UDC 398.0

S.Zh. Bralina

Ye.A.Buketov Karaganda State University
(E-mail: saule_bralina@mail.ru)

Theory of the folklore text

In the article the concept of the folklore text is scrutinized. For this purpose textologic, semiotic, functional peculiarities of the folklore text are revealed. History of science makes us see that folklore study for a long time actively has been using the category of text. But the notion itself in the sphere of folklore study gained different interpretations, reaching far beyond the borders of textual study. Evolution of the notion «folklore text», its functional and semantic reevaluation has in the basis common processes of development, existing as in folklore itself, so in the science treating it. Investigation concerning the problem of traditional and modern folklore, its identification features, types and peculiarities of existence is the matter of conceptual importance for this article. Contemporary perception of folklore is a magnificent picture of in many ways different phenomena not confined only to cultural ones. From nominative and semantic point of view this situation is determined by different factors of ethnical, historical, scientific and educational nature. All this enables us to speak about such types of folklore as written folklore, postfolklore, antifolklore, folklore routine, verbal and non-verbal, spoken and oral culture, folklore subcultures, artistic communication within the limits of folk-groups, Netlore (folklore of Internet) etc. Special attention is paid to contemporary conceptions of folklore text. All the conceptions mentioned above, as diversified as they can be, still have something common in several positions. First of all, they state that folklore text is different from literary one. Hence takes its origin common tendency among researchers to widen borders of text space in folklore and treat it with taking into consideration facts, analyzed by other humanitarian sciences.

Key words: folklore, postfolklore, folklore text, folklore textual study, folklore tradition, variant of the folklore text, semiotic text, verbal culture, linguistic folklore study, ethnolinguistics.

It is known that the basis of any science is theory — system of common principles, methods and approaches in treating certain phenomenon. There is no practice without theory and practice, in its turn, is the source and stimulus for forming theoretical basis. From this point of view the science of folklore, which traditionally is divided in «field study» (expeditionary) and research folklore study, nowadays is on the one of crucial stages of its development — forming of folklore theory.

Professor V.P.Anikin, whose course of lections on the theory of folklore was one of the first examples of generalizing theoretical observations in this area, is fully justified in saying that: «The science begins when facts are embraced by theory, which can see regularity in them. Theory deals with common notions, categories, laws and principles. If we do not know laws and principles are not formed, if we can not observe facts from commonly accepted point of view, we have no science» [1; 26].

The situation, in which folklore study is to be seen today, appreciated by many researchers as «crisis». The reason for it is that the very perceptions of folklore as a notion, its conceptual essence and borders of meaning, functionality and forms of existence have changed. It is difficult to say, what the future theory is supposed to treat: traditional «classical» folklore («voices of the past», «living olden times») or contemporary folklore, which is so different from its cultural «predecessor»? The undisputable is that contemporary theory of folklore should be built with taking into consideration new notions of folklore, and should have as a basis renewed and differentiated terminology.

The process of identification of theoretical folklore study depends primarily on its fundamental problems, which researchers include in the sphere of its study. In other words, at the stage of forming in its sphere of science can be included categories and notions, which were chosen by the authors of lections, special programs and textbooks on the theory of folklore on the quiet arbitrary grounds. It is obvious that such state of affairs is not peculiar only for folklore study; we can see it in other branches of humanitarian sciences as well (theory of literature, theory of language etc.). But the «degree of oscillation» in literary and linguistic theoretical categories, having as diversified plenty of theoretical conceptions as can be, still remains in commonly accepted borders — genre, type, literary direction, style, language of the text etc.

Aforementioned situation can be explained by the long history of literary studies, which took its origin in antique times, by the rich experience, acquired by this practice worldwide, by constantly renewing material for researches, all literary texts, old and new, included etc.

In contrast to the said before theory of folklore (even in the sphere of higher education) surprises by inconsistency of its content. On equal terms in the theory of folklore is included folklore, ethnographic, linguistic, psychological, semiotic, notions from literature and culture studies etc.

However, the process of science development states different demands. It is crucial that every theoretical category of folklore should be analyzed from following points of view: its ontological essence, specificity, functionality, justification of including it in the theory of folklore and its meaning for theoretical folklore study. Sphere of folklore study theoretical problems, thesaurus of theoretical notions and their definitions should be determined. Otherwise theoretical folklore study is in danger of losing all its meaning and usefulness.

