

Волинський національний університет імені Лесі Українки

Факультет іноземної філології

Кафедра англійської філології

Олександр Бєляков, Наталія Пожарська,

Оксана Шкамарда, Вікторія Юшак

Методичні рекомендації

з практики навчальної літературознавчої

для здобувачів освіти за ОП «Мова і література (англійська). Переклад»

Луцьк 2025

УДК 378.147.091.33-027.22:82.0(072)
М 54

Рекомендовано до друку науково-методичною радою Волинського національного університету імені Лесі Українки

(Протокол № 4 від 17. 12. 2025 р.)

Рецензент:

Єфремова Н. В. – кандидат філологічних наук, доцент (Волинський національний університет імені Лесі Українки)

О. Бєляков, Н. Пожарська, О. Шкамарда, В. Юшак

М 54

«Методичні рекомендації з практики навчальної літературознавчої для здобувачів освіти за ОП «Мова і література (англійська). Переклад». Луцьк : ВНУ, 2025. 48 с.

Методичні рекомендації містять теоретичні матеріали з аналізу художнього тексту, спрямовані на систематизацію знань здобувачів освіти під час проходження практики навчальної літературознавчої. Видання включає практичну частину, у якій окреслено особливості роботи з художнім текстом на прикладі англомовного оповідання. У додатках подано рекомендовані твори для аналізу, етапи проходження практики із чітко визначеними завданнями, критерії оцінювання та зразок оформлення титульного аркуша. Розробка призначена для здобувачів освіти другого курсу факультету іноземної філології за ОП «Мова і література (англійська). Переклад».

УДК 378.147.091.33-027.22:82.0(072)

© О. Бєляков, Н. Пожарська, О. Шкамарда, В. Юшак, 2025

© Волинський національний університет
імені Лесі Українки, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	6
PART I. THEORETICAL SECTION OF THE LITERARY STUDIES	
PRACTICE	8
1.1. Methods of analysing literary works and the main linguistic aspects of the text	8
1.2. Basic literary terms.....	8
1.3. Analogies and parallels between works in Ukrainian and other languages....	13
PART II. PRACTICAL SECTION OF THE LITERARY STUDIES	
PRACTICE	17
2.1. Reading and general interpretation of Mark Twain's short story <i>The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County</i>	17
2.1.1. Linguistic means in the short story (synonyms, antonyms, phraseological units).....	17
2.1.2. Cultural contexts and authorial devices in <i>The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County</i>	25
CONCLUSIONS.....	31
LIST OF REFERENCES	33
APPENDICES.....	35

INTRODUCTION

In modern philological education, literary studies practice is expected to combine theoretical knowledge with the skills of close reading and linguistically grounded interpretation. The present methodological guidelines is designed for students of English language and literature and is devoted to the analysis of Mark Twain's short story *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County* within the framework of a course in literary studies practice. The choice of this text is justified by its canonical status in the history of American humour, its relatively small volume and clear narrative structure, which make it suitable for detailed classroom analysis in the original language.

The theoretical part of the guideline systematises the approaches that treat a literary work as a linguistic and aesthetic whole. Drawing on contemporary linguistically oriented literary criticism and Ukrainian university courses on linguistic analysis of the text and comparative literature, it outlines the main methods of analysing a work of fiction and specifies the principal linguistic levels of the text that are relevant for such analysis (phonetic, lexical and phraseological, word-formation, morphological, syntactic and textual). It also introduces a compact set of basic literary and linguistic terms – those connected with the short story as a genre, with narrative structure and point of view, and with lexical relations such as synonymy, antonymy and phraseological units – and summarises the main types of analogies and parallels that may be traced between Ukrainian and foreign literary traditions.

The practical part of the methodological guidelines illustrates how these theoretical principles can be applied to the reading of Twain's short story in English. In accordance with the programme of literary studies practice, the material is organised into two closely connected stages. First, the short story is read and interpreted as a whole, with attention to its frame-narrative organisation, the opposition between the educated frame narrator and the folk storyteller Simon Wheeler, the composition of episodes and the cultural background of the Californian

mining camp. Secondly, on this interpretative basis, the linguistic means in the text are examined in detail: synonymic and antonymic series, as well as phraseological units and idioms in both the frame narrative and Wheeler's monologue, are identified and commented upon.

The aim of the methodological guidelines is to provide a coherent set of theoretical explanations and practical materials that support students' work with an English literary text and help them acquire the skills of linguistically based literary analysis. In accordance with this aim the guideline sets the following tasks: to familiarise students with the main methods of analysing a literary work and with the key linguistic aspects of the text; to introduce a terminological apparatus that will be used in the analysis of *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County*; to show, on the material of Twain's story, how synonymy, antonymy and phraseological units function in context; and to outline possibilities for drawing analogies and parallels between English and Ukrainian texts in further classroom work.

In terms of practical value, the materials of the methodological guidelines can be used in seminars on literary studies practice, in classes on stylistics of the English language and in elements of comparative literature. The structure of the text and the examples of analysis may serve as a model that the teacher can adapt to the needs of a particular group and extend to other English-language short stories of similar type.

PART I

THEORETICAL SECTION OF THE LITERARY STUDIES PRACTICE

1.1. Methods of analysing literary works and the main linguistic aspects of the text

In contemporary literary studies, the analysis of a work of fiction is inseparable from the analysis of its language. The text is not treated as a neutral container of ideas but as a complex linguistic structure whose organisation at different levels produces both meaning and aesthetic effect. In the Ukrainian linguo-stylistic tradition this view is often expressed with a formulation by Y. Lotman, frequently quoted in linguo-stylistic scholarship: “*Poetic speech is a structure of the highest complexity, by means of which such an amount of information is conveyed as is absolutely impossible to transmit through the means of an elementary, purely linguistic structure.*” [1, p. 116]. This thesis outlines the general methodological horizon: without linguistic analysis it is impossible to fully interpret a literary work.

Within literary criticism several complementary methods are used to approach the text as an aesthetic whole.

In the hermeneutic tradition, which was systematically developed in twentieth-century philosophy, literature is treated as a privileged object of interpretation, and reading is described as a dialogic process between the interpreter and the tradition that speaks through the text. *The Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms* sums up this orientation by emphasizing that literary works always already belong to a horizon of understanding that the reader enters, and that interpretation necessarily involves negotiating with that horizon.

At the same time, stylistic and linguistically oriented approaches insist that interpretation must be grounded in the observable verbal form of the work. In the entry on **style**, P. Childs and R. Fowler offer a widely cited definition: “*A style is a manner of expression, describable in linguistic terms, justifiable and valuable in respect of non-linguistic factors.*” [3, p. 228].

On this basis the same dictionary proposes to reserve **stylistics** for “*the linguistic study of style in the sense indicated above*,” that is, for those analyses which use the concepts and methods of modern linguistics to describe the specific language choices of a text [3, p. 229].

In the Ukrainian tradition these ideas are concretised in courses on linguistic analysis of the text. In her textbook, I. Kochan defines the subject of the discipline as follows: “*The course covers the linguistic characteristics of all language units present in the structure of the texts analysed, from the lowest level – phonemes – to syntaxemes; when analysing literary texts, it is necessary to pay attention to linguistic and stylistic means of expression and representation. The subject of linguistic analysis of a text is the identification and characterisation of the system of linguistic units present in the work.*” [1, p. 24]. Thus, in this approach linguistic analysis is a tool for showing by which exact linguistic means the semantic and emotional structure of a literary text is formed.

Within linguistic analysis, I. Kochan distinguishes several main methods [1, p. 24–25]:

- the semantic-stylistic method focuses on the correlation between lexical, phraseological and syntactic choices and the conceptual and emotional content of the work;
- linguistic experiment (for example, replacing a key word with a synonym, changing the order of components, and so on) shows how minimal formal changes break the artistic effect, thereby making the function of the original form more visible;
- the contrastive-stylistic method approach compares parallel texts or passages in different styles or languages to highlight the specificity of an author’s individual manner and of a national literary tradition.

In sum, hermeneutic interpretation, structural and narrative description and linguo-stylistic analysis are not opposed to each other but work together: the interpreter reads the text in its historical and cultural context but does so through close attention to its linguistic form.

It is also possible to clearly identify the main linguistic aspects that are taken into account in the analysis [1]:

- phonetic and graphic (phonetic and orthoepic features, rhythm, sound writing);
- lexical and phraseological (vocabulary, semantic fields, synonymy, antonymy, phraseology);
- word formation (word formation models, individual author's neologisms);
- morphological (distribution of parts of speech, tense and aspect forms of verbs, pronoun system, etc.);
- syntactic (types of sentences, methods of syntactic connection, syntagmatic chains);
- textual (coherence, composition, repetitions, thematic and rhetorical organisation).

