

Поддубская Т. Функционирование гендерных стереотипов в языковом сознании носителей языка.....	62
Почетинская С. Адресат и адресант в структуре художественного диалога.....	64
Сердюк А. Структурні види прямої мови в ідіостилі письменника (на матеріалі французької мови).....	65
Шавловська Т. Словотвір сучасного німецького молодіжного лексикону та емотивність.....	67
Шилева Т. Метафорические модели религиозного дискурса в проповедях Антония Сурожского.....	70
Bohdan V. Semantic and Pragmatic Functions of Adjoining Constructions and Complex Sentences.....	73
Cemărtan C. Categoria aspectului verbal în limba Rusă și cea Română: asemănări și deosebiri.....	75
Cheverikova O. Translation Peculiarities of Modern Military Terminology.....	78
Kazmych O. Trilingualism and Minority languages in Europe.....	81
Starodeдова L. Aspect qualitatif des tendances de différentes variations linguistiques du français dans l'espace (langue d'oc et langue d'oïl).....	83
Stariopol O. Suprasegmentalia im Deutschen und im Ukrainischen.....	85
Yakymchuk N. Kategorien der Affiziertheit und Effiziertheit der metaphorischen Verben im Deutschen.....	89

ЛІТЕРАТУРОЗНАВЧІ СТУДІЇ: НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ І СВІТОВИЙ КОНТЕКСТ

Алштова А. Утопии и реальность на Балканах (Първата световна война в романи на Милош Църнянски и Константин Петканов).....	91
Білоус П. До питання про атрибуцію літератури періоду Київської Русі.....	94
Белоброва Т. Поетичне втілення екзистенціалістської парадигми в українській поезії 50-70-х років ХХ ст. (Нью-Йоркська група).....	97
Горбалис Л. Аспекти творення образу героя у романах Петра Сороки «Жезл» і «Посох».....	99
Єсипенко Д. Борис Грінченко – автор «Большой энциклопедии» Южакова.....	102
Зарудняк О. Синтаксичний рівень художньої мови (на матеріалі новелістики Григорія Косинки).....	104
Кіраль С. Дитяча література та її герої у практиці та роздумах Лесі Ворониної (за матеріалами інтерв'ю письменниці).....	106
Ковпик С. Особливості ментальності молдаван в образку М. Коцюбинського «Відьма».....	109
Клочек Г. Синергетичний та системний підхід як методологічні доктрини на полі літературознавчої науки: проблеми та перспективи.....	111
Копончук Т. Кобзар як Євангеліє від Тараса Шевченка.....	114
Кошелев В. «Каков Кирджали?»: о странном сочинении Пушкина.....	116
Лаєринович Л. Темпоральні маркери у збірці І. Римарука «Бермудський трикутник».....	121
Малиновский А. Художественная антропология И.А. Гончарова в «Слугах старого века».....	124
Морева Т. Новелістичність «Бригадира Жерара» А. Конан Дойла.....	126
Мусий В. Русская литература первой половины XIX века под углом зрения антропологии.....	129
Насенко М. Тисячоліття українського літературознавства.....	131
Погорелова А. Метафізичні доміанти в ліриці Наталі Лівницької-Холодної.....	134
Пяткин С. Поэма С. А. Есенина «Черный человек»: Путь к молитве.....	136
Томчук О. Українська та світова література в науковій рецепції Освальда Бургардта (Юрія Клена).....	140
Райбедюк Г. Націоохоронний етос художньої аксіології Миколи Невидайла.....	143