It was mentioned before that several endeavors were made to build the theory of folklore, but now it is important to begin with fundamental notions, which are the basis of the science.

One of such notions is *folklore text.* This category was not chosen at random. It is known that the division of folklore texts in types and genres, bearing certain designations, is but a conventional phenomenon ant the result of the work, made by collectors and researchers of folklore. At the same time nation itself, the creator and the possessor of folklore, by no means tries to divide folklore material, verbal poetic creations, performed by its representatives in any genres or other types of nomination. For example, all variety of songs in Russian folklore (historical, ballads, quick songs, drawling songs etc.) among people are known merely as «songs», all the genres of fairy tales are merged in simple «fairy tales», narratives, not dealing with supernatural, are called «stories» etc.

Consequently the question arises: what do we hear from a performer? Is it anything we want to hear or anything that he or she performs? We do not hear anything like literary text, which was created in the borders of a certain genre and has certain title. What we hear is artfully connected, joined and interwoven words, sentences and phrases, in other words the phenomenon, which from the ancient times is known as «text».

History of science makes us see that folklore study for a long time actively has been using the category of text. But the notion itself in the sphere of folklore study gained different interpretations, reaching far beyond the borders of textual study. Evolution of the notion «folklore text», its functional and semantic reevaluation has in the basis common processes of development, existing as in folklore itself, so in the science treating it.

Term «text» in 50–60 years of XX century came in research folklore study from folklore textual study, which is a supplementary branch of science dealing with preparing verbal poetic texts to publishing. In its turn folklore textual study took system of categories from literary textual study. This fact made possible drawing an analogy between literary and folklore text and using in treating the latter such terms as «complete», «incomplete», «original», «edited», «highly artistic», «low artistic», «text of an author» etc.

It is obvious that such terminology (appropriate when talking about literary texts) is fully useless in the sphere of folklore. It created questions on which there were no answers: what is the criterion of completeness, originality, artistic merit of folklore text? What can we use to infer about «belonging» of the text to a certain author?

Because of objective reasons Soviet folklore textual study could by no means give necessary answers. At that time science had different tasks: it was crucial to preserve creations of verbal culture, to make all the treasures of epic creations, belonging to the nations of USSR, accessible for all. All these tasks were successfully fulfilled and even now works, which publishing practice of those years produced, did not loose their value.

Nowadays the answers on these questions are of axiomatic nature. In other words, there are plenty of variants, existing in folklore, and their functioning is dependant on many factors, such as place, time of functioning of folklore creation, life condition of its performer, original situation of performing etc. Because of it we can not see the ways one or another text goes in its development, therefore there is no the first and the last text, the best and the worst, we cannot speak about belonging of folklore text to a certain author, all the more.

For example, the fact that Russian epos exists in the form of separate bylinas about Ilya Murometz, Dobrynya Nikitich, Alyosha Popovich and other epic heroes, while other nations` eposes are represented as conglomerates is not yet scientifically explained. Where we are to find «fullness»: can we say that there existed a conglomerate which lately dissolved in separate elements or that only independent songs, which did not form conglomerate (because of the reasons unknown) existed?

Which Russian fairy tale it is possible to consider «full»? May be, fairy tale that logically represents the consequence of events (a fox pretended to be dead, stole from a man fish, which he had laid on his sledge,

learned a wolf to fish with the help of his own tail, wanted to get to the hens, but fell into a tub with dough and, finally, rode on the wolf, which lost his tail because he followed fox's directions, keeping saying that it is she, who underwent worse sufferings, because her brains were knocked out…). But at the same time, as a rule, this «logical and full» plot is known among people in the form of separate fairy tales: «The fox and the man», «The fox and the wolf», «Beaten carries unbeaten». Why it is so? The answer is that the very laws of folklore tradition create this sate of affairs; these laws do not demand cause-effect conditionality or strict logic of events.

One more example: one of the highly popular Russian ballads begins in the following way: *«Prince Roman his wife was losing, / Losing, tormenting and throwing into the water…»* The hearer will never ask «why?» or «because of what?», it is known that ballads are meant to be tragic… But the logical fullness demands that the reason, why the prince killed his wife and the mother of his children, should be made clear… Furthermore, in folklore of any nation exist so called fables (cock-and-bull stories), turning-over stories and muddle, concerning which it is difficult to define type they belong to.

