultural upheaval in Ancient Greece in the 3rd-5th centuries. BC e. SPb.