

Румунії (повністю незалежна держава з 1877 р.) наукових організацій, музеїв, у розгортанні історико-археологічних і філологічних досліджень, пов'язаних з долями причорноморських грецьких міст-держав і їхнім впливом на місцеві племена сусідньої Добруджі (східна Румунія), історією земель нижнього Придунав'я в період римського володарювання та в епоху “великого переселення народів” у зв'язку з етногенезом румунів та еволюцією з народної латини румунської мови¹.

THE AMERICAN DREAM – MYTH OR STEREOTYPE?

Martausová M.

P.J.Šafárik University, Košice, Slovakia

The individual success of a man living an American Dream has throughout centuries always been measured by hard work and thrift in combination with the opportunities given by the situation in society and economy that set no boundaries to one's own development. The American Dream is a social construct - a myth, a stereotype formed by American society (or rather by observers of American society, whether also participants or not). This paper aims at providing an insight into the reasoning of such claims.

Myth

“If the style is conversational and the content unmythic, it seems realistic.”
[Tonkin 1990]

The creation of myth and its sustainability is highly influenced by contemporary as well as past factors affecting and moulding its accurateness, giving it more ‘romantic’ and mystical shape. Both audience and speakers are active participants in the process because a belief or a myth is transmitted orally, supported by written records often already influenced by changes in the context; therefore various emotional shades are implemented by the speakers. Myths and certain beliefs delivered by speakers usually convey a certain degree of emotional involvement of the speaker to influence and attract audiences. Each participant, who gets involved in further transmission of the myth, moulds the idea to their own subjective point of view and transforms it to their own purposes. We may say that to trace accurateness of history of an orally conveyed idea is almost impossible, even more when the idea is not a fact in history, neither is it an event that can be bounded by records attached to certain dates. The American Dream is a belief that has been transmitted orally by people who supported the belief either for their own purposes of

¹ Про латиномовні граматики румунської мови див. також: Лучканин С.М. Латиномовні граматики румунської мови кінця XVIII-початку XIX ст. //Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка. Вісник. Літературознавство. Мовознавство. Фольклористика. Випуск 9. – К.: ВПЦ “Київський ун-т”, 2000. – С.48-51.

psychological satisfaction that dwell in hope, or based on their own experience or experiences of others who were direct or indirect witnesses of. The American Dream is based on values that have formed American Identity; therefore it conveys thoughts not only unmythic, but easily considered even natural, and fit for American community. This results in a tendency not to question its tangible realization and to dwell on the naturalness of its existence.

The fact that the American Dream can be designated as a myth is also justifiable by the theory presented by R. Barthes [Barthes 1957]. As a semiotician, he combined cultural studies with semiotics and thus implemented the theory of connotation and denotation to the theory of myth. As he points out, each sign has its primary meaning describing an object, an idea, and a state of being that the sign denotes but based on cultural experience the same sign can also connote a culture-dependant meaning expressing reality based on cultural codes of a given speech community. The American Dream as a concept attributed to a specific speech community can be perceived from two basic points of view taking into consideration its primary meaning and its connotative meaning; however it is the connotative meaning that takes over its basic interpretation. When people speak of the American Dream, it is not only a dream dreamt at night, it is rather a notion induced in minds during the state of vigilance connoting that this dream is uniquely associated with the United States of America.

According to Barthes [Barthes 1957], when this connotative meaning becomes hegemonic over denotative and becomes ‘natural’ and ‘normal’, thus creating a metalanguage, it illustrates a mythical function of the sign based on specific cultural codes. In this case the myth dwells in the belief that the dream can be pursued by people entering the land of opportunity – the U.S. based not on the sole fact that the land is vast, fertile, and limitless (only for the first settlers) but on the hope in what the land can offer to those who put some effort in it. Thus the first factor was hope and it is hope itself that constitutes a fundamental and central mode of human existence. “A human being without hope is like a walking corpse, which is both physiologically and metaphysically absurd.” [Schumacher 2003:2]

Or Stereotype

The American Dream can also be defined as a stereotype since its basic feature is a generalized idea applied to a homogenous community. Stereotypes generalize certain characteristic traits and attribute them to the whole unit of the undifferentiated group. The main problem of this lingers in what traits are attributed and in generalization as such, since (speaking of community of people - society) people bear certain characteristic traits common for a specific community; however those traits are highly influenced by an individual’s characteristics and therefore cannot be generalized. The traits that are attributed are also exaggerated characteristics consensually shared „in the interest of the social group among whom they are widely utilised and diffused.“ [Pickering 2001:99]. Stereotypes widely overlook peculiarities and distinction of an individual as of a member of the community. They are distinguished as discriminatory, often with derogatory intention, creating hostile and untrue judgments. However, the second and unique function stereotypes undeniably perform is that they create national identities. Each