Finally, at the level of the text as a whole, linguistic analysis naturally intersects with stylistics and semiotics. In the dictionary by Childs and Fowler mentioned above, **stylistics** is defined precisely as “*the linguistic study of style in the sense indicated above*”, that is, as the scholarly description of those language choices which can be explicated in linguistic terms but are motivated by individual and cultural factors.

J. A. Cuddon, in turn, describes the role of **semiotics** in literary criticism as follows: “*In literary criticism semiotics is concerned with the complete signifying system of a text and the codes and conventions we need to understand in order to be able to read it.*” [4, p. 644].

Thus it is the mastery of these codes and conventions that makes reading a text possible. The separate language levels singled out by linguistic analysis are therefore regarded as subsystems of a single signifying structure.

1.2. Basic literary terms

In order to carry out a coherent analysis of Mark Twain's *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County*, it is necessary to establish a small set of basic

literary-critical and linguistic terms. They form a common metalanguage for the subsequent chapters, where the methods of linguistic analysis and the practical interpretation of the story will be applied, including the identification of synonyms, antonyms and phraseological units in the text.

In Ukrainian linguistically oriented literary studies, the main object of analysis is artistic text, i.e. the text of a literary work (prose, poetry or drama) written in an artistic style. We mentioned the concept of **literary analysis** above.

Within this broad category, the main genre relevant for the present practice course is the **short story**. In Ade Mukhlisin's undergraduate thesis on Twain's humour, based on M. H. Abrams, the short story is treated as a brief work of prose fiction which can be analysed in ways similar to the novel but is distinguished by its concentration on a small number of situations that can be read in a short time [6, p. 4–5]. Twain's *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County* is taken there as a paradigmatic example of such a genre.

For the structural description of a short story, Mukhlisin distinguishes a set of intrinsic aspects: characters, settings, theme and plot. These categories will be used throughout the practical analysis.

Characters are the person presented on the story, whom the reader interprets as possessing particular moral, intellectual and emotional qualities on the basis of what they say, how they speak and what they do [6, p. 14]. Abrams' well-known distinction between flat and round characters is also adopted: flat characters embody a single idea or quality and are therefore easy to understand, whereas round characters are more complex and like the real person, capable of surprising the reader [6, p. 14–15]. In Twain's story, for instance, the anonymous first-person narrator and Simon Wheeler are analysed as round characters, while the narrator's friend or Parson Walker are treated as flat ones.

Setting is defined, after J. A. Cuddon, as “*the where and when of a story or play*,” that is, “*the place and time in which the action is centred*.” [6, p. 17]. In *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County* the setting is specified as Angel's

Camp in Calaveras County, and the historical moment is indicated indirectly through references to “the winter of ’49 or spring of ’50.” [6, p. 17–18].

Theme is the central idea of the story, which may be stated directly or emerge implicitly from the development of characters and situations. The *Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms* notes that recurrent local features are better called *motifs*, while theme should designate a “line or thread running through a work, linking features which are otherwise unrelated.” [3, p. 239]. In reading of Twain, themes such as the search for truth and the uniqueness of individual character are foregrounded.

Plot in a narrative work is, in Abrams’ formulation cited by Mukhlisin, “*constituted by its events and actions.*” [6, p. 18]. The same thesis divides the plot of *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County* into a sequence of stages – beginning, rising action, climax, falling action and end – and lists nine key points from the narrator’s receipt of the letter to his decision to leave Wheeler and his unfinished story [6, p. 18–19]. Freytag’s classical model of “(a) *introduction*; (b) *inciting moment*; (c) *rising action*; (d) *climax*; (e) *falling action*; (f) *catastrophe*,” presented in Cuddon’s dictionary, forms the general theoretical background for such plot analysis [4, p. 291].

Because *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County* is built on a frame narrative, notions related to narration are essential. Cuddon defines **viewpoint** (point of view) as “*the position of the narrator in relation to his story; thus the outlook from which the events are related,*” and distinguishes, among others, omniscient narration and first-person narrative [4, p. 761]. In Twain’s story, the external first-person narrator (“I”) frames Simon Wheeler’s long anecdote, and the contrast between their perspectives is crucial for understanding both the humour and the implied evaluation of the frontier community [6, p. 19].

From the perspective of this practical course, literary analysis is inextricably linked to stylistic and linguistic description. As mentioned, stylistics uses the concepts and methods of modern linguistics to describe the choices at different levels of language that characterise a particular author, genre or period.

The lexical level – which is crucial for this course – is described in detail in Kochan’s textbook on linguistic analysis of the text. Summarising a collection of exercises by N. Myroniuk, Kochan notes that the manual includes chapters on:

“3. *The word in a literary text. Lexical elements of the text. Literal and figurative meaning of the word in a literary text.*

4. *Homonyms in a literary text. Synonyms in a literary text. Antonyms in a literary text. Paronyms in a literary text. Active and passive vocabulary in a literary text. Lexical analysis of the text. Phraseological units in a literary text.*

5. *Phonetic and orthoepic features of a literary text.*

6. *Morphemic and word-formation features in a literary text.*

7. *Part-of-speech analysis of a literary text.*

8. *Syntactic features of a literary text.”* [1, p. 25–26].

This structure makes it clear that within the lexical level Kochan treats **synonyms**, **antonyms** and **phraseological units** in the literary text as separate objects of analysis, alongside homonyms, paronyms and the active / passive vocabulary. The tasks proposed in the textbook for “Synonyms in the literary text” and “Antonyms in the literary text” require students to identify synonymous and antonymic series in context and to determine their role in expressing the author’s evaluative attitude.

In line with this approach, *synonyms* will be understood in the present course as words or expressions belonging to the same part of speech which denote the same or a very close concept but differ in shade of meaning, stylistic colouring or usage. *Antonyms* will be treated as pairs of words with opposite meanings within a common semantic field (for example, *big / small, honest / dishonest*), which often structure evaluative contrasts in characterisation and theme.

A special role is played by phraseological units and their internal synonymy. Kochan emphasises the functional importance of phraseology: “*The important functional role of phraseological units is manifested in the synonymous richness of these fixed expressions.”* [1, p. 244]. She then gives the following definition:

“phraseological synonyms are phraseological units which denote the same object of reality and express the same concept, but accentuate different aspects of it; despite differences in internal form and lexical composition, they share the same categorical meaning and similar semantic combinability with surrounding words. For literary texts this means that phraseological series reflect subtle gradations of emotional states and interpersonal relations and encode culturally specific images.” [1, p. 244].

The practical tasks of this course – especially the identification of “linguistic constructions (synonyms, antonyms, phraseological units)” in Twain’s story – are grounded in this theoretical framework. The short story will be read not only through its plot and characters, but also through networks of lexical and phraseological relations that form semantic and evaluative patterns.

Given that Mark Twain’s short story *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County* is traditionally perceived as a comic work, the terms “humour” occupy a central place. In the theoretical section of this work, **humour** is presented as ‘the humours are developed as symbolic stances through which the characters are seen to react to the values of the world they inhabit, rather than as simple flaws or biases in their nature.’ [3, p. 111]. Freud’s theory is summarised as a distinction between two basic forms of humour (the form of expression and the form of narration) and three functions of jokes [6, p. 9].

Taken together, these terms – literary (artistic) text, short story, character (flat / round), setting, theme, plot, point of view, style and stylistics, as well as lexical categories such as word, synonym, antonym, phraseological unit and, finally, humour, irony and satire – constitute the basic conceptual framework of the present practice course.

1.3. Analogies and parallels between works in Ukrainian and other languages

Comparative literary studies start from the assumption that every national literature develops within a wider network of international relations. In the Ukrainian handbook on comparative literature the *main* goal of the course is formulated as follows: “*The main goal of the course is to help philology students develop a system of ideas about literature as a complex process of interaction between national and global cultural traditions, which currently requires comparative methods to study.*” [2, p. 6]. In other words, the task is not to isolate Ukrainian texts, but to train readers to see them as part of world literature, where analogies and parallels with works in other languages constantly arise. This perspective corresponds to the idea of Weltliteratur as reconstructed in J. A. Cuddon’s dictionary: Goethe did not want “*the special characteristics of each nation’s writing to be effaced but merely to be situated within a larger scheme where its connections with other literatures can be explored, to their common benefit*” [4, p. 777].