Раковская И. Литературно-критический дискурс (к проблеме дешифровки авторских кодов).....	145
Рарицький О. Художньо-документальна проза дисидентів як джерело вивчення літературного процесу.....	147
Рева-Лєвшакова Л. Невідомі сторінки з історії неореалізму.....	150
Савенко О. Різдво Христове й українські колядки.....	152
Соколова А. Міфопоетичний світ прози Олександра Денисенка.....	154
Статкевич Л. Картина світу як категоріальне поняття.....	156
Третяченко А. Медитативні доміанти збірки «Сковородинські думи» Володимира Підпалого.....	159
Удовиченко Л. Розвиток методики аспектного вивчення образів-персонажів художніх творів у науці радянського періоду.....	161
Фокина С. Хронотоп как альтер эго автора в художественном мире Х. Кортасара.....	164
Фокина С., Митвеа Е. Переосмысление легенды о Богородице в стихотворении М. Цветаевой «Семь мечей пронзали сердце».....	167
Фоміна Л. Семантичний спектр міфологеми сонця в ліриці Миколи Вінграновського.....	169
Харлан О. Свій – чужий – інший у рецепції української еміграційної прози 1950–1960-х рр.	171
Чик Д. Cherchez la femme: топос ордалії в українській і англійській літературі першої половини ХІХ ст.	173
Чуй А. Дівочі образи народних пісень про кохання.....	176

РОЛЬ ЗМІ В СУЧАСНІЙ СОЦІАЛЬНІЙ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

Акімова Н. Універсальні причини неоднозначного розуміння інтернет-комунікації.....	179
Бабій Ю. Функціонування деяких типів онімів у сучасному політичному рекламному дискурсі.....	181
Бойко-Гагарін А. Застосування соціальних мереж у музейному маркетингу.....	183
Вусик А. Дисфемія и эвфемія в современном политическом дискурсе.....	186
Гладир Ю. Концепт цін в сучасному рекламному мовленні.....	187
Мислива-Буцько І. Словотвірно-семантичні характеристики композитних прикметників у мові української преси ХХ століття.....	189
Моловельська А. Специфіка інформативності архітектури французького «зіркового» інтерв'ю.....	192
Коротич К. Фразеологізми на позначення небезпеки в мові української преси ХХ–ХХІ століть: структурний, семантичний і прагматичний аспекти.....	194
Рябушко С. Медиааналитическая компетентность будущего учителя иностранных языков как предпосылка его успешной профессиональной деятельности.....	197
Сорока Т. Текст, повідомлення, висловлення, дискурс як комунікативні феномени: аналітичний огляд.....	199
Топчій Л. Засоби й прийоми створення експресивних моделей заголовків у газетному дискурсі.....	202
Чубук Р. Медіаосвіта сучасної молоді як умова інформаційної безпеки.....	204
Шульська Н. Прізвиська українських політиків у контексті електронних ЗМІ.....	206

МИСТЕЦТВОЗНАВЧІ СТУДІЇ

Вихованець А. Виразальні засоби духових інструментів в оркестровій творчості М. А. Римського-Корсакова.....	209
---	-----

3. Карасик В.И. Религиозный дискурс / В.И. Карасик // Языковая личность: проблемы лингвокультурологии и функциональной семантики: сборник научных трудов. – Волгоград: Перемена, 1999. – С. 5-19.
4. Кондратьева О.Н.. Метафорическое моделирование в религиозном дискурсе. [Электронный ресурс] — Режим доступа: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/metaforicheskoe-modelirovanie-v-religioznom-diskurse>
5. Красных В.В. «Свой» среди «чужих»: миф или реальность? / В.В. Красных. – М.: Гнозис, 2003. – 375 с.
6. Смирнова Е.В. Метафора как наиболее продуктивный способ образования новых терминов в кардиологической лексике / Е.В. Смирнова // Вестник Адыгейского государственного университета. Сер. Филология и искусствоведение, 2011. №1. – С.159-163.
7. Чудинов А.П. Россия в метафорическом зеркале: Когнитивное исследование политической метфоры / А.П. Чудинов. – Екатеринбург: Урал. гос. пед. ун-т, 2001. – 238 с.
8. Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh. Sermons and talks. [Электронный ресурс] — Режим доступа: http://www.mitras.ru/eng/eng_sermon.htm

Valeriy Bohdan

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor
Berdiansk State Teacher Training College, Ukraine
valeriy.bogdan@gmail.com

SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF ADJOINING CONSTRUCTIONS AND COMPLEX SENTENCES

The complexity of semantic ties and relations among the lexical elements has been repeatedly stressed in linguistic works. Therefore, in order to maximize the semantic objectivity of our research while solving the issue of semantic variation of adjoining constructions (AC) [1; 5] and complex sentences (CS) we consider it necessary to use not only logical categories but to examine the ACs and CSs in the dialectical unity of their structural and semantic parameters (means of connection and sentential correlation of their parts).

