студенти поступово отримують уявлення про те, де, коли і як вони можуть скористатися професійною іноземною лексикою.

Висловлюючись на професійні теми, студенти активніше використовують відповідну лексику. Підводячи підсумки атестації, завжди слід відзначати особистий прогрес кожного. Приріст «навчального продукту» у всіх, зрозуміло, різний, але факт приросту відзначається у всіх, хто регулярно відвідував заняття. На закінчення ще раз підкреслимо, що в процесі вивчення професійної лексики на заняттях з англійської мови у студентів «... формується соціокультурна іншомовна компетенція, необхідна для успішної професійної діяльності в іншомовному середовищі, з представниками різних культур.

Література:

1. Суркова Е.В., Вишневецкая Н.А., Романова О.Н. Психолингвистические особенности смыслового восприятия иноязычного профессионального на слух и формирование аудитивной компетенции студентов // Бизнес. Образование. Право. В 2. Сальная Л.К. Обучение аудированию научной речи// Известия ЮФИ. Технические науки. 2013. №10. С. 126-131.

2. Михайлова В. Обучение профессионально ориентированной лексики специалистов вузов// Вестник ТГПУ. 2013. № 9. С. 104-107.

3. Николаева Н. Особенности обучения аудированию профессиональных текстов на английском языке в техническом вузе // Вопросы современной науки и практики. 2015. №3(57). С. 201–208.Вестник Волгоградского института бизнеса. 2016. № 2 (35). С. 275–279.

VERBALIZATION OF THE EPISTEMIC FACTOR IN TOPIC CONTEXTUALIZATION

Kovalchuk L. V.
Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Senior Lecturer at the English Philology Department
Lesya Ukrainka Volyn National University
Lutsk, Ukraine

Within the framework of the current cognitive-communicative paradigm there is a general tendency of rethinking context and defining it not as an

objectively existing phenomenon, but as specific mental models generated by interlocutors in the process of communication that represent the relevant properties of the communicative environment in their episodic memory.

Accordingly, in course of topic contextualization – a linguo-cognitive operation focused on topic specification – different relevant communicative factors (spatio-temporal, status and role, epistemic, affective) are explicated through the prism of their interpretation by the communicative partners.

T. A. van Dijk, the founder of the sociocognitive context theory, suggests that «contexts, defined as mental models, need a special knowledge component that represents the relevant beliefs of speakers or hearers about the knowledge of their interlocutors. In other words, language users not only need to have general «knowledge of the world», and not only knowledge about the current communicative situation, but of course also mutual knowledge about each other's knowledge. These assumptions are relevant dimensions of the current communicative situation [1, p. 72].

The communicative status of the epistemic factor of topic contextualization presupposes the involvement of common background knowledge and communicative competence of interlocutors represented by the extensive potential of verbal expression in the discourse.

We consider background knowledge as common implicit information for both communicative partners that is added to the content of the verbal utterance and enables to optimize its perception and understanding [5, p. 636]. In our case, it's the general presuppositional (situational and non-situational (sociocultural)) fund of the speaker and the listener without which their common communicative interaction aimed at topic contextualization will be blocked or become almost impossible.

Communicative competence is qualified as the ability of interlocutors to mobilize different knowledge of verbal and non-verbal means, situation, rules and norms of behavior, society and culture in order to perform effectively certain communicative tasks in corresponding contexts and situations [5, p. 233]. The general communicative competence encompasses such constituents as linguistic competence, discursive competence, sociolinguistic competence, sociocultural competence, strategic competence, illocutionary competence and creates the basis for differentiating knowledge that is a part of the individual cognitive space of each communicative partner.

The degree of interlocutors' topic awareness at the beginning (initial awareness) and at the end (additive awareness) of communication is quite different. In course of verbal interaction the communicative partners acquire and accumulate new information about the topic under discussion that contributes to the effective topic contextualization.

According to T. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, «Creativity in language production is an interaction between the old and the new. The new cannot be produced or understood by a human being totally independently of the familiar material. It may be thought of either in terms of rearrangements and/or multiplication of the known stereotypic patterns, or in terms of introducing new elements to the existing patterns by establishing new connections between them, by their reconfigurations» [3, p. 98].