Within this framework, analogies and parallels are described in terms of several types of inter-literary relations. The syllabus of *Comparative Literary Studies* distinguishes, in particular, a genetic and a contact approach: the **genetic** approach “*makes it possible to reveal the origin of a given phenomenon, the paths of its development in interaction with others and, ultimately, the continuity and diversity of the cultural tradition,*” while the **contact** approach “*determines the presence or absence of links between writers and texts.*” [2, p. 8]. At the level of key notions, the course explicitly includes “*genetic links in world culture,*” “*contact links,*” and “*typological parallels.*” [2, p. 8].

Genetic and contact relations presuppose concrete channels of influence (translation, personal contacts, reception of foreign authors), whereas typological parallels concern similarities of form, theme or poetics that arise without direct borrowing but within comparable historical or cultural conditions. In all three cases

the comparative perspective is based on observing analogies between works of different literatures and explaining them in terms of origin, transmission or structural affinity.

A separate line of analysis is provided by **thematology**, which the same handbook defines in a test question as “*a comparative study of themes and ideas, images and plots, symbols, myths and archetypes; it examines literary thematics in the diachronic (Stoffgeschichte, ‘history of ideas’) and synchronic (the study of recurrent motifs, situations, characters) aspects.*” [2, p. 419]. Here analogies and parallels are traced primarily at the level of recurring motifs, narrative situations, symbolic constellations and character types that appear in different national contexts. The same unit emphasises that comparative work must also take into account **genology** (as “*the theory of literary kinds and genres*”) and contact-based approaches that study “*direct links between literary phenomena.*” [2, p. 419]. Thus analogies between Ukrainian and foreign texts can be typological (similar genre models or motifs), genetic (shared tradition) or contact-based (direct intertextual dialogue, translation, rewritings).

The practical sections of the comparative handbook illustrate how such analogies and parallels are actually studied. One of the proposed projects invites students to follow the fate of Horace’s ode *Exegi monumentum* from antiquity to modernity, setting the task “*to trace the development of the theme from the earliest times (from Horace) to the present; ... to analyse translations of Horace’s ode Exegi monumentum... (for example, the Ukrainian translations by M. Zerov and A. Sodomora); ... to ascertain the figurative and stylistic resonances of Horace’s ode in later texts on the same theme (the presence of quotation-reminiscences, symbols, allusions, etc.).*” [2, p. 416]. Here the analogy between the Latin original and Ukrainian texts arises both at the level of thematic continuity (the “monument” of poetry) and at the level of genre and style, while the analysis of intertextual signals (quotations, allusions, paratexts) makes visible the network of parallels that connects them.

Another example concerns documentary prose about political repression. To characterise the specific artistic features of Boris Antonenko-Davydovych's *Sibirska novely*, the handbook proposes to compare their narrative organisation with that of two other camp prose cycles: “*the much better known to the world book Kolyma Tales by Varlam Shalamov and the much less known beyond his native Belarus short story-memoir camp cycle by Vasyl Khomchanka.*” [2, p. 74]. The stated aim is “*to reveal its artistic distinctiveness as a book of testimony.*” [2, p. 74]. In this case parallels between Ukrainian, Russian and Belarusian texts serve not to level their differences, but to sharpen the perception of each writer's narrative strategy, rhetorical stance and imagological position. The same volume devotes a substantial section to the analysis of how Ukrainian experience is absent from certain Russian representations of war and repression, speaking of “*a special mechanism of silencing,*” which in contemporary ethno-imagology and postcolonial studies is associated with “*the discourse of the absence*” of Ukrainian-ness [2, p. 243]. Here the lack of explicit parallels itself becomes a significant comparative datum.

Analogies between Ukrainian and foreign texts may therefore be constructed not only on the level of themes or plots, but also on that of genre, narrative form and linguistic technique. The appendix on Horace's ode already introduces a set of intertextual categories (transtextuality, architextuality, intertextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality, paratextuality) as tools for describing such relations: “*transtextuality is any interaction of texts,*” “*architextuality is the relation of a text to a genre code, to the national and world tradition*” and so on [2, p. 416–417]. These notions make it possible to distinguish, for example, between a Ukrainian poem that merely alludes to a European classic and one that systematically rewrites its genre model; between typological similarities and conscious dialogic engagement.

At the same time the handbook insists on the central role of translation in creating a durable network of analogies and parallels: among the control questions we find the direct formulation “*Is it possible, and how important is it for Ukrainian culture, to have a stable tradition of translations?*” [2, p. 411]. Translation makes

foreign texts available within the Ukrainian cultural space and, conversely, allows Ukrainian works to enter into the circuit of world literature. This is particularly important for cross-linguistic comparison of stylistic and linguistic phenomena, including humour, narrative voice or the use of colloquial and dialectal elements. Without translation it would be difficult to compare, for instance, the narrative rhythm or lexical registers of an English short story and a Ukrainian humorous sketch on equal terms.

Linguistically oriented manuals also suggest how specific devices can become the basis for such analogies. In *Linhvistichnyi analiz tekstu* the section on onomastics stresses that proper names are a very strong means in humour and satire: “*Onomastics is a very strong device in humour and satire. However, in different authors it is realised with different force.*” [1, p. 95]. The author illustrates this by surnames derived from Ukrainian phraseological units; such complex names “*contain an enormous humorous and satirical charge.*” [1, p. 95]. Given that phraseologisms and wordplay are explicitly mentioned in the practical task of this course, this kind of material is directly relevant: it points to a specific area where Ukrainian humorous prose can be compared with English-language humour in terms of how fixed expressions, idioms and proper names are exploited for comic effect.

Finally, the comparative and linguistic perspectives converge in the recognition that any such analogies and parallels must be grounded in close analysis of the text as a verbal construct. As Kochan’s manual on linguistic analysis puts it, “*the task of linguistic analysis is to show those linguistic means by which the ideological and emotional content of a literary work is presented.*” [1, p. 388]. When this task is extended to more than one literature, the critic is required not only to describe the devices of a single author, but also to observe how similar or contrasting devices function in texts written in different languages and embedded in different traditions. Analogies and parallels between Ukrainian and foreign works therefore do not replace individual interpretation but deepen it: they reveal how national literatures participate in common thematic and formal patterns, while preserving their own special characteristics within the broader space of world literature.

PART II

PRACTICAL SECTION OF THE LITERARY STUDIES PRACTICE

2.1. Reading and general interpretation of Mark Twain's short story The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County

2.1.1. Linguistic means in the short story (synonyms, antonyms, phraseological units)

On the linguistic level *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County* is organised around a dense system of synonymous, antonymic and phraseological constructions, concentrated above all in Simon Wheeler's oral narrative. These constructions are not accidental ornaments: they shape the humorous tone, structure the opposition between the educated frame narrator and the folk storyteller, and encode the cultural background of the mining camp.

1. Synonymic constructions. In Twain's story, synonymy usually appears as paired or serial items that intensify a description or fix an evaluative stance.

Frame narrator's discourse

- “good-natured, garrulous old Simon Wheeler.” Two near-synonymous social traits (*good-natured* and *garrulous*) are coordinated to present Wheeler as both friendly and excessively talkative. The repetition of positive but slightly comic qualities already anticipates the long-winded tale to come.

- “as long and tedious as it should be useless to me.” The adjectives *long* and *tedious* constitute a synonymous pair describing the same negative property of duration, with *tedious* reinforcing the evaluative aspect of *long*. The construction turns the narrator's boredom into a slightly hyperbolic complaint.

- “an expression of winning gentleness and simplicity upon his tranquil countenance.” *Gentleness* and *simplicity* here function as near-synonyms of mild, unthreatening character. Their coordination with *winning* and *tranquil* stabilises an image of almost exaggerated harmlessness, which contrasts with the narrator's inner irritation.

- “earnestness and sincerity.” The two abstract nouns name closely related ethical attitudes. Their pairing underlines that Wheeler tells his absurd story in complete good faith, without any sense of comic distance.
- “any thing ridiculous or funny about his story.” *Ridiculous* and *funny* are practically synonymous here: both refer to comic incongruity. The double naming emphasises the gulf between Wheeler’s serious attitude and the narrator’s perception of the tale as pure farce.

Wheeler’s narrative

- “he was lucky, uncommon lucky.” The repetition with intensifier (*uncommon*) produces a synonymous construction: both items denote success in gambling, while the second item upgrades the first and makes Wheeler’s admiration explicit.
- “she was considerable better … and coming on so smart.” These two colloquial phrases describe the same state of improvement. *Considerable better* and *coming on so smart* form a synonymous pair in the semantic field of recovery, and their accumulation heightens the contrast with Smiley’s cynical bet “that she don’t, anyway”.
- “always had the asthma, or the distemper, or the consumption, or something of that kind.” A serial list of near-synonymous illnesses constructs the mare as permanently sick in an undefined way. The precise medical labels are less important than the cumulative effect of “constant disease”.
- “at the fag-end of the race she’d get excited and desperate-like.” *Excited* and *desperate-like* denote closely related states of emotional intensity; the first leans toward agitation, the second toward extremity. Together they represent the paradoxical burst of energy in a half-dead animal.
- “a little small bull pup.” The pairing of *little* and *small* is a tautological synonymous combination characteristic of colloquial speech. It functions as an emphatic diminutive, underlining the contrast between the dog’s appearance and his unexpected fighting skills.

