

Література:

1. Bally, Ch. Linguistique générale et linguistique française. Berne : A. Francke, 1944.
2. Dubois, J. Grammaire générative et transformationnelle. *Langue française*. 1963. n° 1. P. 49–57.
3. Gavalda, A. L'échappée belle. Paris : Le Dilettante, 2009.
4. Gineste, M.-D. De la phrase à la proposition sémantique : un point de vue de la psychologie cognitive du langage. *L'information grammaticale*. 2003. n° 98. P. 48–51.
5. Littell, J. Les Bienveillantes. Paris : Gallimard, 2006.
6. Simon, C. Le sacre du printemps. Paris : Calmann-Lévy, 1984.
7. Neveu, F. Études sur l'apposition. Aspects du détachement nominal et adjectival en français contemporain, dans un corpus de textes de J.-P. Sartre. Paris : Honoré Champion Éditeur, 1998.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-404-7-22>

PRIMARY DISCOURSE OF SURPRISE WORDING IN ENGLISH**ПЕРВИННИЙ ДИСКУРС АНГЛОМОВНОЇ
ВЕРБАЛІЗАЦІЇ ЗДИВУВАННЯ****Lytvyniuk O. I.**

*Head and Senior researcher at the
Research Laboratory of Contrastive
Linguistics and Foreign Languages
Teaching Methodology
Navchalna Knyha Publisher
Dnipro, Ukraine*

Литвинюк О. І.

*завідувачка, старший науковий
працівник науково-дослідної
лабораторії контрастивної
лінгвістики та методики викладання
іноземних мов
Видавництво «Навчальна книга»
м. Дніпро, Україна*

English wording of surprise is examined in (1) a wider discourse-related context ([1; 2; 3; 4]) as well as from the standpoints of (2) expressing surprise ([5; 6; 7; 8]), (3) naming wonder/surprise ([9; 10]); (4) comparing and/or contrasting it to other languages ([11], [12]), and (5) representation in academic texts ([13; 14; 15]) – each with examples extracted from appropriate discourses.

Psychologists refer surprise as a strict sequence of a rapid emotion, feeling and state and only the first of the three is the emotion exactly ([16; 17; 18]). In linguistic studies the language implementations of the three are often mixed

making some false illusion of endlessness of surprise wording. Hence, there is a necessity to correlate linguistic and psychological views on surprise and its wording.

The target of our study is to propose a solution for such coordination. To do this we: 1) look for a shared platform; 2) consider its nature regarding to linguistic and psychological knowledge of surprise and its wording, and 3) define and name the shared platform parts.

The shared area of the emotion, feeling and state of surprise together with their wording variety functioning is the one where each of them can act and react simultaneously with all the rest. Such concurrently performance is possible only in human communication involving certain psychic processes, thinking and wording. It gives us reasons to appeal to the notion of discourse.

In linguistics discourse is usually considered in a narrow and wider meanings as (a) the nearest text neighbourhood of the examined language unit (a piece of speech in which the unit occurred) and (b) a wider piece of life containing a piece of speech together with communicative situation(s), social, cultural, and other proper fillings and surroundings. The second is rather comprehensive to imply both wording and the things to be worded. Hence, discourse in its wider meaning is the shared platform we are looking for.

Discourse, as a piece of life in which our speaker wonders and utters, varies under plenty of influences, however it always has its starting point – the emotion of surprise, followed by some feelings (surprise among them as well) and states (again with surprise or astonishment as one of them). That means we deal with such parts of ‘surprise discourse’ as the primary discourse within which the emotion of surprise appears and is expressed both non-verbally (facially, by gestures and poses) and verbally, usually in exclamations like ‘Wow!’, ‘Oh!’, ‘Oh my!’ and so on. As we deal with linguistic discourse we are to cut our primary discourse exactly after the moment of the first lingual unit performance. So the primary discourse finishes with the end of its first wording reaction. Then the secondary discourse (associated with the feeling) and tertiary discourse (connected with the state) follow it, however they are not interesting for us now.

