

GAME/PLAY AS A WORLDVIEW PHENOMENON OF HOMO LOQUENS

The interaction of laws of language sign functioning, linguistic competence of speakers and pragmatic intentions of a specific communicative act in verbal activity involves the study of speech creativity as a manifestation of homo loquens's individuality, on the one hand, and as the use of language potential and associative perception – on the other. The language system as a mechanism that determines the variation of linguistic units and the emergence of non-standard ludic coinages comes to the fore.

The verbal behavior reflects the freedom of language consciousness. It can be traced in different linguocultural communities (Ukrainian, Polish, English, etc.) in the form of various ludic (playful) impulses of the speakers. Through speech playfulness, the linguo-creative potential of the language personality is realized, which adapts the personality to the relevant communication features (stylistic, socio-cultural, emotional, etc.).

Researchers note a high level of interest in the concept of game, the number of its interpretations. However, it should be recognized that the game as a phenomenon of the linguistic worldview, as a linguocognitive phenomenon is insufficiently studied, as the subject of linguistic research on various natural languages were components of the concept of "game" in relation to sport games, music and theater [1; 3]. Many works specifically devoted to the concept of game indicate that in its interpretation there can be a variety of phenomena, including language. The multifaceted and complex nature of the concepts of game and play makes it difficult to interpret them unambiguously and consistently.

According to the definition of the term [3], game is a kind of human activity that is limited in time and space, voluntary in nature, and takes place within its space. The main essential characteristics thereof are recognized as such as hedonistic orientation, taking place in a conditional space, the presence of rules, the freedom of personality, its procedural character, the development of creative abilities of the individual.

The term "language game" was introduced into the theory of language and linguistic philosophy by L. Wittgenstein, who considered all verbal human activity (and even some non-verbal) as a set of speech games. In this way, the ludic components of interaction appear unambiguously as a "game in the game", which invites further debate based on the current state of development of the theory of speech activity.

However, even today the concept of "language game" does not have a consistent and unambiguous interpretation. Although it is defined as a type of unproductive activity that has a motive that lies in the process of the game itself, but it is unlikely to be considered as a type of unproductive activity, as it results in jokes, puns, paradoxes, etc. that contribute to a certain pragmatic-semantic effect of expression.

The multifaceted nature of the term "language game" is evidenced by the fact that it has no unambiguous equivalent in English. Thus, in the works of English the terms "language play" (D. Crystal, D. Nilsen), "language game" and "linguistic game" (A. Leskiv) are used, as well as "speech play" (J. Sherzer, B. Kirschenblat-Gimblett, Ch. Hockett, S. Laycock), "word play" (P. Farb, J. Wolinsky). In our study, language

play is understood as a process and result of conscious linguo-creative activity of an individual aimed at non-stereotypical variation of the form and content of language units in the ludic code of communication in order to influence the emotional and/or intellectual sphere of the addressee.

The question of the linguistic status of the language game gives rise to discussions among scholars. An attempt to bring together the variety of research on the linguistic aspect of the game reveals the existence of two opposing views on this phenomenon. Noting a certain similarity between play and speech as a kind of human activity, scientists believe that language and speech play is a game carried out in accordance with certain rules. At the same time, they point out that such a playful activity presents a violation of the rules. Pointing out the similarities between language and non-language games, researchers also draw attention to the deliberate violation of common language norms, which is carried out within the so-called "language anomalies". Study and analysis of research of such linguists as O. Zemskaya, V. Sannikov, T. Gridina, S. Attardo, D. Crystal, D. Nilsen gives a ground to argue that the traditional approach to the study of the phenomenon of "language play" is linguistic-stylistic, which is associated with all its existing interpretations, centered mainly on the deviant nature of language play. We are emphasizing its changing nature, functional paradox, deviation from the norm, interpreting the language play as a manifestation of (unconventional and non-canonical) linguo-creative thinking of the linguistic personality.

Being a special form of linguo-creative thinking with its associative nature, language play is always focused on the use of linguistic techniques aimed at emphasizing the paradox that arises from the contrast between the standard language form and non-standard (unexpected) content of the language unit, new associative processing and representation of lingual or extralingual knowledge.

In contrast to traditional linguistics, in which the analysis of language play is focused mainly on the means or methods of embodiment of the comic (O. Tytarenko, V. Ovsianikov, O. Shon'), the cognitive-discursive approach allows to actualize the emphasis on cognitive and communicative principles of deviation from the norm (N. Arutyunova, B. Norman). The need to distinguish ludicrous phenomena from stylistic devices (tropes, figures of speech, expressive means) is necessary given that in this term researchers have partly different and sometimes contradictory content, because language play as a multifaceted phenomenon has a number of differences regarding its manifestations in speech.

The concepts of "language game" and "stylistic device" (stylistic figure, trope) may intersect if the latter is used in a ludic function, i.e. to create a non-standard witty expression (cf. creating a metaphor in the riddle "Who crosses the river twice and is still not clean?" "A dirty double-crosser"; demetaphorization and structural-grammatical parcelling of the phraseological unit 'to take the button off the foil': "What are you looking for?" – "The button from your foil. You have dropped it" (O. Wilde), phraseological unit 'to tremble in one's shoes': "the wretched Hatter trembled so, that he shook both his shoes off. The Hatter hurriedly left the court, without even waiting to put his shoes on" (L. Carroll).

Given that the existing views and definitions of language play are grouped around a broad (linguistic-philosophical) and somewhat narrower (linguo-pragmatic) understanding of it, language play should be considered as an intentionally conditioned

and linguistically marked act of presenting the propositional content. Only in the case of a conscious deviation from the language norm can a language game reflect the speaker's desire to demonstrate their linguistic competence through non-standard "packaging" of the content. This occurs within the conventionality of communicative activity – provided the utmost awareness of the conventionality of speech actions, designed to ensure that the recipient will adequately perceive the rules of the game (lingual code) in communication, i.e. adequately decode them. Relevant understanding is possible only with the considering the language stereotype, the deconstruction of which precisely reveals the paradox of the perceiving the specific ludic tactics. Linguo-philosophical and linguo-pragmatic approach to language play involves its elucidation not only within different levels of the language system, but also in terms of logical categories, playing upon the laws and principles of constructing a coherent text. When it comes to referring such facts to the phenomenon of "language play", such a perspective would obviously be controversial, as it is a deviation not only from the actual language norm, but also from the formal-logical. For instance, a language play situation may be created on the basis of a deliberate violation of a logical presupposition.

To sum up, the phenomenon of language play is characterized by a number of discursive functions, such as emotional-expressive, aesthetic, poetic, phatic, argumentative, persuasive, ludic, etc.

REFERENCES

1. Старко В. Ф. Концепт ГРА в контексті слов'янських і германських культур (на матеріалі української, російської, англійської та німецької мов): автореф. дис. ...канд. філол. наук: 10.02.15 / НАН України, Ін-т мовозн. ім. О.О. Потебні. К., 2004. 16 с.
2. Huizinga, J. Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture. London, Boston and Henley : Routledge & Kegan Paul. 226 p.
3. Sherzer, J. Speech Play and Verbal Art. Austin, TX : Texas University Press, 2002. 198 p.