- “You never see a frog so modest and straightforward as he was, for all he was so gifted.” *Modest* and *straightforward* form a synonymous cluster of moral simplicity and lack of pretence. The combination prepares the irony of Dan'l Webster's humiliating defeat after being loaded with shot.

- “fair and square jumping on a dead level.” The paired adverbs *fair* and *square* are conventional near-synonyms meaning ‘honest, without trickery’. In the context they define the conditions under which Dan'l Webster is unbeatable.

- “Smiley says, sorter indifferent like, ‘It might be a parrot, or it might be a canary, may be, but it an't; it's only just a frog. ’” The tentative *sorter indifferent like* combines two close notions of emotional detachment; together they mimic the tone of feigned unconcern with which Smiley hides his pride in the frog.

- “Well, I'm only a stranger here, and I ain't got no frog.” Although not strictly synonyms, *only a stranger* and *ain't got no frog* are structurally parallel excuses. They form a semantic pair expressing lack of resources and local belonging.

- “Smiley was monstrous proud of his frog, and well he might be.” *Monstrous proud* and *well he might be* function as an evaluative synonymous reinforcement: both elements stress the legitimacy of Smiley's pride in Dan'l Webster.

- “fellers that had traveled and been everywhere.” The verbs *traveled* and *been everywhere*s are near-synonyms; the colloquial phrase intensifies the idea of broad experience and thereby the objective impressiveness of the frog.

These synonymous constructions contribute to the oral, repetitive rhythm of Wheeler's story and foreground evaluation over bare factual information.

2. Antonymic constructions. Antonymy in the text is used to build contrasts: between emotional reactions, between economic success and failure, and between expectation and outcome.

- “fellers that had traveled and been everywhere.” The verbs *traveled* and *been everywhere*s are near-synonyms; the colloquial phrase intensifies the idea of broad experience and thereby the objective impressiveness of the frog.

- “He never smiled, he never frowned, he never changed his voice.” The verbs *smiled* and *frowned* are opposite possible reactions to a story. Their simultaneous negation constructs an antithetic scale where both positive and negative responses are absent, highlighting Wheeler’s complete emotional immobility.

- “If there was a horse-race, you'd find him flush, or you'd find him busted at the end of it.” The slang adjectives *flush* and *busted* form a clear antonymic pair in the semantic field of wealth vs. ruin. They compress Smiley’s risky behaviour into a binary “all or nothing” outcome.

- “she was considerable better … she'd get well yet … ‘I'll risk two-and-a-half that she don't, anyway’” The lexical items *better* / *get well* are opposed to the negated verb *don't* (= ‘won't get well’). The antithesis between improvement and predicted death creates the black humour of Smiley’s bet on Parson Walker’s wife.

- “that to look at him you'd think he warn't worth a cent … It was a good pup, was that Andrew Jackson.” The combination of *worth a cent* (negated) with *good pup* sets up an antonymic contrast between appearance and essence: outward worthlessness vs. inner value.

- “so he got shucked out bad … it was a good pup … the stuff was in him, and he had genius … if he hadn't no talent.” *Good* vs. *bad*, and *genius* / *talent* vs. their negation, form a chain of explicit and implicit antonyms. Twain plays with evaluative oppositions to stress the injustice of Andrew Jackson’s last defeat.

- “old Simon Wheeler” / “Rev. Leonidas W. Smiley, a young minister of the Gospel.” The age adjectives *old* and *young* point to a latent contrast between the rustic, experienced storyteller and the absent educated clergyman; this opposition structures the entire frame narrative.

- “he was planted as solid as an anvil … he couldn't budge … he was anchored out” vs. *ordinary jumping.*” The metaphors of immobility (*planted*, *couldn't budge*, *anchored out*) implicitly oppose the frog’s usual condition as champion jumper, intensifying the sense of paradox in the final scene.

3. Phraseological units and idioms. Phraseological units, especially in Wheeler's dialect, play a central role in constructing the oral and regional flavour of the narrative. Many of them are fixed or semi-fixed expressions characteristic of colloquial American English.

Frame narrative

- “go to work and bore me nearly to death with some infernal reminiscence of him as long and tedious as it should be useless to me.” The idiom *bore me nearly to death* and the colloquial *go to work* (‘set about doing something’) express the narrator’s exaggerated dread of Wheeler’s storytelling and frame the tale as an ordeal.
- “dozing comfortably by the bar-room stove.” The collocation *dozing comfortably* and the fixed locus *bar-room stove* evoke the stereotype of the idle storyteller in a frontier tavern.
- “backed me into a corner and blockaded me there with his chair.” This metaphorical idiom combines physical action and figurative imprisonment; it describes how the listener is trapped into hearing the story.
- “reeled off the monotonous narrative.” *Reel off* is an established phraseological unit meaning ‘produce speech rapidly and mechanically’. It underlines the rehearsed, formulaic nature of Wheeler’s tale.
- “drifting serenely along through such a queer yarn.” The expression *queer yarn* (‘strange, improbable story’) belongs to folk storytelling vocabulary. Together with *drifting serenely along* it creates the comic dissonance between tone and content.
- “by your leave.” A polite formula used just before the narrator silently withdraws, reinforcing his distance from Wheeler’s enthusiasm.
- “the enterprising vagabond Jim Smiley.” This semi-oxymoronic collocation (*enterprising vagabond*) is a fixed-sounding epithet capturing Smiley’s energy and rootlessness.

- “he button-holed me.” The idiom *button-hole* (‘detain someone in conversation’) literalises the idea of being physically caught and forced to listen.
- “Oh! hang Smiley and his afflicted cow!” The exclamation *hang X* functions as a mild curse; *afflicted cow* is a mock-biblical phraseology that parodies sentimental language.

Wheeler’s narrative

- “it never made no difference to him—he would bet on anything—the dangdest feller.” *Never made no difference* is a typical emphatic negative idiom; *dangdest feller* is hyperbolic vernacular praise.
- “he was always ready and laying for a chance.” *Lay for a chance* is an idiomatic expression meaning ‘wait eagerly for an opportunity’, here applied to betting.
- “if there was a horse-race, you'd find him flush, or you'd find him busted at the end of it.” *Flush* and *busted* are idiomatic slang terms for financial success and ruin; the whole structure is a fixed pattern of gambling talk.
- “they used to give her two or three hundred yards start.” *Give ... a start* is a racing idiom for a handicap, marking Smiley’s willingness to bet on seemingly hopeless odds.
- “at the fag-end of the race.” *Fag-end* is an idiomatic noun for the very last, exhausted part of something.
- “kicking up m-o-r-e dust, and raising m-o-r-e racket.” *Kick up dust* and *raise a racket* are colloquial idioms for making noise and disturbance, here stretched by spelling for comic emphasis.
- “to set around and look ornery, and lay for a chance to steal something.” *Look ornery* and *lay for a chance* are phraseological combinations marking the dog as a habitual schemer.
- “Andrew Jackson would never let on but what he was satisfied.” *Never let on* is a fixed idiom meaning ‘never reveal anything’; it marks the dog’s deceptive calm.

- “till they throwed up the sponge.” A well-known boxing idiom (‘admit defeat’), transferred to dog-fighting.

- “the other dog had him in the door, so to speak.” *Have someone in the door* is a figurative idiom of entrapment, softened by *so to speak*.

- “would have made a name for hisself if he'd lived, for the stuff was in him.”

Make a name for oneself and *the stuff was in him* are idiomatic ways to talk about potential success and inner qualities.

- “he hadn't had no opportunities to speak of, and it don't stand to reason.” *To speak of* (meaning ‘worth mentioning’) and *it don't stand to reason* (meaning ‘it is illogical’) are stable colloquial expressions.

- “till you couldn't rest, and you couldn't fetch nothing for him to bet on but he'd match you.” *Couldn't rest* and *fetch nothing ... but he'd match you* are idiomatic exaggerations of Smiley’s obsessive gambling.

- “said he cal'klated to edercate him.” *Cal'klated to edercate* (‘intended to educate’) is a dialectal idiom showing Smiley’s quasi-pedagogical attitude to the frog.