However, here another problem arises: do we really deal with one primary discourse or a set of such pieces derived from the same emotion? Discourse in its wider meaning is ‘a piece of life’ with plenty of components. In our primary discourse the starting psychic push is surprise but it can be caused by various cues. So the emotion of surprise (the push itself) is the constant here and others are variables. Two other constants are body manifestations (more or less expressed but they are anyway) and verbal reaction (at least as an indistinct and muffled sound).

If the person is alone, such sounding, exclaiming or speaking is self-directed regardless of its voicing (not sounded in the case of inner speech).

Psychology considers the stimulus as an external factor and the motive as an internal factor of both mental and outer acting.

So, in the case of any sole speaking actor the outer cue is a stimulus for the emotion of surprise and the self-directed exclamation or utterance is the verbal reaction to the stimulus. The reaction gives birth to the motive (mental assessment and so on) but the last unfolds after the exclamation/utterance and so is not connected to the stimulus directly. That is why it belongs to the secondary discourse. Thus, the primary discourse unfolds both in outer situation and inner speech. The following discourses (secondary, tertiary ones) have motives but not stimuli. The three constants and an unspecified amount of variables (such as place, time, reason of wonder and so on and so force) form its setting that starts from the stimulus and ends with the motive birth. The new-born motive acts in another discourse – a secondary one. So we get a group of primary discourse invariants with the shared three constants and some amount of variables.

In the case of two or more speakers there is a communicative act increasing the number of variables but not the constants. So, the primary discourse nature remains.

For English the wording of the emotion of surprise in the primary discourse is as follows: exclamations: *Oh!* (with different intonations); *Ah!*; *Eh!*; *Wow!*; *Oh, my!*; *Oh, my God!*; *Oh, Lord!*; *Oh, my gosh!*; *Oh, no!*; *Oho!*; *What!*; *What?*; *No way!*; *Hey!*; sole words: *Really?* *Seriously?* *Oh, heavens!*; some short cliché (if the actor uses them automatically like a sole word otherwise they serve secondary and tertiary discourses): *What a wonder!*; *I can't believe it!* *That's impossible!*

Plenty of other expressions are longer and more complicated in syntax and semantics (*I can't believe my eyes!*; *I can't think of it!*; *I find that very surprising!* and etc.) so due to their structure and meaning they serve secondary and tertiary discourses.

All the above gives us reasons to define primary discourse as follows.

Primary discourse of surprise wording is a designation term to refer to a homogeneous group of discourse invariants each of which starts with the actor's reaction to the stimulus and finishes with the actor's motive, contains three shared constants (the emotion of surprise as a reaction to outer stimulus, face and body manifestation, and wording of the emotion of surprise in a natural language) together with an amount of variables, ends just after the exclamation/utterance finish and is followed by secondary discourse where the motive acts as a feeling cause.

Bibliography:

1. DeLancey S. The Mirative and Evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33 (3), 2001, pp. 369–382.

2. Jugnet A., L’Hôte E. Looking at ‘unexpectedness’. A corpus-based cognitive analysis of surprise & wonder. N.Depraz & A.Celle (eds.), *Surprise at the Intersection of Phenomenology and Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2019, pp. 139–170.

3. Kövecses Z. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge University Press & éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l’Homme, Paris, 2004.

4. Kövecses Z. Surprise as a conceptual category. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*. December 2015, p.p. 270-290 doi: 10.1075/rcl.13.2.01kov

5. Celle A. Questions as indirect speech acts in surprise contexts. *Tense, Aspect, Modality, and Evidentiality: Crosslinguistic perspectives*, John Benjamins, 2018, pp. 211–236 hal id: hal-01774821 <https://u-paris.hal.science/hal-01774821>

6. Celle A., Jugnet A., Lansari L., L’Hôte E. 2017. Expressing and describing surprise. In *Expressing and Describing Surprise*, Agnès Celle & Laure Lansari (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2017, pp. 215–244 doi: 10.1075/bct.92.09cel

7. Celle A., Jugnet A., Lansari L., Peterson T. Interrogatives in surprise contexts in English. In *Surprise at the Intersection of Phenomenology and Linguistics*, N.Depraz & A.Celle (eds.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2019, pp.118–137.

