

but this did not happen, because this lexeme represents the oldest relations of proto-Slavs with Turkic peoples (Komans) at the turn of two eras, when, for example, the Antes were on their “first” ancestral home in western spurs of the Tian Shan. In the pre-Christian period in Slavic dwellings *kut* is a holy (red) corner, which stores the life-force, isomorphically associated with pagan deities, and a place in the house where the whole multigenerational family come together to gain grace. Heavenly grace, happiness, wellbeing penetrate into *kut* through lighting from the street and farmstead. After 988 the concept of opposition “Tengri-Umai – Bielbogh – Ak Kudai (Svarog, Dazhbog) – Mother-earth (Chernobog – Kara Kudai)” was exposed to the ruthless annihilation, and the resulting gap was gradually filled with categorical world religions – Islam and Christianity.

Thus, in the proto-Turkic mythology *kut* is a supernatural life force. This force had to be begged for from the upper tier of Tengri deities (Svarog and Dazhbog) and the deities of middle world (animistic and pantheistic spirits - Ydyk Yer-Sub). *Kut* is a place in Cossacks’s dwelling and a talisman of family wellbeing (a holy corner) as well, and with the help of *kutya* they wanted to protect themselves from disease, and from death, which could send the souls of dead ancestors.

Turkisms-locatives *лан* and *майдан* are used frequently in the northern Black Sea region. In DRDOR the word *лан* (“field”) has a widespread use in the villages of Odessa region [10, Vol. 1, p. 281]. In Kazakh language there are homonyms: *алай* - 1) “area; small area”; 2) doubt in the heart, anxiety, concern” [4, p. 46]. The residents of Russian and Ukrainian villages in Odessa region use the word *майдан* to designate a “square”. This Turkism entered the Ukrainian literary language [10, Vol. 1, p. 294]. Vasmer M. and Radloff W. indicate that this lexeme is taken from Kipchak language and has the meaning – “a smooth, empty place” (*mādan; maidan*) [11, Vol. 2, p. 559; 13].

There were developed three different opinions with regard to an origin of the word *магазин*. Some scientists believe that it came through German mediation (*Magasin*) from the French language (*magasin*). The others point to a Dutch origin: *magazijn (magazeya)* [11, Vol. 2, p. 554–555]. F. Mikloshich believes that this word was initially understood by the Romanic and Germanic languages from the ancient Turkic language (*мағаз*) [12]. Thus, into the Slavic languages it gets from Turkish by French and German mediation. It is possible that the process of adoption took place in parallel; because today it is difficult to overcome the phenomenon of range aberration in this matter. In Russian dialectal speech of the inhabitants of the Odessa region villages a word *магазин* means: 1) “storage, grain storage room”; 2) “honeycomb” [10, Vol. 1, p. 293].

The word *баушка* with a stress on the first syllable is used, apparently, only by the Russians of Northern Black Sea region in the meanings: 1) “cellar add-on”; 2) “vault”; 3) “summer kitchen” [10, Vol. 1, p. 33-34]. In Russian dialects a word *баушка* appeared from Kipchak *baş* – “head”. This was due to frequent commercial transactions when buying cattle (*Башка канча берүпчән? How much do you ask for head?*) [11, Vol. 1, p. 139].

Turkisms, naming objects that were used by the Slavs during trade relationships indicate primarily on existing economic relations between the Slavs and Turks. Borrowing the words of superconcept “man”, denoting qualities, condition and human behavior, social relationships, show, above all, the acculturation process that occurred between the Slavic and Turkic peoples in a close proximity or cohabitation.