As to the artistic merit, this term looses its scientific definition in the sphere of folklore. Indeed, from whose point of view we are to judge? Is it the point of view of a collector (e.g. academician A.F.Gilferding), of a highly educated researcher (e.g. professor V.Y.Propp) or should we take into consideration opinion of an illiterate performer, whose cultural level can be low? The fact that there were two types of folklore in Soviet folklore study, official (accepted) and unofficial (forbidden, taboo folklore), does not seem to be accidental. According to a keen remark of an American scientist Dodson, Soviet folklore consisted in nine tenths of «fakelore» (falsified).

Has situation changed? Contemporary textual study of folklore, by definition, should use conception of folklore text and include it in the system of categories. It means that clear understanding as to the nature of this phenomenon should be achieved. In connection with it well-known specialist in textual study T.G.Ivanova states: «Historical-folklore textual study aims at the investigation of the multiform nature of the texts, representing verbal-poetic creations. A researcher enters the sphere of textual study when comparing and confronting one variant of a fable (bylina, song etc.) with another, discovering local variants and edited versions of a certain folklore creation, forming scheme on the genealogical correlation of the texts, sometimes discovering literary sources for a variant. The text in itself (not existing in it pagan conceptions, social content, poetic techniques, which create artistic value of a folklore creation, etc.) is the object for the research, conducted by scientists» [2; 6].

Elusive, almost metaphorical definition of folklore text as «the text in itself», according to our point of view, does not reveal the very notion of it. At the same time contemporary practice of textual study often treats folklore text at very liberal terms.

For example, in one of the modern works in the area of textual study term «text» is used as a synonym for «record», «variant», «version», «bylina», «plot», «extract»: «Priladozhskaya (existing in the regions surrounding lake Ladoga) tradition of bylina is represented in science by 6 *texts (6 plots)* (*here and further fragments are accentuated by the author of the article* — S.B.), «*Episodes* 9–11 from this complicated scheme are realized in priladozhskiy *variant.* <…> Nevertheless certain rare formula are reflected in priladozhskiy *text* — hero advises people to leave the place of his future execution, because the execution is going to be terrible», «*Bylina* «Dyuk Stepanovich and Shark-the-giant» … is difficult to classify. The content of this *text* is following…», «Therefore the region under investigation is represented in science by three original *texts* of bylina. Judging from these *records,* we can conclude that people, who lived in the region of lake Ladoga in the second half of 19 century, remembered such traditional heroes of Russian song epos as Alesha Popovich, Ilya Murometz, Vasiliy Buslaevich…» [3; 25–35]. It is significant that in the title of this work and in the content, the part in which bylinas, their passport data and comments to them are included, the author called «*Texts*».

As we can see, term «text» in folklore textual study does not belong to the «strictly defined» class of terms, therefore it is often replaced by other terms, which have approximately the same meaning.

Therefore for the conception of textual study the notion of folklore text as a theoretical category is not current and it is usually used only in practice. It is significant that in «classical» bibliographical reference books, created by M.Y.Meltz and T.G.Ivanova there is a part with the title «Texts» in which publications of folklore are included [4].

In the whole, functioning of the category «text» in folklore textual study did not facilitate definition neither for the very concept, nor for its specificity in the sphere of science. On the contrary, the borders of folklore text became uncertain, that led to equating text with other notions of textual study.

In the sphere of research folklore study the problem of the text is even more complicated and difficult to solve. The reason for all this is that nowadays we do not hear folklore creations only from a performer, so to say in «living form». We can also hear it by the means of radio, audio and video tapes, and cinema, find it in Internet. In other words, new life conditions changed perception of folklore and made possible diversified interpretations of the notion «folklore text».

In fact, traditionally folklore is perceived as popular poetic creations of ritual or not connected with rituals nature, existing among the people in verbal form, in other words different charms, lamentations, fairy tales, songs, riddles, funny stories etc. Specialist in folklore study, analyzing folklore in reality deals only with the records of variants and versions of folklore creations. But such «records» can only record text, but not make it «written».

