

текст до получения им статуса основного объекта лингвистического исследования. Но даже сейчас многие аспекты текстовой проблематики требуют дополнительного изучения. Так, например, в ближайшей перспективе следовало бы расширить понимание текста как сложного языкового знака до понятия текста-дискурса, т.к. текст как единица языка потенциально дискурсивен, а дискурс по форме своего существования текстуален.

ON APPLICATION OF G. HOFSTEDÉ'S THEORY IN BELARUS

Коришук Е. В., Белорусский государственный университет

For obvious reasons—lack of IBM in the country and the fact that the country itself did not exist as a separate unit for a long time — no studies have been carried by G. Hofstede in Belarus.

Belarus emerged as a separate country in 1991, for the first time in its history.

Due to geo-political and historical reasons the territory of the country turned into a crossroads of transit routes from the North Sea to the Black and the Mediterranean Seas, from Continental Europe to Russia and further to Asia as well as from Asia to Europe.

Belarus was part of bigger multicultural, multinational states most of its history, starting with the Kievan Rus in the 9th—12th centuries, Great Duchy of Lithuania 12th—16th centuries, Rzecz Pospolita 16th—18th centuries, the Russian Empire and then the USSR. This led to the formation of an outstanding adaptation and integration techniques, acceptance, tolerance, division of labour on the one hand and to a very subdued sense of cultural identity, on the other.

Today Belarus is trying hard to find its place in the modern world, to build its own image. The process requires overcoming the presumably low degree of national identity awareness. The famous quotation runs, «To know how other people behave takes intelligence, but to know myself takes wisdom. (*John Heider, The Tao of Leadership, 1998*)». The least a teacher of intercultural communication can do is to promote understanding and knowledge of the students' own culture.

Going back to the starting point, there is no data on Belarusian cultural profile collected with the use of Hofstede's or von Trompenaars' methodology. Meanwhile under favourable circumstances data can be collected at the request of the author of this or that taxonomy, as it happened with Richard Lewis's National Cultural Profile. As a result, we have at least a pilot study data on NCP at present.

Another possibility is given by a series of interactive cross-cultural games like "Cultural Detective" that help to get acquainted with the values and analyze the cultural "bumps" people experience when the values of the interlocutors differ.

But where should the Belarusians place themselves on Hofstede's dimensions scale that proved to be very convenient for the application in both research and everyday life?

The options which might be suggested as possible ways of approaching the problem are as follows:

— collecting papers written by students who evaluate themselves, their relatives and friends according to Hofstede's dimensions. A certain number of such papers might be further analyzed to distinguish the major trends, to draw some conclusions about the position of Belarus on the scale;

— compiling surveys on comparative behaviour analysis performed by students who have first-hand experience of communicating with other cultures;

— estimating the existing data in accordance with Hofstede's theory.

This approach might develop other ways of learning our own culture so as to be able to become competent in intercultural communication.

ОСОБЕННОСТИ КОНТЕКСТУАЛЬНОЙ АНТОНИМИИ В АНГЛОЯЗЫЧНОМ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

Месячик А. А., Минский государственный лингвистический университет

Коммуникация в сфере политики характеризуется высокой степенью манипулятивности. В ней цель говорящего заключается преимущественно в том, чтобы навязать аудитории определенную точку зрения на ситуацию, внедрить в сознание слушателя ту или иную оценку явлений и событий.

Одним из семантических приемов, эксплуатируемых создателями политических текстов для осуществления указанных интенций, является прием семантического контраста, средством реализации которого в политическом тексте чаще всего выступают контекстуальные антонимы.

Противопоставляемые в речи ораторов единицы обычно подчеркивают важные для политического текста идеи. К таким идеям, безусловно, принадлежат сотрудничество и согласие: *In 1776, cynics and skeptics could not see an independent America.... They saw only 13 colonies that could never hang together and would surely hang separately* (C. Rice's Remarks at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee's Annual Policy). Данный фрагмент выступления К. Райс интересен тем, что здесь она апеллирует сразу к двум прецедентным для американской аудитории фактам: ключевому в американской истории событию (принятию в 1776 г. Декларации Независимости), а также к высказыванию одного из самых популярных и уважаемых в истории США государственных деятелей Б. Франклина «If we don't hang together, we hang separately». Обращение к прецеденту используется говорящим для подтверждения значимости высказываемой мысли.

В контекстуальных антонимических сочетаниях нередко противопоставляются позитивно окрашенные слова, обозначающие активные действия, и пейоративно окрашенные в речи единицы, выражающие пассивность, бездействие (*engagement — indifference, react — wait, confront problems — pass them on to future generations*). В таких противопоставлениях лексемы, представляющие зону активности, часто являются эфемизмами: *We live in an era of global challenges. Old security concepts no longer apply. We have to find new solutions to new problems. Sometimes, we may have to improvise. Sometimes we will make mistakes, and we will have to learn from those mistakes. Yet one thing is clear: to safeguard our security today, we have to engage. And that means that we have to project and promote stability. I am aware that not everyone might agree with this. For some, indifference may seem less risky than engagement* («Addressing Global Security»: Speech by NATO Secretary General); *Historically, democratic societies have been slow to react to gathering threats, tending instead to wait to confront threats until they are too dangerous to ignore, or until it is too late* (C. Rice's Opening Statement before the 9/11 Commission).