As far as we analyse the semantics of the two units at different syntactic levels – ACs and CSs – this study will focus on a proposition as a semantic model of these structures and the new propositional meanings that ACs and CSs acquire in the context in the process of reflection of a sentence situation, which supports the relevance of our study.

There is a consensus among scholars that formal connectors (connective words) are of paramount importance in determining semantic and syntactic (propositional) relationships among the parts of CSs.

The definition of propositional relations in the formal framework of ACs and CSs is based on academician V. Vynohradov's observation on the fulfilment by formal connectors of a wider range of functions when they join the parts of syntactic structures that go outside the framework of the sentence compared to the functions when they join predicative units [3, с. 552-553]. Our study shows that the usual for CSs relations (adverbial, object and attributive ones) in the subordinate adjoining clauses are transformed, and the meanings of additional information and evaluation prevail in them. In the ACs these atypical for the CSs relations of subordination completely dominate, and these changes are a forcible argument supporting our idea that there is a semantic variability between ACs and CSs. This study has found that the propositional relations of additional information, precise definition, hypothesis, conclusion, cause, consequence, contrast and enumeration are characteristic of the ACs with the subordinate connective words.

However, despite the importance of the role of connective words in the formal, semantic and syntactic structure of the ACs and the CSs, the surrounding lexical content has an extremely important influence on their semantic load. It is only in the context that we can accurately determine the meaning of these markers of dependence of syntactic parts (e.g. the conjunction *that* can function as a subject, a predicate, an object and an attribute (in the latter case, it goes to the category of connective pronouns); the connecting pronouns *who* and *which* – as a subject, an object and an attribute; the connecting pronoun *why* – as a subject, a predicate, an object, etc.). Therefore, in terms of our research the assumption that the connective words "express their semantic meaning ... by themselves without the taking into account lexico-semantic content of predicative units" seems unjustified [11, с. 67].

The functional potential of ACs and CSs is overlapped and reinforced by the semantic one [2, с. 30], which makes it possible for the "range of probability" of syntactic units (implicit, systemic possibilities inherent in them) to realize in the context. According to many researchers of propositional and semantic relations of composite units, the existence of truth in meaning and meaningfulness in language can be observed not in the sentence-like structures but in the propositions that reflect a denotative situation [13, с. 118-119]. However, domestic linguists clarify this statement by the observation that not all the propositions can be checked for truthfulness / untruthfulness [10, с. 110-111].

A significant analysis of propositional meanings in the second parts of compound sentences and coordinate ACs was presented by V. Dmytrenko. She justly divided these meanings into the pairs on the basis of

their semantic proximity: 1) additional information – precise definition; 2) hypothesis – conclusion; 3) cause – consequence; 4) contrast – enumeration. In doing so, she justly noted that such proximity of propositional relationship does not mean their identity and pointed to their common and distinctive features [5]. In analysing the problem of propositional relation definition we found it possible to extrapolate this approach to CSs and subordinate ACs and conduct our research in this direction.

1) The meaning of additional information and precise definition. These meanings are similar in their semantics, and the basis of their generality is the sense of doubt and uncertainty, which the second part of the ACs and CSs can express.

The structural parallelism of the form and content also contributes to close similarity of the meanings of additional information and precise definition. Both of them are characterized by syntactically parallel constructs that assume temporal correlation of their parts, logical connection among them and, therefore, low probability of interchange of their parts. In principle both the meaning of additional information and precise definition can be reflected by any adjoining connective words (CW), which are homonymous to coordinating and subordinating conjunctions (the undisputed 'leader' for the first meaning is *which*).

Despite the fact that the semantics of additional information and precise definition are clearly manifested in conjunctions, the distinctive features of ACs and CSs are clearly manifested in the narrative type of utterance, the latter – to the provides a real basis for their generality, while the former meaning corresponds to the narrative type of utterance, the latter – to the semantics too. If the former meaning corresponds to the narrative type of utterance, the latter – to the interrogative one.

Another distinguishing feature is the possibility of a certain gradation of the meaning of additional information (indication of varying degree of its accuracy), while the meaning of precise definition is always a signal of uncertainty and doubt.