The speaker as the initiator of topic contextualization has to activate not only his own knowledge, but also to hypothetically model his communicative partner's knowledge. To achieve this, he usually applies the following K(knowledge)-strategies [2, p. 84–88]: 1) K 1 – the strategy of activation of already shared information *(«Did I tell you about...?», «You remember...», «As I have already said...»)*; 2) K 2 – the strategy of introducing new information by means of explaining some new facts about the topic.

Differences in knowledge form the intellectual distance between interlocutors. According to the results of our research, the smaller the intellectual distance, the more implicit the topic contextualization and, vice versa, the greater the intellectual distance, the more explicit the topic contextualization.

While representing his knowledge about the topic, the speaker indicates the source of his knowledge and his certainty/uncertainty concerning the topic awareness. A modal-epistemic scale developed in linguistics *«I know – I assume – I don't know»* [4, p. 22] testifies to the gradation of the epistemic factor in topic contextualization.

The explication of the epistemic factor in the discourse is realized by a wide range of verbal means: verbs *(know, realize, determine, mean, convince, believe, doubt, seem, think, consider, presume, assume, suppose, guess);* modal verbs *(must, should, ought to, can, need, will, can, could, may, might, would);* adverbs *(certainly, surely, really, in fact, undoubtedly, obviously, confidently, indeed, definitely, apparently, evidently, perhaps, possibly, probably, supposedly);* adjectives *(sure, aware, confident, certain, obvious, true, uncertain, likely, unlikely, possible, probable, doubtful);* nouns *(certainty, confidence, sureness, assertion, fact, doubt, assumption, uncertainty, impossibility, improbability).*

According to the way of gaining knowledge, we should distinguish a direct and a mediated access to the information. The direct access to the information is based on the individual perceptual experience of the communicative partners and covers the area of certainty *(«I know»)* on the modal-epistemic scale, whereas the mediated access to the information occupies the area of uncertainty *(«I assume» or «I don't know»).*

The direct access is related to the phenomenon of «visual or auditory evidence», in other words, the speaker experienced or witnesses a certain event by himself. The verbal means of the direct access to the information are represented by the 1st person pronouns *(I, we);* verbs of sense perception – visual and auditory *(see, watch, observe, notice, eye, listen, hear).*

The mediated access to the information presupposes that the speaker was not a direct witness to the situation and received the information from other people's words or though inferences. He makes a clear demarcation between himself and the source/author of the message attributing the origin of the information to others and to some extent distancing from it, thus shifting the responsibility for the accuracy of the information on someone else.

The representation of the mediated access is performed by means of quoting or retelling which is usually accompanied by the shift of deictic time and place coding, substitution of pronouns and sequence of tenses. The following verbal means are the markers of the mediated access to the information: indirect address introduced by the verbs *(say, tell, inform, answer, reply, remark);* passive voice of the verbs *(it was mentioned, it was announced);* lexical introductory units *(according to, as for (to).*

The involvement of the cognitive components of communication directed towards the minimization of interlocutors' attempts in topic contextualization contributes to the optimization of the communicative interaction. The study of verbalization of the epistemic factor in topic contextualization opens up new vectors for further researches of gender and ethnocultural peculiarities of contextual operations.

References:

1. Dijk T. A. Contextual Knowledge Management in Discourse Production. A CDA Perspective. *A New Agenda in Critical Discourse Analysis / R. Wodak, P. Chilton.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2005. P. 71–100.

2. Dijk T. A. Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 266 p.

3. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk B. Convention and Creativity in Natural Language. *Studia Auglica Posnaniensia.* Poznon: Universitet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznanin, 1993. Vol.1. P. 97–105.

4. Приходько А. Н. Высказывание в модально-эпистемическом аспекте. *Культура народов Причерноморья.* 2003. № 42. С. 21–27.

5. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енцикло-педія. Полтава: Довкілля-К, 2006. 716 с.