- “you bet you he did learn him, too.” *You bet you* is a common emphatic idiom, marking absolute certainty.

- “whirling in the air like a doughnut ... turn one summerset ... come down flat-footed and all right, like a cat.” These simile-based idioms (*like a doughnut, flat-footed, like a cat*) stylise the frog’s movements through vivid, conventional comparisons.

- “flop down on the floor again as solid as a gob of mud.” The idiom *as solid as* plus the grotesque image *gob of mud* create a comic picture of heavy landing.

- “as indifferent as if he hadn't no idea he'd been doin' any more'n any frog might do.” A formulaic comparison (*as indifferent as if...*) emphasises Dan'l’s apparent lack of vanity.

- “Jumping on a dead level was his strong suit ... Smiley would ante up money on him as long as he had a red.” *Strong suit* (card-playing idiom), *ante up*

and *as long as he had a red* (slang for money) firmly locate the narrative in gambling discourse.

- “he laid over any frog that ever they see.” *Lay over* is an idiom meaning ‘surpass, outdo’.
- “good enough for one thing ... he can outjump any frog in Calaveras County.” *Good enough for one thing* is a vague phraseological formula introducing Smiley’s boast.
 - “I don't see no p'ints about that frog that's any better'n any other frog” (repeated twice). The expression *see no p'ints about* someone is a colloquial idiom for ‘see no special qualities in’. Its repetition frames the entire trick.
 - “I'm only a stranger here, and I ain't got no frog.” *Only a stranger* and *ain't got no* belong to the idiomatically fixed repertoire of self-deprecating excuses.
 - “hold my box a minute ... set down to wait.” *Hold ... a minute* and *set down to wait* are everyday idiomatic descriptions of casual action.
 - “prized his mouth open ... filled him full of quail shot ... filled him pretty near up to his chin.” These collocations use verbs (*prize open*, *fill ... full*) in conventional phraseological patterns to describe the deception.
 - “slopped around in the mud.” *Slop around* is an idiom denoting messy movement, characteristic of dialect storytelling.
 - “I'll give the word ... One, two, three, jump!” *Give the word* is a fixed phrase for signalling the start of an action.
 - “he couldn't budge ... he was planted as solid as an anvil ... anchored out.” The sequence of idioms of immobility (*couldn't budge*, *planted as solid as*, *anchored out*) comically over-describes Dan'l's inability to move.
 - “I do wonder what in the nation that frog throw'd off for.” The exclamation *what in the nation* is a mild oath; *throw'd off* in this context is a phraseological unit meaning ‘failed, performed badly’.
 - “Why, blame my cats, if he don't weigh five pound!” *Blame my cats* is a dialect interjection; its idiomatic nature marks Wheeler’s voice.

- “a double handful of shot.” *Double handful* functions as a conventional measure phrase.
- “he was the maddest man ... took out after that feller, but he never ketched him.” *The maddest man* and *take out after* (meaning ‘run in pursuit’) are idiomatic hyperboles of anger and chase.
- “Just set where you are, stranger, and rest easy I ain't going to be gone a second.” *Set where you are* and *rest easy* are formulaic expressions of informal hospitality and reassurance.

Together, these phraseological units constitute the main vehicle for Twain’s humour and for the cultural colouring of the narrative. They will be central for the subsequent contrastive analysis of synonymy, antonymy and idiom in Ukrainian translations of the story.

2.1.2. Cultural contexts and authorial devices in *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County*

In *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County* the linguistic organisation of the text is inseparable from its culturally specific background and from a set of highly deliberate authorial devices. The story belongs simultaneously to the tradition of American frontier writing, to the genre of the tall tale and to the practice of local-colour realism, and it uses the resources of humour and satire to articulate a critical view of contemporary social values.

1. Frontier culture, local colour and oral storytelling. From the outset the story is anchored in a recognisable cultural geography: the scene is Angel’s Camp in Calaveras County, a mining settlement in the American West, and the main action is located in a bar-room where Simon Wheeler is “dozing comfortably by the bar-room stove” and then detains the visiting narrator with his tale.

These details correspond closely to what Cuddon’s dictionary describes as **local colour**: the use of features peculiar to a given region (setting, customs, types of character) to give authenticity and interest, a technique in which Mark Twain is explicitly listed among the classic practitioners [4, p. 407]. The social milieu is that

of frontier life, a category that Cuddon defines as literature organised around the experience of settler communities on a colonial frontier, particularly in the Americas.

Twain's text foregrounds precisely those elements: rough gambling culture, improvised horse races, dog fights, casual betting on any event, and the presence of an "enterprising vagabond" like Jim Smiley who lives by his wits in an unstable environment.

The repeated references to tavern life, to "fellers that had traveled and been everywhere," and to the half-domesticated animals kept for wagering reinforce the image of a transient, male-dominated community whose values are shaped by chance and profit rather than by settled norms.

The narrative also emerges from an oral storytelling culture. The publisher's note included in the teaching edition stresses that Twain did not invent the plot ex nihilo, but heard versions of this frog story in mining camps and elsewhere before writing it down.

Simon Wheeler's performance reproduces this oral tradition through its digressive structure, its stock phrases and its apparent indifference to any "point" that might interest the visiting Eastern narrator. Twain thus inscribes into the written literary text a specific cultural practice: the long, exaggerated yarn told at leisure by a local raconteur in a communal space.

2. The tall tale tradition and American humour. Cuddon classifies Twain's story explicitly as a **tall story** (or tall tale), placing it among a series of narratives that rely on extravagant invention and humorous exaggeration, from classical examples to modern instances [4, p. 710–711]. In the same entry he notes that tall stories have flourished particularly in frontier environments, in "bad lands" and in pioneering contexts such as the various Gold Rushes.

The Celebrated Jumping Frog fits this generic description closely. The central episode – a frog trained to outjump any rival, defeated only because another man secretly fills him with quail shot – combines improbability with a matter-of-fact tone characteristic of the tall tale. The same is true of the anecdotes about the consumptive

mare that always wins at the last moment or the dog Andrew Jackson who appears indifferent until he seizes his opponent's hind leg.

From the perspective of humour theory, the Indonesian thesis on American verbal humour summarises the Freudian distinction between humour realised in utterance and humour realised in narrative form: jokes that make people laugh directly, and stories in which the narrator's depiction of real or imaginary behaviour produces comic effect.

Twain's story systematically combines both forms. On the one hand, much of the comedy lies in particular phrases, similes and idioms in Wheeler's dialect (for instance his careful spelling out of *m-o-r-e* dust and racket, or the mock oath "blame my cats"). On the other hand, the overall design of the tale – the slow build-up of Smiley's confidence, the elaborate praise of Dan'l Webster, and the final revelation that the frog has been "anchored out" by shot – constitutes a narrative joke whose punchline depends on the reader's retrospective re-evaluation of all previous information.

The teaching notes in the school edition explicitly state that Twain is satirising "several aspects of American life," and especially those rural talkers who speak at length, in great seriousness, about matters that are ultimately trivial or nonsensical.

This observation links the local tall tale not only with the comic tradition but also with a broader cultural critique directed at provincial verbosity and lack of self-awareness.

3. Materialism and social criticism. Beyond local colour and generic affiliation, the story encodes a recognisable ideological context. A Japanese critical article on *The Celebrated Jumping Frog* emphasises that Twain, through such episodes as the bet with Parson Walker regarding his wife's recovery and the repeated scenes of wagering, depicts a society in which people are ready to do anything for money [5]. The critic notes that this tendency reflects the penetration of "materialistic civilization" into the spirit of the age, a process in which moral and spiritual values lose their force as money becomes the universal measure of worth.

Within this framework, Jim Smiley functions as an extreme but symptomatic figure. He bets on horses, on dogs, on insects, on the health of acquaintances, and even on the outcome of events he cannot control. His behaviour exemplifies a specific stage of capitalist development in which economic risk-taking and the desire for profit overshadow all other considerations. The same Japanese study stresses that Twain uses Jim and the dog Andrew as exemplary cases in order to criticise a social condition where the pursuit of money dominates and corrupts human motives; humour serves as an “undercurrent” that carries this critical intention without turning the story into overt moralizing [5].

In this way the cultural context is double: on the surface, the picturesque world of the mining camp with its anecdotes and eccentric animals; at a deeper level, a society in which the logic of the wager has become a model for action in general. The tall tale about a frog thus becomes a vehicle for reflection on the human condition under capitalism, a theme that Twain would develop more explicitly in later works.