In contrast to the aforesaid nowadays declarations about new form of popular poetic creations, so called «written folklore», gained special productivity. To this type of folklore are included such phenomena as mascots, graffiti (records on the desks, walls, fences etc.), army albums, albums of girls, questionnaires, forms, rebuses, inscriptions on photographs, post cards, envelopes, glossaries, pseudo-explanations to abbreviations, computer «smiles», SMS etc. These «genres» radically changed the perception both of folklore text and folklore itself. As the result in the sphere of science were included following notions: city, court, school, student, soldiers, tourist, prison folklore, folklore of parachutists and archeologists, folklore of wards etc.

In other words, contemporary perception of folklore is (we can state it without exaggeration) a magnificent picture of in many ways different phenomena not confined only to cultural ones. From nominative and semantic point of view this situation is determined by different factors of ethnical, historical, scientific and educational nature. All this enables us to speak about such types of folklore as written folklore, postfolklore, antifolklore, folklore routine, verbal and non-verbal, spoken and oral culture, folklore subcultures, artistic communication within the limits of folk-groups, Netlore (folklore of Internet) etc.

American specialist in folklore A.Dundes includes in folklore along with the traditional fairy tales and riddles such phenomena as arts, medicine, instrumental music, dialectic speech, slang, names, nicknames, names of places, gestures, mimic, symbols, rough jokes, popular etymology, recipes of dishes, quilting and embroidery, cries of street vendors, traditional signals for calling animals etc. [5; 1–3].

It is obvious that such «motley» list is but a reflection of widespread in world science conception of folklore as universal phenomenon, embracing all manifestations of material and spiritual culture of a certain nation.

Perception of folklore as phenomenon of verbal spoken culture, on the other hand, created contrary tendency. Accordingly, contemporary glossary of Eastern Slavonic terms of folklore study includes in the sphere of folklore all forms of popular verbal element: greetings, oath, teasing, puns, vow, hailing, rumors, slander, cries of street vendors, sport shoutings, humoristic nicknames, curses, thieves slang and argot etc [6].

As we can see different countries and different scientific traditions are united by the common tendency of understanding folklore text as wide, almost unlimited phenomenon. Moreover, today folklore science can not exist in isolation. In our century of intensification, globalization and integration it experiences the influence of other spheres of social knowledge (language, culture, religion, psychology, informational and semiotic sciences etc.).

For the science of folklore this situation resulted in appearing of two methodological tendencies in treating its object.

The first appeals to the ontological essence of folklore as «popular wisdom» and «popular knowledge», therefore it includes in the sphere of folklore all manifestations of material and spiritual life of a nation, which have their roots in the ancient times: rituals, superstitions, village habitations, national costume, household utensils, pieces of handicraft, popular toys, musical instruments, dances, songs, fairy tales, verbal narratives, riddles, proverbs, sayings etc.

Understanding of folklore in such «wide» sense is typical for the culture of many countries. For example, one of the founders of American folklore study, M.Barbo, considers that folklore is not only fairy tales and songs, plays etc. From his point of view we can see manifestations of folklore when a mother teaches her daughter to sew, to knit, to spin, to bake a pie, using an old recipe. If a farmer teaches his son on their hereditary field how to sow, how to till the ground or how to predict the weather with the help of the Moon and wind, when it is important while sowing or harvesting, it is also folklore we face. Folklore is to be descried when a village carpenter, shoemaker or smith explains his apprentices how to handle the instruments, shows them how to build a house, make a spade, how to horseshoe or shear sheep [7; 398].

We can see that this interpretation of folklore in essence reduces it to the tradition in the «wide» sense of the word. That is, totality of knowledge, skills, abilities and experience of the past, which is transferred verbally from old generation to the new directly, in person, without using books and means of mass information etc.

Second methodological direction, which is current in domestic science, interprets folklore only as the art of words, popular poetic creation, existing in verbal form, so we can call it «philological» folklore study. Under the guidance of this direction science of our country identified folklore phenomena according to following criteria: verbal character, anonymity, possibility of variations, collectivity, traditional character and syncretism. At the same time collectivity and traditional character were included a priori in such category as artistic value and aestheticism. In other words, nations were considered as certain abstract substance, being at the same time creators and possessors only of artistic and aesthetically significant creations.

Above we revealed the delusiveness of this direction in the sphere of textual study. In the practice of collecting and researching it led to the ambiguous state of affairs.