nation tries to present itself with certain sets of attributes common for majority of members belonging to the nation and each national identity „presupposes a culture that supports this sense of allegiance and belonging.“ [Pickering 2001:99] In this case, stereotype does not necessarily bear a derogatory meaning; on the contrary it is a generalized image of a community presented to be distinguished from other communities. Nonetheless, its power often dwells in the representation itself since an object, an idea or a fact only becomes real when represented and this can be spatially and temporarily modified – as such representation is a highly subjective performance. As Michael Pickering in his study of stereotypes stresses, „reality is only objectified, but not objective“ [2001:24]. Therefore, the image presented can only be a processing of subjective experiences blended with knowledge that is again based on previous subjective experiences trying to create a romantic image with the promise of a new experience for those who have not encountered it. Each presentation is only an interpretation that is based on omission of certain information while leaving the information favourable to the purpose. In the case of the American Dream we can speak of a stereotypical self-image. National self-image-stereotypes are in developed countries ironically transmitted via controlled education as a part of its cultural heritage; though the biggest share in the transmission takes media that is the bearer of hegemony. [Hall 1993].

As Angela McRobbie [McRobbie 1994] points out, a stereotype can also be a subject to binary oppositioning in which the presence of one denotes the absence of its opposition. In this case McRobbie [Pickering 2001:70] illustrates on the example presented by Bhabha that a stereotype presented from the non-involved party is perceived as something that the party lacks. The binary oppositioning is also present in creating a collective identity that is achieved through „differentiation, objectifying and identifying of the others“ [2001:71] whereas at the same time modifies and blurs the image of the „not-others“. Paraphrasing Lacan it is the problem of ‚the others‘ involved in this case, in which the non-involved party lacks qualities presented by the stereotype, these qualities are a promise of completeness that everybody subconsciously and inherently intends to achieve creating a desire to attain what the stereotype offers. „It is something that is not me. Therefore, I am not whole.“ [2001:73].

The American Dream is definitely a concept that captivates attention of those who not only seek better conditions for their lives, but also those who want to fulfill their human existence with completeness.

Literature

- Barthes R. *Mythologies*. HarperCollinsCanadaLtd. 2001.-125p.
 Hall S. *Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage. 2009.-400p.
 McRobbie A. *Postmodernism and Popular Culture*. London: Routledge. 1994.-219p.
 Pickering M. *Stereotyping. The politics of Representation*. N.Y.: Palgrave. 2001.-246p.
 Schumacher B. *A Philosophy of Hope. Josef Pieper and the contemporary debate on hope*. USA. 2003.-319

Tonkin E. History and the myth of realism. The myths we live by. Ed. London: Routledge. 1990.-255p.

Summary

The American Dream is a concept people may live if they only fulfill certain conditions. But can a theoretical concept so strongly influence one's reality? Can this concept overcome theoretical boundaries and become a practical part of one's life? If the American Dream can be precisely identified in theory, is it possible to finally grasp the concept in reality and claim its existence not only on theoretical basis?

УДК 81'255.4

ГЕНДЕРНІ ІНДИКАТОРИ У ПЕРЕКЛАДІ ДИСКУРСИВНИХ МАРКЕРІВ (на матеріалі англо-українських перекладів художніх творів ХХ століття)

Мегела К.І.

Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка

Сучасний етап розвитку науки, і, зокрема, перекладознавства, характеризується інтенсивним підкріпленням новими напрямками досліджень. Розробляються теоретичні підвалини для інтеграції наукових галузей – соціології, етнології, психології, прагматики та когнітології.

Останнім часом у теорії перекладу посилилась увага до службових, так званих периферійних класів слів, які виявляються багатими своїм функціонально-комунікативним та прагматичним потенціалом, виражають не стільки об'єктивні, скільки суб'єктивні (модусні) смисли, що викликає неабиякий інтерес для перекладознавчих досліджень, оскільки модусні смисли не завжди мають явні, формальні засоби вираження та нерідко є імпліцитними.

Термін “дискурсивні маркери” був запроваджений американською дослідницею у галузі соціолінгвістики Д.Шиффрін [13]. З початку 90-х років ХХ століття дискурсивні маркери активно досліджуються як зарубіжними [9, 11, 12] так і російськими [3, 6] та українськими лінгвістами [1,4].

Дискурсивні маркери формально належать до різних граматичних категорій: вигуків (*oh, well*), сполучників (*and, but, or, because*), прислівників (*now, then, so*), та вставних виразів (*you know, I mean*), проте вони часом виконують схожі прагматичні функції. Склад функціонального класу дискурсивних маркерів не є чітко визначеним та варіює залежно від поглядів різних авторів.