In DRDOR there are given Turkisms: *байбак, байлык, бастрюк, бельбек, кабаниха* and others. Let us compare. In the Odessa region Russian dialects there are homonyms *байбák*: 1. “A lazy man”. 2. “a paddle” [10, Vol. 1, p. 23]. In Karaite language *baidbax* – “a steppe marmot, sloth (bad)”; in Kipchak *bajbak* – “a marmot”. M. Vasmer believes that the meaning of “lazy” is earlier than “a marmot”, a zoonym is secondary and formed on the basis of a metaphor [11, Vol. 1, p. 107]. *Байлык* – 1) “forced labor, duty”; 2) “obligation” [10, Vol. 1, p. 24]. In Kazakh the word *байлык* has polysemantic. Its figurative meanings – “wealth; state”; “property” [4, p. 114]. Denotative meaning underwent annihilation; there were saved meanings formed due to semantic shift. Apparently, the carriers of Odessa Russian dialect managed to keep its meaning lost in modern Turkic languages. *Байстриук (байстриук, бастрюк)* – “Ukrainian, degenerate; illegitimate child” [10, Vol. 1, p. 24]. A related word occurs in Polish – *bastard* – where it was borrowed from the Middle High Germanic dialect – *Bastard* [11, Vol. 1, p. 132]. In Odessa Russian dialectal speech under the influence of metaphorization, the word *байстриук (байстриук, бастрюк)* acquired an additional terminological meaning – “maize’s stepson”. So, the villagers of Demidovo of Berezovsky district say: “У кукурузы три раза на лето байстриуки обламывают” [10, Vol. 1, p. 24]. Compare, in Kazakh language the meaning of a lexeme *бастыру* – “nipping smb., smth.” [4, p. 128]. It is “nipping” that is a “grain of first meaning” (concept) of Ukrainian and Russian dialect word *байстриук (байстриук, бастрюк)*. *Бельбék* – “a fool, blockhead” [10, Vol. 1, p. 36]. Perhaps this word is derived from Kipchak *bilmäs* “he will not know” (< *bilmäk*) [11, Vol. 2, p. 149]. *Кабаниха* “a fat woman” [10, Vol. 1, p. 246]. Derived from the word *кабан*, which in turn came from Kipchak, where *кабан* – “a wild boar, (wild) pig, hog”, as well as “stack, rick” [11, Vol. 2, p. 149].

The Turkisms discussed in the previous paragraph are used in live speech of the Russians of Black Sea region, showing bygone traces of ancient acculturation. These words are entered into the flesh and blood of the Slavs and used for pejorative assessment of human behavior within the opposition “good – bad”.

Now let us look at the Turkisms in the analyzed dictionary designating everyday objects. Some of these words are missing in the “Dictionary of Russian folk dialects”, as used locally only by the Russians of Odessa region. **Баба́й** – “a wooden peg on a boat board for fastening a rope” [10, Vol. 1, p. 20]. There is no a word with such a meaning in Turkic languages. **Бара́н** – “shaft; drum” [10, Vol. 1, p. 28]. This word is used with this meaning throughout the Russian villages of Odessa region. It is interesting, that M.Sh. Musatayeva and L.Y. Shelyakhovskaya [8, p. 136] noted two meanings of a word *баран* – 1) “a male sheep”; 2) “an ancient battering tool, ram”. **Баи́тарма́к** – “thick wooden pitchforks” [10, Vol. 1, p. 34]. This word is in use only in the rural areas of Odessa region. In the “Dictionary of Russian folk dialects” it is not fixed. It is a compound word, formed by combining Kipchak words *baş / баи* (“head”) and *tarmaq / тармак* (“offshoot”). This original tool is designed for gathering ears during threshing. **Саман** – “clay mortar with an admixture of cut straw” [10, Vol. 2, p. 152]. The word is spread outside the Northern Black Sea region and designates dried bricks made of clay mortar with straw addition. Borrowed from Kipchak language in which *saman* – “straw” [11, Vol 3, p. 552]. **Чуми́чка** – “ladle, skimmer” [10, Vol. 2, p. 279]. Formed from *чум* “scoop, dipper”, first fixed in ancient literacy in 1328. In Kipchak language *čömič* – “skimmer” [11, Vol 4, p. 381] used for kneading and pouring koumiss. Let us note that *чумичка* is also used today by the sailors of the Black Sea Fleet as a ladle, skimmer for pouring food into aluminum bowls. Let us note that “чочич” (“spoon”) was indicated with a special sign-tamga:



These tamgas are found in Omurchi (Romania). There is a high frequency of use in the area. Imre Baski shows in his study that this mark is fixed at a cemetery in Omurchi 7 times. The same sign is found in Yevpatoriya, in the Crimea, as well as Hungary lands and Mongolia [15].