Examples of popular creation of low artistic value or without it, sometimes unquotable (tokens, superstitions, curses, obscene language), creations dealing with taboo themes (erotic, sex, alternative forms of marriage), folklore of declassed people (beggars, thieves, convicts), all these forms were concealed, although they existed together with the traditional folklore.

The result of using these principles in selection of material was that considerable part of popular culture was isolated and left without proper scientific investigation for a long time.

On the other hand, definition of folklore as the art of artistic word revealed its vulnerable and artificial nature. Art, artistic value and words of folklore itself were perceived in the borders of literary aesthetics, but people do not differentiate these categories and their oppositions.

From our point of view, even nowadays, when all bans concerning unofficial folklore are removed, it is still hard for the researchers of the folklore to answer questions like: where in popular culture art «begins» and «ends»? What is the criterion we can use inferring as to the artistic value of folklore word (text)? And what is the «word» in folklore?

This fact is not accidental. What is the solution if this problem? From our point of view there are two clearly defined approaches to the folklore text, existing in contemporary theoretical folklore study.

First approach we can define, roughly speaking, as traditional or historic-typological approach. Representatives of it prefer «narrow» sense of the folklore text and perceive folklore only as «the art of words». According to their interpretation folklore text is certain verbal spoken (orally formed) text, functioning among people.

As we can see, according to the mentioned conception folklore text is only the verbal side of a creation. All that is beyond it (rituals, activities, mimic, gestures, objects, situation, reaction of audience etc.) is meant to belong to the condition of performing, having nothing to do with the text itself. Within the limits of traditional conception investigation of such phenomena was supplementary process and the research of them was handed over to other branches of science, such as ethnography, music and handicraft study etc. In other words, it was up to a researcher to decide whether it is necessary to take so called context and background knowledge (historical, ethnical, ethnological) into consideration or not, because the verbal folklore text was perceived as all-sufficient phenomenon.

Negative character of this conceptual approach to the literary text found its reflection figurative statement of Y.M.Lotman: «literary creation, which is perceived in and of itself, without certain cultural context, without defined system of cultural codes is like an «epitaph on an unknown language» [8; 255].

Second approach can be defined as innovational, structural-semiotic. Representatives of this approach prefer «wide» sense in interpretation of folklore text. Basing their interpretation on informational and semiotic sciences they understand folklore text as a realization of certain structure, scheme, model or totality of sings, codes, symbols, different «languages».

Owing to this approach not only «words» were distinguished in folklore text but also something that stands behind these «words» and explains them. The result was that such sciences as linguistic folklore study, ethnolinguistics, ethnopedagogigs and psychological linguistics came into being. In many respects these branches of science inherited ideas from A.N.Veselovskiy and A.A.Potebnya`s researches in the sphere of language and folklore.

N.I.Tolstoy, basing his statement on the rich experience of linguistic culture study, proposes following interpretation of folklore text: «…from the point of view of semiotics, culture has many languages and even in one and the same texts it often uses several of them. In this case we understand text not as consequence of

written and spoken words, but as a spoken consequence and connected with it certain consequence of activities directed to different objects, which have symbolic meaning» [9; 23].

In other words, folklore text as it is understood in traditional way, from the point of view of ethnolinguistics is only one of the languages, «words» or codes of indivisible semiotic text. This text consists of three sing components: ritual (actional), objective (real) and spoken (verbal). As an example of such texts we can take Russian ritual of «kolyadovanie» or «carol-singing». Here ritual activities (going from court to court, strewing of grain), objects used (grain, ritual food, coins etc.) are accompanied by performing of folklore (Christmas well-wishing songs). Obviously enough that such interpretation widens the borders of the text space and appeals to the wide culture study context.

Conception mentioned above influenced views of other researchers. V.M.Gatzak, for example, interprets folklore as «manysubstantive phenomenon», «first natural multimedia system» and suggests to treat folklore text not as «single» or «unilineal» but as «fascicular (bundle-like)» phenomenon [10: 311].

Ethnographers and culture study specialists propose their own interpretation of folklore text. Basing on the tight connection between folklore and everyday life, culture of people they propose such notion as «folklore-ethnographic text.» Text is supposed to have «central unit», which can be of «music-poetic, instrumental-choreographic or another nature» [11; 12]. As we can see, according to this conception, a folklore text is a certain «metasystem», the center of which can be verbal, music or choreographic «text». This kind of text, as complicated structural-semiotic unit, is no more confined in the borders of folklore and becomes special communicative instrument.