8. Mocini R. Expressing surprise. A cross-linguistic description of mirativity. *Other Modernities*. 11, 5/2014, pp. 136–156.

9. Darbor K.E., Lench H.C., Davis W.E., Hicks J.A. Experiencing versus contemplating: Language use during descriptions of awe and wonder. *Cognition and Emotion*, vol. 30, 6, 2016, pp. 1188-1196. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2015.1042836>

10. Minaya Gómez F.J. Wonder, beauty, ability and the natural world: The experience of wonder as a positive emotion in Old English verse. *Journal of the Spanish Society for Medieval English Language and Literature*. 27(1), 2022, pp. 1–27.

10. Minaya Gómez F.J. Words of wonder: the cognitive and semantic dimension of the literal and figurative denominators for wonder in Old English sources. *Cognitive Semantics*. 9, 2023, pp. 418–441 doi 10.1163/23526416-bja10055

11. Celle A. Surprise questions in English and French. *Open Linguistics*. 9, 2023. De Greyter, pp. 1–17 <https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2022-0261>

12. Celle A., Jugnet A., Lansari L. Expressive questions in English and French: what the hell versus mais qu’est-ce que. A.Trotzke, X.Villalba (eds.).

Expressive Meaning Across Linguistic Levels and Frameworks. Oxford University Press, 2021, pp. 138–166. 9780198871217. hal-03386387

13. Chen L., Hu G. Surprise markers in applied linguistics research articles: A diachronic perspective. *Lingua*, 248, 2020, pp. 1–12.

14. Deng R., Zhang Y. An Analysis of Surprise Markers in Linguistic Research Articles. *Sino-US English Teaching*, vol. 18, 12, 2021, pp. 368–376 doi: 10.17265//1539-8072/2021.12.005

15. Hu G., Chen L. ‘To our great surprise ...’: A frame-based analysis of surprise markers in research articles. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 143, 2019, pp. 156–168.

16. Adolphs R., Anderson D. J. *The neuroscience of emotion: A new synthesis*. Princeton University Press, 2018.

17. Neta M., Kim M.J. Surprise as an emotion: a response to orotony. *Perspective of Psychological Science*. 2022, pp. 1–9 doi: 10.1177/17456916221132789

18. Reizenzein R., Meyer W.-U., Niepel M. Surprise. *Encyclopedia of Human Behaviour / Second Edition*. Editor-in-chief V.S.Ramachandran. In 3 v., v. 3, Elsevier, 2012, pp. 564–570.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-404-7-23>

**CHALLENGING GENDER STEREOTYPES THROUGH
LANGUAGE USE: AN ANALYSIS OF THE FABULOUS
GODMOTHER’S DISCOURSE
IN THE FILM “CINDERELLA” (2021)**

**ВИКЛИК ГЕНДЕРНИМ СТЕРЕОТИПАМ У МОВЛЕННІ:
АНАЛІЗ МОВЛЕННСВОГО ДИСКУРСУ ХРЕЩЕНОЇ МАТЕРІ
У ФІЛЬМІ «ПОПЕЛЮШКА» (2021)**

Lozovska K. O.

*Postgraduate student at the Department
of English Translation Theory
and Practice
Zaporizhzhia National University
Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine*

Лозовська К. О.

*аспірантка кафедри теорії
та практики перекладу
з англійської мови
Запорізький національний
університет
м. Запоріжжя, Україна*

The examination of gender differences has been a topic of interest across a range of academic disciplines, including the field of linguistics. The study