**Кили́м** – “carpet” [10, Vol. 1, p. 258]. Compare: *килем* in Kazakh language – “a fleecy carpet” [11, p. 423]. **Баи́маки** – “slippers” [10, Vol. 1, p. 34]. Borrowed from Turkish, Chagatai languages: *başmak* – “shoe, sole”. The frequency of the lexeme in Russian language has been increasing since the XVI century. This word is found in the inventory of the property of Ivan the Terrible (1582) [11, Vol. 1, p. 139]. **Казан** – “a large copper for cooking” [10, Vol. 1, p. 248]. It is found everywhere in Odessa region. Borrowed into Russian from Kipchak: *kazan* – “cauldron” [11, Vol. 2, p. 159]. **Казан** – “utensils for cooking” [10, Vol. 1, p. 247]. This word with this meaning is found only in Voznesenka Pervaya village of Artsyzsky region. In Turkic languages, the word is used for calling ancient Turkic title of supreme power – *Каган*. The word was borrowed into Old Russian language during the era of Kievan Rus (*каганъ*), Khazaria and Byzantine Empire, into middle Greek (*χαγάνος*). A related word is preserved in Avar language – *chacanus*. However, in Turkic language the title name was borrowed from Chinese language: *Ke* (great) + *kuan* (ruler) [11, Vol. 2, p. 155]. **Бакы́р** – “three-liter can” [10, Vol. 1, p. 25]. In one of Kipchak dialects *baqyr* – “a bucket” [4, p. 117]. Apparently, here the topic is about a copper bucket or a can.

These and other Turkisms of the “Dictionary of Russian dialects of Odessa region”, denoting household goods, actively function in Russian dialect speech of Odessa region.

Apart from the analyzed groups of Turkisms, in the lexicon of Russian dialects of Odessa region there are Turkisms – phytonyms, used only in the region of North-Western Black Sea Region. **Арнау́тка** – “spring wheat cultivar” [10, Vol. 1, p. 18], and light wheat cereal from its grains. M. Vasmer fixes the word meaning *арнаут* with a meaning “an Albanian”, pointing to Turkish mediation in borrowing: *arnaut*. On the basis of borrowed from Turkish *арнаут* there is formed a word *арнаутка* meaning “wheat grade with firm seeds” [11, Vol. 1, p. 88]. Vasmer also points out that in the XVI century Ivan Peresvetov used a toponym *Ornyautskaya land*. **Кабáк** – “pumpkin” [10, Vol. 1, p. 246]. M. Vasmer used another meaning, borrowed from Kipchak (*kabak*) – “type of grass” [11, Vol. 2, p. 148]. **Каву́н, кау́н** – “watermelon” [10, Vol. 1, p. 247]. It is believed that it is borrowed from Kipchak and Turkish languages: *Каун, Каун* (“melon”). In Kipchak language it means “watermelon, cantaloupe” [11, Vol. 2, p. 154]. **Курáй** – “weeds” [10, Vol. 1, p. 274] from Kipchak *Kurai* – “a plant *Salsola cali*” [11, Vol. 2, p. 422], prickly weeds that can grow in arid zone. These and other phytonyms-Turkisms fixed in DRDOR, have a high frequency of use in Russian dialectal speech of Northern Black Sea region.

Unfortunately, it is impossible to describe all thematic groups of Turkisms represented in the “Dictionary of Russian dialects of Odessa region”. It seems necessary to extirpate the following thematic groups of Turkisms out of this dictionary by continuous sampling: pragmatonyms (**раки́я** – “plum vodka”, **булгу́р** –

“wheat porridge”, *бастр* – “low-grade sugar”, *каларма* – “mutton, stewed with hot spices” and etc.); zoonyms (*товар* - 1) “a herd of cows”, 2) “leather for shoes”; *табун* – “a group of horses”; *бузай* – 1) “bull-sire”, 2) figurative, “thundercloud”, 4) “locomotive”; *баба́* – “pelican”, etc.); clymatonyms (*абазá* – “south-east wind”) and some other thematic groups.

In the present work we are focusing on: drawing the attention of researchers to the problem of linguistic acculturation that took place in ancient times and the Middle Ages in the Northern Black Sea region. The Slavs were between Turkish and Crimean-Tatar language elements in the south and Kipchak language in the north-east. It is here that there was a specific Slavic-Turkic isogloss, operating in the conditions of active development of mastering foreign words as a result of diffusion, and then dispersion in the recipient language. Many Turkisms mastered by the Slavic languages in ancient and medieval times, today are perceived by native Russian speakers, in particular, its island dialects, as age-old.