4. Authorial devices: framing, voice, dialect and satire. These cultural meanings are not simply “reflected” in the story, but produced by a series of carefully constructed authorial devices. First, Twain employs a **frame narrative** or “story within a story,” a device explicitly noted in the reading pointers, where the search for the Reverend Leonidas Smiley is identified as the least important layer.

The outer narrator, writing in standard educated English, is dispatched to Angel’s Camp on a trivial errand and is “button-holed” by Wheeler, whose inner tale gradually displaces the frame plot. This double structure creates a systematic contrast between two cultural and linguistic codes: the urbane, somewhat ironic Eastern visitor and the rustic Western storyteller. The reader is invited to adopt the outsider’s perspective, amused and faintly exasperated by Wheeler’s endless digressions, but at the same time to appreciate the vitality and coherence of the local oral tradition he represents.

Secondly, both the school edition and critical commentary stress Wheeler's **deadpan and understated narrative style**, which remains serious and emotionally flat even when he is recounting the most ridiculous events. In the text this is reinforced by the narrator's observation that Wheeler tells his story without smiling or frowning, in a monotone voice that never acknowledges any "thing ridiculous or funny" in what he says. The discrepancy between the seriousness of delivery and the absurdity of content is one of Twain's most effective comic devices; it concentrates the humour in the reader's act of interpretation rather than in any self-conscious joke-making by the character.

Thirdly, Twain's **use of dialect and vernacular idiom** should be seen not simply as mimetic, but as a structural device belonging to local-colour writing. Cuddon's definition highlights that local colour often involves not only landscape and customs but also speech patterns that are peculiar to a region. The edition's brief biography reminds us that Twain is remembered as a writer with an "uncanny ear for speech" who excelled at exposing hypocrisy and inconsistency in human behaviour.

In *Jumping Frog* the non-standard grammar, elided pronunciations and colloquial expressions of Wheeler's monologue are not merely decorative; they construct a specific narrative voice whose worldview is encoded in its language. The dialect, with its repetitions, tautological intensifiers and formulaic idioms, enacts a mode of thought that accepts gambling, trickery and exaggeration as normal elements of everyday life.

Finally, the story employs **satire and ironic displacement** as central devices. The teaching notes specify that Twain is satirising not only rustic talkativeness but also "aspects of American life" more broadly. The choice of names for Smiley's animals – Dan'l Webster and Andrew Jackson – implicitly juxtaposes the world of high politics and national statesmanship with the petty, often sordid sphere of gambling and dog-fighting. The tall tale about a frog becomes a parody of national self-importance, suggesting that the heroic and the ridiculous are much closer than patriotic rhetoric would allow. When Smiley himself is cheated by a nameless stranger who loads the frog with shot, the story briefly shifts perspective: the habitual

trickster becomes a victim, and the reader is reminded that within a culture governed by the logic of the wager there is always someone more unscrupulous than the previous winner.

Taken together, these cultural contexts and authorial devices show that *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County* is not a simple anecdote, but a carefully structured narrative in which local-colour detail, tall-tale conventions, dialectal humour and ironic framing interact to produce a complex commentary on American society in the age of rapid capitalist expansion.

CONCLUSIONS

In the theoretical part of the methodological guidelines the main approaches to the analysis of a literary work and the principal linguistic aspects of the text have been systematised on the basis of Ukrainian and international scholarship. Literary interpretation has been presented as a synthesis of hermeneutic, structural-narratological and linguo-stylistic approaches, while the language of the text has been described in terms of several interconnected levels: phonetic and graphic, lexical and phraseological, word-formation, morphological, syntactic and textual. A compact set of basic literary terms relevant to the short story genre has been defined (short story, character, setting, theme, plot, point of view, humour, irony, satire), together with linguistic notions that are central for the practical part of the course, namely synonymy, antonymy and phraseological units. Theoretical principles for establishing analogies and parallels between Ukrainian and foreign works have been summarised in terms of genetic, contact and typological relations and of intertextual categories.

In the practical part of the guideline these principles have been applied to Mark Twain's *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County*. The story has been considered in its entirety, with emphasis on the frame narrative structure, the interaction between the external narrator and Simon Wheeler's embedded tale, and the specificity of the mining-camp setting as a cultural context for the events described. On this narrative and cultural basis the linguistic organisation of the text has been analysed through detailed examination of synonymic chains, antonymic oppositions and phraseological units. The examples drawn from both the narrator's and Wheeler's speech demonstrate how lexical choices and fixed expressions contribute to characterisation, construct evaluative contrasts between success and failure, seriousness and absurdity, and support the comic and ironic effects of the short story.

Special attention has been paid to those elements of Twain's text that are particularly important for linguistically and culturally oriented reading: the role of regional dialect and colloquial idioms, the use of biblical and proverbial phraseology

in a humorous context, and the opposition between the perspective of the “stranger” narrator and that of the local storyteller. These observations correspond to the comparative and onomastic remarks outlined in the theoretical section and may serve as a basis for further classroom work on analogies with Ukrainian humorous prose and on cross-linguistic comparison of stylistic devices.

Taken together, the theoretical generalisations and the practical analyses presented in the methodological guidelines form an integrated system that supports literary studies practice in English. They show that the analysis of an English short story in the original language can simultaneously develop students’ linguistic competence (vocabulary, phraseology, sensitivity to register and idiom), interpretative skills (work with narrative structure, character and theme) and awareness of intercultural and comparative perspectives. The proposed approach can be extended to other texts and adapted to different levels of training, but in all cases the basic algorithm remains constant: from clarification of terms and methods, through close reading of linguistic constructions and narrative strategies, to situating the work in its broader cultural and inter-literary contexts.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Kochan I. M. Linhvistichnyi analiz tekstu : navch. posib. 2-he vyd., pererob. i dop. Kyiv : Znannia, 2008. 423 s. (Кочан І. М. Лінгвістичний аналіз тексту : навч. посіб. 2-ге вид., перероб. і доп. Київ : Знання, 2008. 423 с.).
2. Koloshuk N. Porivnialne literaturoznavstvo : posibnyk dla vyshchych navchalnykh zakladiv. Kyiv : Vydavnychiy dim "Kondor", 2018. 424 s. (Колошук Н. Порівняльне літературознавство : посібник для вищих навчальних закладів. Київ : Видавничий дім «Кондор», 2018. 424 с.).
3. Childs P., Fowler R. The Routledge dictionary of literary terms. Abingdon ; New York : Routledge, 2006.
4. Cuddon J. A. A dictionary of literary terms and literary theory; rev. by M. A. R. Habib. 5th ed. Chichester : Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.
5. Ikeda H. A study of Mark Twain's: "The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County". 2012.
6. Mukhlisin A. The form and the function of humor in Mark Twain's short stories entitled "The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County" and "Steamboat Race" : graduating paper. Yogyakarta : Sunan Kalijaga State Islamic University, Faculty of Adab and Cultural Sciences, English Department, 2016.
7. Twain M. The celebrated jumping frog of Calaveras County ; ed. J. Paul. New York : American News CO., Agents, 1867. 212 p.

Additional Literature

1. Жирмунський В. М. Теорія літератури. Київ : Либідь, 2003.
2. Положення про проведення практики здобувачів освіти Волинського національного університету імені Лесі Українки. Луцьк : ВНУ ім. Лесі Українки, 2024. 21 с. URL: https://hell.your-objectstorage.com/vnustorage/s3fs-public/File/2024/11/2024-polozhennya_pro_praktyku-1.pdf (дата звернення: 15.10.2025 р.)