The third main difference between the meanings is different syntactic position that they occupy in a composite syntactic unit. The precise definition in the form of a question always induces another interlocutor to answer and is aimed at obtaining necessary information. Therefore, the postpositional location of ACs and CSs with this meaning in a composite syntactic unit is impossible because the act of communication is not yet complete.

2) Certain semantic parallels can be traced between the meanings of hypothesis and conclusion. But, despite the really existing similarity, deeply embedded in the semantics of these meanings, there are a number of important differences between them that cannot be missed as they (as well as the meanings of additional information and precise definition) are not largely based solely upon the content, but upon a more reliable formal criterion – their location within the framework of a composite syntactic unit. The syntactic unit with the meaning of hypothesis must either open a composite syntactic unit or be located in the median position, giving space for the expression of an opinion in order to confirm or refute it. Accordingly, for the structures with the meaning of conclusion it would be logical to close a composite syntactic unit, i.e. (pre)terminal position.

Moreover, in the ACs and CSs confidence and categorical character of judgment are inherent in the meaning of conclusion (which is reflected in the relevant lexical content) while the meaning hypothesis has such characteristic features as partial clarity and the possibility of revision of one's point of view in the process of thinking it over, which can be seen in the post-text where the assumption may be challenged and wholly or partially rejected.

3) The meanings of cause and consequence. They coincide with the meanings of conclusion by one of the components of their same structure. It is fairly easy to identify them in subordinate units because unlike the other syntactic relations that are being studied by us (except for that of an additional information), there are special semantic classes of determinative CSs – those of causes and consequence. Thus, the meanings of cause and consequence can be dominant not only in the parataxis but in hypotaxis too. It is known that the clauses of cause are introduced by means of such CWs as *as, because, for, now that (= since), since* that implement various nuances of causal relations (substantiation of that expressed in the main part, an indication of favourable / unfavourable reason, etc.), whereas the clauses of consequence are introduced by the only *so that* (in colloquial speech – often just *so*). Besides, as noted by R. Vykhovanets, the propositional meanings of consequence "is often accompanied by the semantic features of an additional message and an adjoining syntactic unit" [4, c. 327].

Linguists usually divide the structures with the meanings of cause and consequence into two groups: 1) cause – consequence (with different nuances of their realization: reason – effect / result, condition – effect, explanation – effect, motive – effect) and 2) consequence – cause.

4) The meanings of enumeration and contrast. There is no difficulty in identifying the former of the two meanings in the text. In the research literature, when it comes to the syndetic connection during the enumeration or repetition, first of all they have been associated with the coordinating conjunctions (mainly *and*) [6, c. 63; 8, c. 143-146]. However, as a rule, it is characteristic of the CSs to have homogeneous polysyndetic constructions which make the whole utterance rhythmic and "create the spontaneity effect that is inherent in oral speech because of its 'open' structure that is potentially capable of unlimited extension" [9, c. 35].

Such CSs with homogeneous subordinate clauses can get complicated both formally and semantically to such an extent that, as linguists point out, they gain in the context some new meanings that are not characteristic

of them in the language system, creating unique background composite syntactic units [10, c. 61-62].

The characteristic feature of subordinate constructions in English is the absence of a special connective word to express the meaning of contrast (unlike coordinate constructions, in which such a function is performed by *but*). However, the absence of such a marker with specific functions does not mean that there is a complete absence of relations of contrast and comparison in the ACs and CSs. When investigating the variability of contrasting structures within the framework of composite sentences, H. Karpenko pointed to a semantic variation of the conjunction *but* when it can draw nearer in meaning with such connective words as *if, that, unless, where, whereas, when, which, while, who* [9, c. 127, 130, 134-139]. A number of other connectors can be added to them, for example, *although, though, unlike*, which, along with the main meaning of admissibility, manner and comparison also may have an additional sense of contrast.