It is important to underline the fact that all the conceptions mentioned above, as diversified as they can be, still have something common in several positions. First of all, they state that folklore text is different from literary one. At the same time it is acknowledged that folklore text is many-sided phenomenon (this variety can be the result of traditional syncretism or semiotic nature of folklore). Hence takes its origin common tendency among researchers to widen borders of text space in folklore and treat it with taking into consideration facts, analyzed by other humanitarian sciences.

Therefore, contemporary folklore study, suggesting different interpretations of folklore text, based on the new conditions of its existence and perception, is in the search for theoretical solution as to its scientific status and specificity.

References

1 *Аникин В.П.* Теория фольклора: курс лекций. — М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1996. — 408 с.

2 *Иванова Т.Г.* Специфика фольклористической текстологии // Русский фольклор: Проблемы текстологии фольклора. — Л.: Наука, 1991. — С. 5–21.

3 *Иванова Т.Г.* «Малые» очаги севернорусской былинной традиции: исследования и тексты. — СПб.: Дмитрий Буланин, 2001. — 455 с.

4 *Мельц М.Я.* Русский фольклор: библиографический указатель. — Л.: Наука, 1981. — 477 с.; *Иванова Т.Г.* Русский фольклор: библиографический указатель. — Л.: Наука, 1990. — 500 с.

5 *Dundes A.* The study of folklore. — England: Prentice-Hall, 1965. — 481 p.

6 Восточнославянский фольклор. Словарь научной и народной терминологии. — Минск: Наука и техника, 1986. — 478 с.

7 Funk and Wagnalls standard dictionary of folklore, mythology and legend. — New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1949. — Vol. 1. — 1196 p.

8 *Лотман Ю.М.* Об искусстве: Структура художественного текста. — СПб.: Искусство-СПб., 1998. — 704 с.

9 *Толстой Н.И.* Язык и народная культура: Очерки по славянской мифологии и этнолингвистике. — М.: Индрик, 1995. — 512 с.

10 *Гацак В.М.* Этнопоэтические константы в фольклоре: уровни, изоглоссы, «мультимедийные формы» (на славянском и неславянском материале) // Литература, культура и фольклор славянских народов. XIII Междунар. съезд славистов (Любляна, 2003, август). Доклады российской делегации. — М.: Наука, 2003. — С. 310–315.

11 *Лобкова Г.В.* Древности Псковской земли. Жатвенная обрядность: образы, ритуалы, художественная система. — СПб.: Дмитрий Буланин, 2000. — 224 с.

С.Ж. Бралина

Фольклор мәтінінің теориясы

Мақалада фольклор мәтінің ұғымы және теориясы қарастырылды. Осы мақсатты басшылыққа ала отырып, фольклор мәтінің текстологиялық, концептуалдық, синкретті, семиотикалық, фунционалдық сипаттамасы анықталды. Ғылыми танымның әмбебап категориясы (санаты) ретінде мәтінді ауыз әдебиеті саласындағы мамандар белсенді түрде қолдана бастады. Осының нәтижесінде зерттеу тәжірибесінде «ауыз әдебиетінің мәтіні» («фольклор мәтіні») деген ұғым берік қалыптасты. Алайда бұл ұғымның өзі ауыз әдебиеті туралы ғылымда түрліше түсіндіріледі және ол түсіндірулер таза текстология шегімен шектеліп қалмайды. Ауыз әдебиетінің мәтіні ұғымының эволюциясы, оны семантикалық және функционалдық жағынан қайта қарау ауыз әдебиеті мен ол туралы ғылым дамуының ортақ үрдістерімен байланысты. Мақалада көрсетілгендей, концептуалды маңызды мәселенің бірі — дәстүрлі және қазіргі фольклордың пәндері, олардың идентификалық белгілері және қолданылу ерекшеліктері туралы зерттеу. Қазіргі заманда фольклорды тікелей орындаушыдан «тірідей» тыңдап қана қоймай, жинақтардан оқуға да, радиодан, аудиожазбадан тыңдауға да, бейнетаспадан, кинодан көруге де болады. Бүгінде халықтың поэтикалық шығармашылығының жаңа түрлеріне — жазбаша фольклор, постфольклор, антифольклор, күнделіктік фольклор, вербалды және вербалға қарсы, сөйлеу және ауыз мәдениет, фольклор субмәдениеттер, folk-топтар, Netlore (Интернет фольклор) арқалы көркем коммуникация және т.б. жатқызылып жүр. Мақалада фольклор мәтінінің қазіргі тұжырымдамаларға ерекше назар аударылды. Фольклор мәтінінің қарастырылған тұжырымдамалары сырттай ұқсас болмаса да, түрлі өлшемдері жағынан бір-біріне жақын екенін атап айту керек. Автордың ойынша, ең алдымен, олар фольклор мәтінінің дербестігін, оның әдеби мәтіннен айырмашылығын көрсетеді. Сол себепті де зерттеушілер фольклор мәтіні кеңістігін кеңейтуге, оны басқа гуманитарлық ғылымдардан белгілі мәліметтермен байланыстыра қарастыруға ұмтылады.