3. Пропп В. Я. Морфологія казки. Київ : Видавництво Києво-Могилянської Академії, 2008.
4. Франко І. Студії над українськими народними казками. Львів : Українська Академія, 2007.
4. Barry P. Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory. Manchester University Press, 2017. 352 p.
5. Carter R., McRae J. The Routledge History of Literature in English: Britain and Ireland. 3rd edition. Routledge, 2017. 622 p.
6. Culler J. Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction. Oxford University Press, 2011. 168 p.
7. Eagleton T. Literary Theory: An Introduction. Blackwell Publishing, 2008. 256 p.
8. Fry P. Theory of Literature. Yale University Press, 2012. 390 p.
9. Lodge D. The Art of Fiction. Vintage, 2011. 256 p.
10. Rimmon-Kenan S. Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics. 2nd edition. Routledge, 2002. 194 p.
11. JSTOR (Digital Library). URL: <https://www.jstor.org>
12. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. URL: <https://www.ldoceonline.com>
13. McMillan Dictionary. URL: <https://www.mcmillandictionary.com>
14. Merriam-Webster Dictionary. URL: <https://www.merriam-webster.com>
15. SparkNotes (Study Guides). URL: <https://www.sparknotes.com>

APPENDICES

ДОДАТКИ

Додаток А

Твори англійських та американських авторів

для літературознавчого аналізу

English Authors

1. Geoffrey Chaucer – The Canterbury Tales (selected stories)
2. Daniel Defoe – The Storm
3. Samuel Johnson – Rasselas
4. Jane Austen – Lady Susan
5. Charles Dickens – The Signalman, The Ghost's Walk
6. Thomas Hardy – The Three Strangers
7. Virginia Woolf – A Haunted House, The Mark on the Wall
8. Doris Lessing – The Old Chief Mshlanga
9. Jeanette Winterson – The Passion
10. Julian Barnes – The Perils of Pleasure
11. John Milton – Paradise Lost (selected passages)
12. Charlotte Perkins Gilman – The Yellow Wallpaper
13. E.M. Forster – The Machine Stops, The Celestial Omnibus
14. James Joyce – Dubliners (selected stories, e.g., A Little Cloud, The Dead)
15. Graham Greene – The Destructors, A Shocking Accident
16. Elizabeth Bowen – The Demon Lover
17. Angus Wilson – The Old Men at the Zoo
18. Angela Carter – The Bloody Chamber
19. Ian McEwan – The Swimming Pool Library
20. Zadie Smith – The Embassy of Cambodia

American Authors

1. Edgar Allan Poe – The Tell-Tale Heart, The Fall of the House of Usher
2. Nathaniel Hawthorne – The Minister's Black Veil, The Birthmark
3. Herman Melville – Bartleby, the Scrivener
4. Ambrose Bierce – An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge
5. Mark Twain – The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County
6. Kate Chopin – The Story of an Hour
7. F. Scott Fitzgerald – The Diamond as Big as the Ritz
8. Ernest Hemingway – The Killers, Hills Like White Elephants
9. Flannery O'Connor – A Good Man Is Hard to Find
10. Raymond Carver – What We Talk About When We Talk About Love
11. Don DeLillo – The Body Artist
12. David Foster Wallace – Girl with Curious Hair
13. Walt Whitman – Leaves of Grass (selected excerpts)
14. Henry James – The Turn of the Screw (novella)
15. Theodore Dreiser – The Lost Phoebe
16. William Faulkner – A Rose for Emily, Barn Burning
17. John Steinbeck – The Chrysanthemums, The Red Pony
18. Ralph Ellison – Invisible Man (excerpts)
19. Richard Wright – The Man Who Lived Underground, Big Boy Leaves Home
20. J.D. Salinger – A Perfect Day for Bananafish, For Esmé – with Love and Squalor
21. Toni Morrison – Recitatif
22. John Updike – A & P, The Christian Roommates
23. Ray Bradbury – The Veldt, The Fog Horn
24. Kurt Vonnegut – Harrison Bergeron, 2 B R 0 2 B

Postmodern and Contemporary Authors

1. Thomas Pynchon – Entropy, The Secret Integration
2. Haruki Murakami – The Elephant Vanishes, The Second Bakery Attack
3. Margaret Atwood – The Handmaid's Tale (novella excerpts), Happy Endings

4. George Saunders – Tenth of December, The Semplica Girl Diaries
5. Junot Díaz – Drown, The Pura Principle

Додаток Б

Етапи практики

1. Підготовчий

Мета:

- Ознайомити здобувачів освіти із завданнями, тривалістю та вимогами практики.
- Надати інструкції щодо оформлення звітної документації.

Завдання:

- Проведення настановчої конференції, де здобувачі освіти:
- Отримують перелік літературних творів для аналізу (*примітка*: надається список рекомендованих творів англійських та американських авторів для літературознавчого аналізу, проте студенти мають право обрати художній твір для аналізу самостійно. Крім того, підбір казки для аналізу здійснюється здобувачами освіти самостійно.).
- Ознайомлюються з вимогами щодо виконання аналізу оповідання та казки.
- Вивчають критерії оцінювання практики (аналізу оповідання та казки і презентацій).
- Складання графіку консультацій з керівником практики.

2. Ознайомчий

Мета:

- Забезпечити розуміння методів аналізу літературних творів та основних лінгвістичних аспектів тексту.

Завдання:

- Проведення вступних лекцій або семінарів щодо:
- Особливостей аналізу літературних творів (оповідання, казки).
- Лінгвістичних конструкцій у текстах (синоніми, антоніми, фразеологізми).
- Ознайомлення з основними літературознавчими термінами.

- Пошук аналогій та паралелей між творами в українській та інших мовах.

3. Основний

Мета:

- Виконання практичних завдань із аналізу обраних літературних творів.

Завдання:

1. Критичний аналіз оповідання:

- Читання та розбір обраного уривка чи твору із запропонованого списку / обраного самостійно згідно уподобань ЗО.
- Визначення мовних конструкцій (синоніми, антоніми, фразеологізми).
- Виявлення культурних контекстів та авторських прийомів.

2. Критичний аналіз казки:

- Аналіз структури та образності казки.
- Пошук паралелей в інших мовах (наприклад, фольклорні мотиви).

3. Підготовка презентацій:

- Здобувачі освіти готують виступ із висвітленням результатів свого аналізу.
- Презентація включає візуальні матеріали (схеми, цитати, порівняння).

4. Підсумковий

Мета:

- Узагальнення результатів роботи та оформлення звітної документації.

Завдання:

- Підготовка письмового звіту:
- Розбір та аналіз оповідання (10 сторінок).
- Розбір казки з акцентом на мовні конструкції та культурні паралелі (10 сторінок).

Представлення результатів під час підсумкової конференції:

- Виступ із презентацією результатів аналізу (10-15 хвилин).
- Обговорення висновків із керівником та іншими здобувачами освіти.

Очікуваний результат:

- Захист практики перед комісією.
- Оформлена звітна документація (звіти, презентації).

Додаток В

Оцінювання

1. Критичний аналіз оповідання:

Письмова робота – 20 балів:

- Змістовність та повнота аналізу (10 балів).
- Чіткість, логіка викладу та структура роботи (5 балів).
- Оригінальність думок і висновків (5 балів).

Презентація – 15 балів:

- Якість візуальних матеріалів (5 балів).
- Здатність пояснити ключові ідеї (5 балів).
- Чіткість і доступність викладення інформації (5 балів).

Виступ – 15 балів:

- Виразність і грамотність мовлення (5 балів).
- Аргументованість відповідей на запитання (5 балів).
- Здатність зацікавити аудиторію (5 балів).

2. Критичний аналіз казки

Письмова робота – 20 балів:

- Змістовність та повнота аналізу (10 балів).
- Чіткість, логіка викладу та структура роботи (5 балів).
- Оригінальність думок і висновків (5 балів).

Презентація – 15 балів:

- Якість візуальних матеріалів (5 балів).
- Здатність пояснити ключові ідеї (5 балів).
- Чіткість і доступність викладення інформації (5 балів).

Виступ – 15 балів:

- Виразність і грамотність мовлення (5 балів).
- Аргументованість відповідей на запитання (5 балів).
- Здатність зацікавити аудиторію (5 балів).

Додаток Г

Критерії оцінювання

Критерії оцінювання письмової роботи

Письмова робота – 20 балів

1. Змістовність та повнота аналізу (10 балів):

10 балів: Робота містить глибокий і всебічний аналіз теми, що охоплює всі основні аспекти, важливі для розкриття питання. Виконано детальний огляд літератури, сучасних наукових підходів і теоретичних аспектів. Здобувач освіти логічно і послідовно розглядає усі ключові моменти, підтверджуючи свої висновки аргументами з наукових джерел. Тема повністю розкрита, аналіз проведено без істотних прогалин.

8-9 балів: Здобувач освіти зробив досить глибокий аналіз, але є деякі дрібні прогалини у висвітленні окремих аспектів теми або літератури. Використано значну кількість джерел, але можливо, є відсутність повної аргументації в деяких розділах роботи.

6-7 балів: Здобувач освіти зробив неповний або поверхневий аналіз, деякі важливі аспекти не були розглянуті. Тема в основному розкрита, але без глибокого аналізу.

4-5 балів: Здобувач освіти зробив аналіз обмежений лише кількома аспектами, значна частина теми не була розкрита або викладена поверхнево. Джерела не повністю охоплюють питання.

2-3 бали: Аналіз здобувача освіти є дуже поверхневим, з серйозними прогалинами в розкритті основних аспектів. Тема частково або недостатньо розкрита.

0-1 балів: Проведений здобувачем освіти аналіз майже відсутній або абсолютно неповний, важливі аспекти теми не розглянуті. Письмова робота не відповідає вимогам за змістом.