Another important finding of our analysis of contrast relations within the subordinate ACs and CSs is that it is within such structures the opposition of the general and partial can be very often found that can be further strengthened by both temporal unconformity in their parts and the presence of modifiers. That is, when the relations of contrast in the parts of composite structures exist in an explicit or implicit form, then the "the contrary-to-expectation" effect [12, c. 205] is often created in them. As regard this, M. Liapon states that "in the sphere of adversativeness two principles are realized: the principle of an antithesis and the principle that can be theoretically designated as the combination of nonantagonistic contradictions" [7, c. 152].

Thus, in the structures with the relations of contrast the progressive-regressive function of ACs and CSs is explicitly performed because an addressee in order to interpret author's pragmatic message needs both to return to the pre-text and to address the post-text. The findings of this study suggest that the relations of contrast can be found in all the functional styles, although they are less characteristic of the scientific style because the choice of an adjoining conjunction is always subject to author's strict pragmatic goal – monosemantic perception of the information communicated by them.

Taking into account the new functions of connective words in ACs (not only formal and syntactic, but semantic and syntactic ones), formal, lexical and grammatical structure of the constituent parts joined by them and modifier words, the pivotal in the ACs semantic meanings of additivity and assessment are specified in such propositional meanings as: additional information, precise definition, hypotheses, conclusion, cause, consequence, enumeration and contrast.

1. Богдан В. В. Синтактика, семантика, прагматика англоговорящих приеднувальних конструкцій і складних речень з підрядним зв'язком: монографія / В. В. Богдан. – Донецьк: «ЛАНДОН-XXI», 2011. – 263 с.
2. Бондарко А. В. Функциональная грамматика / А. В. Бондарко – М.: Наука, 1984. – 136 с.
3. Виноградов В. В. Русский язык (грамматическое учение о слове) / В. В. Виноградов – М.: Высш. школа, 1972. – 614 с.
4. Вихованець І. Р. Граматика української мови. Синтаксис / І. Р. Вихованець. – К.: Либіль, 1993. – 368 с.
5. Дмитренко В. А. Структура, семантика і функції союзнних форм зв'язи в словесних мініатюрах в сучасному англійському мові / В. А. Дмитренко // Вісник Харківського нац. ун-ту. Сер. Романо-германська філологія. – 2002. – № 572. – С. 87-93.
6. Кухаренко В. А. Інтерпретація тексту. Навчальний посібник для студентів старших курсів факультетів англійської мови / В. А. Кухаренко. – Вінниця, НОВА КНИГА, 2004. – 272 с.
7. Ляпон М. В. Смысловая структура сложного предложения и текст. К типологии внутрителикстовых отношений / М. В. Ляпон – М.: Наука, 1986. – 200 с.
8. Мороховский А. Н. Стилистика английского языка / А. Н. Мороховский, О. П. Воробьева, Н. И. Лихохерст – Киев: Вища школа, 1984. – 247 с.
9. Проблемы варьирования языковых единиц. Материалы к спецкурсам и спецсеминарам / Авторы сост. И. В. Арнольд и др. – Киев, 1990. – 199 с.
10. Прокопчук А. А. Сложноподчиненное предложение и текст / А. А. Прокопчук – Х.: Изд-во "Основа" при Харьков. ун-те, 1990. – 192 с.
11. Ширяев Е. Н. Бессюзное сложное предложение в современном русском языке / Е. Н. Ширяев – М.: Наука, 1986. – 223 с.
12. Rudolph E. Contrast, Adversative and Concessive Relations and their Explication in English, German, Spanish, Portuguese on Sentence and Text Level. – Berlin, N. Y.: Walter de Gruyter, 1996. – 544 p.
13. Ziff P. About Ungrammaticalness / P. Ziff // Mind. – Edinburgh, 1964. – Vol. 73. – №. 290. – P. 110-130.

Claudia Cemărtan

Doctor în filologie, Conferențiar universitar,
Universitatea de Stat din Moldova
claudiacemartan@gmail.com

CATEGORIA ASPECTULUI VERBAL ÎN LIMBA RUSĂ ȘI CEA ROMÂNĂ: ASEMĂNĂRI ȘI DEOSEBIRI

Categoria gramaticală a aspectului verbal și modalitățile de reprezentare a ei în diferite limbi constituie obiectul unor numeroase analize – deseori în contradicțoriu – care vin să confirme sau să infirme existența ei