С.Ж. Бралина

Теория фольклорного текста

В статье рассмотрено понятие фольклорного текста. С этой целью выявлены его текстологические, синкретические, семиотические, функциональные особенности. История науки убеждает, что фольклористика давно и активно пользуется категорией текста, однако само понятие, выделено автором, приобрело в науке о фольклоре различные толкования, далеко выходящие за пределы сугубо текстологических. Эволюция понятия фольклорного текста, его семантическое и функциональное переосмысление обусловлены общими процессами развития как самого фольклора, так и науки о нем. Концептуально важно в статье исследование проблемы предмета традиционного и современного фольклора, его идентификационных признаков и особенностей бытования. Сегодняшнее представление о фольклоре, отмечено в статье, — это грандиозная картина разнообразных по масштабам явлений, относящихся как к области культуры, так и вне ее пределов. И номинативно, и семантически эта картина обусловлена различными факторами этнического, исторического, научно-образовательного характера, позволяющими говорить о наличии письменного фольклора, постфольклора, антифольклора, фольклорной повседневности, вербальной и невербальной, речевой и устной культурах, фольклорных субкультурах, художественной коммуникации в рамках folk-групп, Netlore (Интернет фольклора) и т.д. Особое внимание уделено современным концепциям фольклорного текста. Рассмотренные концепции фольклорного текста при внешнем несходстве близки друг другу по ряду позиций. Прежде всего, определено автором, они утверждают самостоятельность фольклорного текста, его отличие от литературного. Отсюда и общее стремление исследователей — расширить границы текстового пространства в фольклоре, рассматривать фольклорный текст на широком фоне сведений, предлагаемых другими гуманитарными науками.

References

1 Anikin V.P. *Folklore Theory:* Lectures, Moscow: Publ. MSU, 1996, 408 p.

2 Ivanova T.G. *Russian folklore: Problems of textual folklore*, Leningrad: Nauka, 1991, p. 5–21.

3 Ivanova T.G. *«Small» centers of northern Russian epic tradition: Studies and texts*, Saint Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2001, 455 p.

4 Melzi M.Ya. *Russian folklore: Bibliographical Index*, Leningrad: Nauka, 1981, 477 p.; Ivanova T.G. *Russian folklore: Bibliographical Index,* Leningrad: Nauka, 1990, 500 p.

5 Dundes A. *The study of folklore*, England: Prentice-Hall, 1965, 481 p.

6 *East Slavic folklore. Dictionary of scientific and popular terminology*, Minsk: Nauka i technika, 1986, 478 p.

7 *Funk and Wagnalls standard dictionary of folklore, mythology and legend*, New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1949, 1, 1196 p.

8 Lotman Yu.M. *About the Art: The structure of a literary text*, Saint Petersburg: Iskusstvo-Saint Petersburg, 1998, 704 p.

9 Tolstoy N.I. *Language and Popular Culture: Essays on Slavic mythology and ethnolinguistics*, Moscow: Indrik, 1995, 512 p.

10 Gatsak V.M. *Literature, culture and folklore of the Slavic peoples*. XIII International Congress of Slavists (Ljubljana, August, 2003). Reports of the Russian delegation, Moscow: Nauka, 2003, p. 310–315.

11 Lobkova G.V. *Antiquities of Pskov land. Reaping ritual: the images, rituals, art system*, Saint Petersburg: Dmitry Bulanin, 2000, 224 p.