2. Чіткість, логіка викладу та структура роботи (5 балів):

5 балів: Робота має чітку структуру, логічну послідовність викладу матеріалу. Кожна частина роботи органічно випливає з попередньої, розділи чітко

поділені і взаємопов'язані. Текст написано зрозумілою мовою, без зайвої складності.

4 бали: Структура роботи в основному чітка, але деякі частини можуть бути не зовсім логічно пов'язані між собою або деякі переходи не зовсім чіткі.

3 бали: У роботі є проблеми з логічною послідовністю або структура не зовсім чітка. Місцями складно відстежити розвиток думки, деякі розділи не зв'язані між собою.

2 бали: Структура роботи має серйозні недоліки, важко слідкувати за розвитком і послідовністю аргументації.

1 бал: Структура роботи незрозуміла або відсутня, матеріал викладений без логічних переходів.

0 балів: Робота не має структури, що робить її важкою для розуміння та сприйняття.

3. Оригінальність думок і висновків (5 балів):

5 балів: Робота містить оригінальні і глибокі думки, здобувач освіти запропонував нові підходи до вирішення проблеми, які не були знайдені в джерелах. Висновки чітко обґрунтовані, логічно випливають з аналізу, та мають наукову новизну.

4 бали: Здобувач освіти пропонує оригінальні думки, але їхнє обґрунтування або застосування не є повністю новим або вони частково повторюють думки з джерел.

3 бали: Оригінальність думок здобувача освіти помірна, багато висновків є повторенням відомих ідей або досліджень. Висновки сформульовані, але без суттєвого новаторства.

2 бали: Робота містить мінімум оригінальних думок здобувача освіти, більшість висновків є загальними або повторюваними.

1 бал: Висновки здобувача освіти практично не оригінальні, більшість ідей є переписуванням думок з джерел.

0 балів: Робота не містить оригінальних думок або висновків.

Загальний бал за письмову роботу:

20 балів – Високий рівень виконання роботи, всі аспекти оцінювання на найвищому рівні.

15-19 балів – Хороший рівень виконання, з незначними недоліками в деяких аспектах.

10-14 балів – Середній рівень, є серйозні прогалини, але загальний аналіз і структура роботи задовільні.

5-9 балів – Низький рівень виконання, суттєві недоліки в аналізі, структурі і оригінальності.

0-4 бали – Дуже низький рівень, робота не відповідає вимогам за змістом, структурою та оригінальністю.

Критерії оцінювання презентації:

Презентація – 15 балів

1. Якість візуальних матеріалів (5 балів)

5 балів: Візуальні матеріали повністю відповідають темі презентації, добре структуровані, зрозумілі та естетично оформлені. Використано відповідні графіки, схеми, таблиці або зображення, які доповнюють та ілюструють основні ідеї. Колірна гамма, шрифти та дизайн гармонійні, матеріал легко читається.

4 бали: Візуальні матеріали добре оформлені, але можуть мати незначні недоліки (наприклад, занадто дрібний шрифт, недостатньо контрастний текст або відсутність декількох ключових ілюстрацій).

3 бали: Матеріали частково відповідають темі, але оформлення містить суттєві недоліки. Графіки, схеми чи зображення є, але вони недостатньо пояснюють або ілюструють матеріал.

2 бали: Візуальні матеріали не повністю відповідають темі, їхнє оформлення неякісне або незрозуміле. Презентація містить надто багато тексту або зовсім не використовує візуальних елементів.

1 бал: Матеріали погано структуровані, складні для сприйняття, візуальних елементів недостатньо або вони не відповідають змісту.

0 балів: Відсутні візуальні матеріали або вони не використовуються в презентації.

2. Здатність пояснити ключові ідеї (5 балів)

5 балів: Здобувач освіти чітко, логічно і вичерпно пояснює ключові ідеї. Пояснення демонструє глибоке розуміння теми, є послідовним і аргументованим. Всі ключові моменти розкриті.

4 бали: Ключові ідеї пояснено досить добре, але можуть бути незначні недоліки в послідовності чи деталізації. У певних моментах спостерігається недостатня аргументація.

3 бали: Основні ідеї розкриті, але пояснення поверхове або непослідовне. Деякі

ключові моменти залишаються незрозумілими.

2 бали: Здатність пояснити ключові ідеї обмежена, основна частина матеріалу подана неповно, із пропусками важливих деталей.

1 бал: Здобувач освіти майже не пояснює основних ідей, пояснення уривчасті та неструктуровані, важко зрозуміти головну думку.

0 балів: Відсутнє пояснення ключових ідей, або здобувач освіти не демонструє розуміння теми.

3. Чіткість і доступність викладення інформації (5 балів)

5 балів: Матеріал викладений чітко, структуровано та доступно для аудиторії. Використовується грамотна мова, відповідний стиль і темп мовлення. Презентація цікава, а основні моменти добре підкреслені та легко сприймаються.

4 бали: Інформація викладена зрозуміло, але є незначні проблеми з темпом, стилем мовлення або структурою. У деяких місцях виклад інформації міг бути більш зрозумілим.

Критерії оцінювання виступу

Виступ – 15 балів

1. Виразність і грамотність мовлення (5 балів)

5 балів: Мовлення чітке, виразне, логічне, демонструє високу культуру мови. Здобувач освіти використовує багатий словниковий запас, уникає мовленнєвих помилок, правильно наголошує на ключових моментах. Інтонація, темп та паузи добре підлаштовані для сприйняття.

4 бали: Мовлення здебільшого чітке та грамотне, але можуть бути незначні мовленнєві помилки або повтори. Інтонація й темп адекватні, але місцями потребують корекції.

3 бали: Виразність мовлення помірна, трапляються помилки у граматиці або стилі, які заважають повному сприйняттю. Темп мовлення занадто швидкий, повільний або нерівномірний.

2 бали: Мовлення нечітке, багате на мовленнєві помилки, бракує структурованості, що ускладнює розуміння. Інтонація та темп не відповідають ситуації виступу.

1 бал: Мовлення невиразне, з великою кількістю грубих помилок, значно ускладнює сприйняття матеріалу.

0 балів: Виступ нерозбірливий, мовлення позбавлене логіки та чіткості.

2. Аргументованість відповідей на запитання (5 балів)

5 балів: Відповіді повністю обґрунтовані, чіткі й логічні. Здобувач освіти демонструє глибоке розуміння теми, володіння матеріалом і здатність адекватно реагувати на запитання. Використовуються релевантні приклади й докази.

4 бали: Відповіді в основному аргументовані, але можуть містити незначні неточності або недостатню деталізацію. Зміст відповідей добре розкриває тему.

3 бали: Аргументи в відповідях поверхові або частково неповні. Можливі логічні прогалини, які впливають на переконливість.

2 бали: Відповіді недостатньо обґрунтовані, містять численні неточності. Продемонстровано слабке розуміння матеріалу.

1 бал: Аргументація практично відсутня, відповіді нечіткі й непослідовні, значна частина запитань залишилась без змістової відповіді.

0 балів: Відповіді не містять аргументів або взагалі не надаються.

3. Здатність зацікавити аудиторію (5 балів)

5 балів: Здобувач освіти вміє утримувати увагу аудиторії протягом усього виступу, використовує інтерактивні прийоми або цікаві приклади. Презентація матеріалу захоплююча, контакт з аудиторією підтримується постійно.

4 бали: Здобувач освіти здебільшого вміє зацікавити слухачів, хоча подача матеріалу може бути менш інтерактивною або емоційно нейтральною. Увага аудиторії зберігається, але не повністю.

3 бали: Здобувач освіти привертає увагу аудиторії лише частково, подача матеріалу недостатньо яскрава або інформативна. Контакт з аудиторією епізодичний.

2 бали: Виступ монотонний, значна частина аудиторії втрачає інтерес. Спілкування з аудиторією обмежене або взагалі відсутнє.

1 бал: Виступ не викликає інтересу у слухачів, контакт з аудиторією повністю втрачений.

0 балів: Здобувач освіти не намагається залучити аудиторію, матеріал подано у вигляді нецікавого монологу.

Додаток Д

Зразок оформлення титульного аркуша

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
ВОЛИНСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ІМЕНІ ЛЕСІ УКРАЇНКИ**

Кафедра англійської філології

**ЗВІТ
з практики навчальної літературознавчої**

Виконав / ла здобувач / ка освіти групи Англ-21
факультету іноземної філології
спеціальності 035 Філологія
ОП «Мова і література (англійська). Переклад»
Прізвище ім'я по батькові

Керівник практики:
канд. філол. наук, доцент / доктор філол. наук, професор
Прізвище ім'я по батькові

ЛУЦЬК 202_