## REFERENCES

1. Gumilyev L.N. Ancient Rus and the Great Steppe : 2 books / L.N. Gumilyev. – M. : DI-DIK, 1997.
2. Ancient Turkic Dictionary. – L., 1969. – 567 pages.
3. Charles du Cange. Glossarium mediae et infimae graecitatis. – Lugduni, 1688.
4. Kazakh-Russian Dictionary / edit. R.G. Syzdykova, M.M. Kopylenko and others. – Almaty, 2002. – 1008 pages.
5. Kairzhanov A.K. The Kipchaks (comans, cumans, koms, khoamans) in the context of ancient geographical tradition / A.K. Kairzhanov // Eurasian University Press. Issue: linguistics, philology. – 2000. – № 3. – P. 145–146.
6. Kairzhanov A.K. Milky Way of Eurasia / A.K. Kairzhanov. – Astana : ENU after L.N. Gumilyev, 2004.
7. Kairzhanov A.K. Īrq bitig // A.K. Kairzhanov. Byzantinism and Kievan Rus mentality. Reflections on the steppe road. – Kiev: Printing house Dom Dmitrya Burago, 2012. – P. 233–251.
8. Musatayeva M.Sh. Ideographical Dictionary of Turkisms in Russian language / M.Sh. Musatayeva, L.A. Shelyakhovskaya. – Almaty, 2006. – 266 pages.
9. Rakhimzhanova G.K. Turkisms in Russian newspaper text: dissertation. ... Candidate of philological sciences – Astana : ENU after L.N.Gumilyev, 2004. – P. 185.
10. Dictionary of Russian Dialects of Odessa Region: 2 volumes / Executive editor Y.A. Karpenko, S. Uemura. – Odessa : Astroprint, 2000–2001.
11. Fasmer M. Etymological dictionary of Russian language: 4 volumes / M. Fasmer. – M., 1964 – 1973.
12. Miklosich F. Die turkischen Elemente in den sudost – und osteuropaischen Sprachen, I–II, Nachtrag I, II (DWA, № 34 (1884); № 35 (1885); № 38 (1890)).
13. Radloff W. Das turkische Sprachmaterial des Codex comanicus / W. Radloff. – St. Petersburg – Riga – Leipzig, 1887.
14. Olkhovskiy V.S. Tamga (to a sign function) // Historical and Archaeological almanah. – Armavir, 2001. Imre Baski. Tamgas and ethnic names (contribution of tamga-signs in ethnogenesis of the Tatars). – Budapest, 1997.
15. Amanzholov S. Questions of dialectology and history of Kazakh language. – Part 1. – Almaty, 1959; Pearl H. A study of ethnogenesis of the Mongolian tribes by exploring their clan symbols (in Mongolian language). – Ulaanbaatar, 1975; Philonenko V.I. Tamgas of Tatar cemeteries in Yevpatoriya. – Simferopol, 1928. – 22 pages; Baski Imre. Tamgas and ethnic names (contribution of tamga-signs in ethnogenesis of the Tatars). – Budapest, 1997.
16. Ghasanov Z. Royal Scythians: ethnolinguistic identity of “Royal Scythians” and ancient Oguz. New York: Publishing House, 2002. – P. 122–130.
17. Herodotus. History. L., 1972. – IV. 6.
18. Dyakonov I.M. History of Media / I.M. Dyakonov. – M.-L., 1956.
19. 19 Triyarsky E. Tamgas of Turkic tribes from Bulgaria: UAJG. 47. 1975. – P. 189–200; Pearl H. A study of ethnogenesis of the Mongolian tribes by exploring their clan symbols (in Mongolian language) / H. Pearl. – Ulaanbaatar, 1975; Philonenko V.I. Tamgas of Tatar cemeteries in Yevpatoriya / V.I. Philonenko. – Simferopol, 1928. – 22 pages.
20. Solomonik E.I. Sarmatian signs of Northern Black Sea region / E.I. Solomonik. – Kiev, 1959.
21. Gaidukevich V.F. Bosporan kingdom / V.F. Gaidukevich. – M.-L., 1949.
22. Svetsitskaya I.S. Macedonia, Greece and Northern Black Sea region during the Hellenistic / I.S. Svetsitskaya // History of the Ancient World: Prosperity of ancient societies. – 3-rd edition, revised and completed. – M. : Head editor of oriental literature, 1989. – P. 349.

***А. Каиржанов, А. Болдрикова. Тысячелетия вокруг Черного моря (тюркизмы в островных говорах и этнических тамгах). – Статья.***

***Аннотация.*** В статье исследуются тюркизмы в островных говорах Северного Причерноморья и определяются языки-источники (на материале этнических тамг) и языки-посредники, при помощи которых произошла диффузия и дисперсия в язык-реципиент.

***Ключевые слова:*** аккультурация, денотативное и коннотативное значения, язык-посредник, язык-источник, тамга, диффузия, дисперсия.

*А. Каіржанов, А. Болдрікова. Тисячоліття навколо Чорного моря (тюркізми в острівних говорах і етнічних тамга). – Стаття.*

*Анотація.* У статті досліджуються тюркізми в острівних говорах Північного Причорномор'я й визначаються мови-джерела (на матеріалі етнічних тамг) і мови-посередники, за допомогою яких відбулися дифузія та дисперсія в мову-реципієнт.

*Ключові слова:* акультурація, денотативне й конотативне значення, мова-посередник, мова-джерело, тамга, дифузія, дисперсія.

**УДК 37.091.33(076)**

**О.В. Кміть,**

*кандидат педагогічних наук,  
доцент кафедри мов і методики їх викладання,  
Чернігівський національний педагогічний  
університет імені Т.Г. Шевченка,  
м. Чернігів, Україна*

## **ФОРМУВАННЯ ПРОФЕСІЙНО-КОМУНІКАТИВНОЇ КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТІ МАЙБУТНЬОГО ВЧИТЕЛЯ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ ПОЧАТКОВОЇ ШКОЛИ НА ОСНОВІ КОНТЕКСТНОГО ПІДХОДУ**

*Анотація.* У статті визначено напрями й технології застосування контекстного підходу до процесу формування професійно-комунікативної компетентності майбутнього вчителя англійської мови початкової школи й обґрунтовано доцільність проведення контекстного навчання на основі кейс-технології.

*Ключові слова:* англійська професійно-комунікативна компетентність, учитель англійської мови початкової школи, контекстний підхід, технологія "Case study".

Одним із актуальних завдань вищої педагогічної школи є підготовка компетентного, гнучкого, конкурентоспроможного фахівця для роботи в умовах школи, що динамічно змінюється, підготовка спеціаліста, здатного ефективно і творчо здійснювати професійну діяльність. У контексті сучасних потреб у педагогічних кадрах, які забезпечують на високому рівні іншомовну освіту школярів, проблема формування професійної, зокрема професійно-комунікативної, компетентності вчителів англійської мови початкової школи набуває особливої важливості. Проте наявність об'єктивних і суб'єктивних причин, що зумовлюють недостатню ефективність традиційного навчання майбутніх педагогів, спонукає до пошуку більш дієвих технологій формування професійно-комунікативної компетентності названих фахівців. Одним із важливих шляхів вирішення зазначеної проблеми є посилення практичної спрямованості навчання, поєднання теоретичної та практичної підготовки майбутніх учителів англійської мови початкової школи. Це завдання може бути вирішене за допомогою контекстного підходу до навчання, який забезпечує природний зв'язок набутих знань із майбутньою професійною діяльністю.

Наукове обґрунтування основних концептуальних положень контекстного навчання здійснено А.А. Вербицьким. Їх апробація в навчальному процесі вищої школи дала вченому змогу переконливо довести, що стратегічним напрямом інтенсифікації або активізації навчання є не збільшення обсягу наданої інформації, прискорення процесів її засвоєння, а створення дидактичних і психологічних умов осмисленості учіння, включення до нього студента на рівні не лише інтелектуальної, а й особистісної й соціальної активності.

За визначенням автора концепції, контекстне навчання – це форма активного навчання, призначена для застосування у вищій школі, зорієнтована на професійну підготовку студентів і реалізована за допомогою системного використання професійного контексту, поступового насичення навчального процесу елементами професійної діяльності [1, с. 25]. Контекстне навчання спирається на теорію діяльності Л.С. Виготського [2], відповідно до якої засвоєння соціального досвіду здійснюється в результаті активної діяльності суб'єкта, що ґрунтується на таких принципах: