

ЗМІСТ

ПРОБЛЕМИ ЗАГАЛЬНОГО МОВОЗНАВСТВА

Денисова С. П. (Київ). Лінгвістика епохи постпостмодернізму: спроби першого опису.	5
Бесараб Т. П. (Харків). Схід та Захід: проблеми міжкультурної комунікації в ділових стосунках.	11
Кан В. С. (Кизил, Російська Федерація). Соціальні фактори етноязикової ситуації в республіці Тыва.	17
Магомедов М. И. (Махачкала, Республіка Дагестан, Росія). Сучасне становище і тенденції в розвитку російського і дагестанських мов.	23
Макаревич П. Ю. (Маріуполь). Основні підходи до дослідження політичного дискурсу.	33
Найдюнова Л. А. (Маріуполь). Лінгвофольклористичні дослідження мови фольклорних текстів румейських народних казок.	42
Бушаков В. А. (Маріуполь). Етимологія слів * BOYPAГЪ , BAРAГЪ , BITAЗЪ , KЪBAГЪ та POYСЪ .	49
Bogdan V. V. (Berdyansk). The correlation between adjoining constructions and composite sentences at different syntactic levels.	52

ТЕОРІЯ ТА ПРАКТИКА ПЕРЕКЛАДУ

Сомкин А. А. (Саранск, Республіка Мордовія, Російська Федерація). Семантико-стилістичне своєобразие соціально-філософських текстів і особливості їх перекладу.	59
Халабузар О. А. (Бердянськ). Особливості застосування перекладацьких трансформацій під час реферування готичної літератури.	70
Ходаковська О. О. (Харків). Проблеми класифікації та перекладу правничої термінології.	78
Білас А. А. (Івано-Франківськ). Про функціональний підхід до перекладу французької зниженої розмовної лексики.	85
Панчев И. Б. (Софія, Бґларія). Використання інструментів за допомогою комп'ютера в роботі перекладача.	94
Шепель Ю. О. (Дніпропетровськ). Переклад синтаксичних конструкцій з російської мови українською (на матеріалі повісті М. Гоголя "Тарас Бульба").	98
Капаткова О. В., Хохлова Н. В. (Северодвінск, Російська Федерація). Проблеми перекладу антропонімів произведених жанра фентези (на матеріалі романів Дж. К. Роулінг о Гаррі Поттері).	108

Аннотация

В статье представлены достоверные (германские), по мысли автора, этимологии пяти слов, связанных в единое историческое, географическое и лингвистическое целое летописным "путем из варяг в греки". Этими словами являются ***воурагъ**, ***варагъ**, ***витазь** и ***кълвагъ**. Автор статьи – последовательный сторонник норманского происхождения названия Русь и противник его иранской, кельтской или славянской этимологии, которые противоречат исторической правде.

Ключевые слова: суффикс -ing, русь, этимология, антинорманизм.

Summary

The article deals with the reliable (germanic), according to the author, etymology of the five words united into an historical, geographical and linguistic entity by the annalistic "trade route from the Varangians to the Greeks". They are ***воурагъ**, ***варагъ**, ***витазь**, and ***кълвагъ**. The author of the article is a consistent follower of the Norman origin of the name Rus and an antagonist of its Iranian, Celtic or Slavonic etymologies that contradict the historical truth.

Keywords: suffix -ing, Rus, etymology, and antinormanism.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 10.09.2012 р.

УДК 81-115:367.335:[811.161.2+811.111]

Bogdan V. V.

Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Berdiansk State Pedagogical University

THE CORRELATION BETWEEN ADJOINING CONSTRUCTIONS AND COMPOSITE SENTENCES AT DIFFERENT SYNTACTIC LEVELS

The subject of research of this paper is common and distinctive features of formal structure of adjoining constructions (AC) and composite sentences for the purpose of determining the peculiarities of their functioning. For illustrative purposes, the comparison of a formal arrangement of ACs and composite sentences will mainly be based on complex sentences (CS) which are more demonstrative for our study because they are much more diverse in structural terms than compound ones.

Among the arduous tasks of modern linguistics one of the leading ones is a comprehensive study of text as a maximum unit of language activity. This global problem cannot be solved successfully without conducting research on different text components – their structure, semantics, pragmatics, function and regularities in their connections. Among the most important text units there are two that stand out: composite sentences and adjoining constructions (AC) with adjoining connective words (CW), which are homonymous to coordinating and subordinating conjunctions. These composite sentences and ACs are the object of our research.

Despite the great interest of scholars in textual problems, there is a great lack of papers dedicated to the study of ACs and the criteria for their dissociation from composite sentences, the different types of adjoining that exist, and, especially,

parcelling. Nevertheless, modern linguistic research in that direction has made it possible to learn (with the help of a text) those functions and regularities of a language that can only be revealed by the studying of linguistic units in textual segments that are bigger than a sentence [16, 17].

The similarity in terms of form, semantics and executable functions between CSs and ACs led to the fact that some researchers did not see much difference between them. Linguists hold widely differing views on ACs. We call an AC a two-component text unit divided by an external punctuation mark (that divides sentences) into two parts that have a fixed position – an autosemantic base utterance (BU) and synsemantic adjoined part (AP). And that AP forms a separate sentence that is connected with a BU by a CW, which determines the ease of an AC's syntactic singling out in a text. For example:

(1) "Yes, thanks to you," Zec said ^{BU}. "Whoever ^{CW} you are" ^{AP} (Higgins, p. 399).

The ACs with CWs and CSs are considered as variable units at various syntactic levels (text and sentence levels respectively). In this article, 'variability' is understood in broad terms to mean the ability of language units to change, but not necessarily keep an identical meaning [3, 4].

Considering grammatical principles of ACs and CSs, linguists point out certain external isomorphism of the syntactic structure of their models, which include: 1) the presence of two parts in their composition (BU + AP) in an AC and the main clause(s) and subordinate clause(s) in a CS that can be characterized by a contact representation, direct or inverted word order; 2) primary function of one part (a BU and main clause) in relation to the other, dependent one (an AP and subordinate clause); 3) the existence of predictable / unpredictable connection in CSs and two classes of ACs that are related to them – "shifted", the parts of which are incompatible in content and cannot form a CS, and those in which an AP is compatible with a BU in the plane of content, and its transformation into a CS is possible; 4) the simplicity of identification of an AP and a subordinate clause in the text due to the presence of an AC in their initial position; 5) the possibility of existence of both units in the form of elementary and non-elementary structures.

The differences between an AC and a CS are seen in: 1) a different type of syntactic relations between the parts of an AC and a CS (adjoining and subordinate respectively). The use of an AP after a long pause focuses attention on it and thus significantly increases both the role of the pause and a pragmatic effect of an AP, which results in: a) the vividness of intonation and abruptness of an AP; b) the acquisition of new meanings and expressiveness by an AP that are not characteristic of a subordinate clause; 2) the impossibility for a CS to have a syntactically dominant or dependent word in the other composite sentence, while such syntactic relations exist between the components of an AC, similar to those relations that exist among formally independent sentences; 3) the existence of both free and fixed part order in a CS and always strictly fixed order in an AC (a BU + an AP) that does not deny (unlike in a CS) the possibility of existence of distant grammatical and semantic relations between the parts of an AC and 4) the impossibility for an AC to be included in the structure of a CS and vice versa,

possibility for a syntactic unit similar to a composite sentence to be the part of an AC (punctuation marks between their parts: a comma, a dash, a colon, a semicolon or no punctuation in a CS, and a period, a question mark, an exclamation mark and a stage direction in an AC. The common punctuation mark for both units is three dots. A CW that has strong connecting and anaphoric properties helps to distinguish an AC from adjoining at the sentence level as well as from other units of text level.

We support the idea that some communicatively important information can be transmitted by both a subordinate clause of a CS [19] and an AP in an AC [7, 10; 10, 57, 40] and that makes them equal in significance to a main clause / BU. For the first time we have singled out these kinds of APs that are equal in importance to BUs) not only semantically but also formally, i. e. they are structurally integral elements of an AC. For example:

(2) Plus, with the built-in multimedia capabilities of the PowerBook computer, salespeople can show videos and animations, making a normal sales presentation more persuasive than ever^{BU}. All of which can give your salespeople a new power, too^{AP}. The power to be more responsive, more productive, more effective (Business Week, p.120).

The attempt to eliminate the AP (*All of which can give your salespeople a new power*, *too*) from the AC leads to a semantic inconsistency of the BU with the following (after the AC) sentence (*The power to be more responsive, more productive, more effective*).

The researchers studying ACs in many languages agree that the lower bound of a BU and the upper bound of an AP are always easy to identify due to the mandatory formal indicator – a CW. As far as a BU is concerned, all scholars are in agreement that it is autosemantic as well as structurally and intonationally complete [5, 11, 19; 15, 13], which can be seen in syntactic structures of different sizes. When analyzing APs no one denies that separate words and word combinations can be joined to a BU, but the statement that they are members of the previous sentence (a BU) [6, 9–14; 11, 85; 17, 15] has attracted constructive criticism. For example, according to Vira Rinberg, an AP resembles a sentence part, but in accordance with its syntactic and communicative purpose an AP does not have its distinctive characteristics, among which are semantic and intonational independence [15, 18].

There is a genuine difference of opinion among scientists as to the naming of APs that are larger in size than a word combination: a sentence (step / complete / incomplete / distinguishing / simple / composite) [1, 57–58, 6, 9–14; 8, 200–202], a subordinate clause with a correlate, a specific incomplete sentence of a transitional type (from a sentence part to an incomplete sentence [12, 122], and a predicative unit of a different structure [11, 85]. In our view, such an assessment of an AP is not justified because any sentence must be notable for an external autonomy and be able to act outside a context as a complete segment of speech [4, 14]. Comparing this definition of a sentence with a universally recognized provision that concerns AC's (an AP semantically depends on the previous component (a BU) since it is generated by it and cannot exist without it), we

have reached the conclusion that they are complete opposites. While classifying an AP it can only be said that according to its formal features it may coincide with a composite sentence, however it cannot be a composite sentence per se.

The interpretation of an AP as a predicative unit has also been justifiably criticized because a predicate relationship can exist among predicative units only within a sentence, and within an AC the relations between its parts can only be adjoining ones [4; 15; 17, 24].

Observations made with the help of text material reveal both a linear (consecutive) and a parallel adjoining of an AP. A linear adjoining takes place when a BU is closely connected by its content with an AP that consists of one part. At a sentence level we can draw an analogy with a CS with an elementary structure (with one subordinate clause). A parallel adjoining, which is more characteristic of multicomponent APs, correlates to non-elementary CSs (with two or more subordinate clauses). This type of adjoining is sometimes contrasted with a consecutive one as a widening by a syntactically homogeneous component as opposed to a widening by a syntactically dependent component [13, 145–146, 18, 9–10]. It should be noted that we do not fully share this view since an AP is in any case syntactically dependent on a BU.

Taking into consideration the size of the added component (an AP) linguists single out the following variants of it: a) simple ones – word forms (example 3), word combinations (example 4), units structurally similar to elliptical predicative units (example 5), complete predicative unit (example 6) and b) complex ones – with several predicative units in the form of a CS (Example 7) or a sequence of sentences:

- (3) Fine^{BU}. Whatever^{AP}. I just wish I knew what you were talking about (Grisham, p. 352).
- (4) Honestly, I was a bloody mess^{BU}. As a student^{AP} (Fowles, p. 65).
- (5) But did he realize what it meant?^{BU} Because if he didn't, I'm lost!^{AP} (Fowles, p. 122)
- (6) Well, you are not alone^{BU}. Because for more than 40 years, people have been losing sleep over Corvettes^{AP} (Fortune, p. 108).

(7) It was of the many skills he wouldn't have acquired had he been a better shot at a sixteen^{BU}. If his shaft hadn't missed the deer and pierced Wolf's shoulder...^{AP1} If Cicatrice's band hadn't chosen to lay waste the von Mecklenberg estate...^{AP2} If old Baron had employed more men like Vukotish, and less like Schunzel, his then-steward...^{AP3} If...^{AP4} (Yeovil, p. 156).

Researchers point to the possibility of adjoining being possible after a BU in a syntactic unit of any size up to a composite syntactic unit [2, 2; 8, 13, 200–202; 9, 35–48]. Developing this idea, we offer a more detailed classification of multicomponent APs, arranging ACs that have such APs according to the classification of CSs with several subordinate clauses and composite sentences with various types of syntactic relations. ACs with multicomponent APs can have (similar to non-elementary CSs and composite sentences) various types of syntactic relations of different sizes (the number of 'sentence parts') and depth of structure (the number of levels of division into parts). Thus, we single out basic ACs (elementary, formally indivisible: BU + CW + AP) and derivative ACs (non-elementary, compound: (BU + CW₁ + AP₁ + CW₂ + AP₂ + CW₃ + AP₃ ... + CW_n + AP_n).

Among derivative ACs, we single out the following: 1) APs similar to the consecutive (stage) subordination, 2) APs similar to collateral subordination (homogeneous, heterogeneous and mixed), and 3) ACs with relationships among their different parts similar to those that exist in a composite sentence with various types of syntactic relations. At the same time, the dominant part in relationships between a BU and an AP is the adjoining relationship, and all the other possible ones 'overlap' it. For example:

(8) Stand here, Dear one – do not be afraid for yours is the noblest role off all in Smoosh^{BU}. Because your voice has not changed like the others and is still high and squeaky^{AP1}. Because you have sort of a pin head with a small ears and eardrums^{AP2}. Because of that, you and you alone heard the bat that was admitted to this Great Hall as a test^{AP3} (Harrison, Haldeman, p. 44).

In this example the relations between the BU and APs are manifested with the help of adjoining CW *Because* (homonymous to the corresponding subordinating one) – between the BU and AP₁ (external level of division), between AP₁, AP₂ and AP₃ (internal level of division).

The ACs in the following examples are similar to the CSs with homogeneous (example 9), heterogeneous (example 10), and mixed subordination (example 11).

(9) The raiders didn't know – could not have known – that their target was not at large in the village when they struck^{BU}. That their target had nothing to do with the village^{AP1}. That their ashes would be dust on the wind before the night was out^{AP2} (Davidson, p. 41).

The relations among the BU and APs in (9) – *That ... That ...* are of the same syntactic type. The reduction of any of the APs does not destroy the AC semantically. It only withdraws information partially. It is possible to change the syntactic position of APs in the AC without changing its semantics significantly. Among the clauses of a CS of this type coordinating relationships with the same functional load (in this case – enumeration) exist at an internal level of division. But such relationships cannot exist in structures with heterogeneous (parallel) collateral subordination (10) and mixed subordination (11) among their parts due to the fact that several APs are in several different semantic and syntactic relationships with a BU.

(10) The second the tape recorder was off, Smith took Thornton aside and pitched a comedy he thought the two of them should do^{BU}. Which is great^{AP1}. As long as we get 10 per cent^{AP2} (Newsweek, p. 52).

(11) A sentence is what the speaker means it to mean^{BU}. What he secretly means it to mean^{AP1}. Which may be quite opposite^{AP2}. What he doesn't mean it to mean^{AP3}. What it means as evidence of his real nature^{AP4}. (Fowles, p. 261).

All the APs are introduced by the CWs of different syntactic types: (10) AP₁ is introduced by *Which* (the equivalent of an adjoining clause), AP₂ – by *As ... as* (the equivalent of a time clause); (11) AP₂ – by *Which* (the equivalent of an adjoining clause). AP₃ is formally connected to AP₂, but its content correlates more with AP₁ and AP₄. It is even possible to change places of AP₁, AP₃, and AP₄ without losing the semantic coherence of the whole AP. In addition, it is even possible to exclude any of them from

the AC. In this case, the AC will only lose some additional information that does not significantly affect its adequate perception.

Another piece of evidence for the existence of universal relationships at different syntactic levels is the example below of an AC with these kinds of relationships among its parts which are the functional equivalent of those in a multicomponent composite sentence with different types of syntactic relationships. For example:

(12) The next part will be a rave^{BU}. She looked at him, both persuading and estimating. "And on the other hand they live in cynical open worlds^{AP1}. Bitchy ones^{AP2}. Where no one really believes anyone else's reputation – especially if they are successful^{AP3}. Which is all rather healthy, in a way"^{AP4} (Fowles, p. 225).

AP₁ is introduced with the help of CW *And* homonymous to the coordinating *and*. AP₂ is joined *asyndetically* and AP₃ and AP₄ are introduced with the help of CWs *Where* and *Which* homonymous to the corresponding subordinating ones.

To sum up, we can come to the conclusion that non-elementary ACs with CWs can realize practically all the models of arrangement and all the semantic and syntactic relations that are characteristic of non-elementary CSs. ACs with SWs and composite sentences have equivalent structures, but in the text hierarchy they are on different syntactic levels – a textual and a sentence level respectively.

Illustrative material

1. Business Week. – April 24, 1995. – 148 p.
2. Davidson C. The Reavers and the Dead / C. Davidson // IGNORANT ARMIES / [Ed. by D. Pringle]. – L.: BOXTREE, 1993. – P. 25–44.
3. FORTUNE. – June 26, 1995. – 176 p.
4. Fowles J. The Cloud / J. Fowles – N.Y.: A Signet Book, 1975. – P. 233–291.
5. Fowles J. Eliduc / J. Fowles – N.Y.: A Signet Book, 1975. – P. 107–133.
6. Fowles J. The Ebony Tower. – N.Y.: A Signet Book, 1975. – P. 1–106.
7. Fowles J. The Enigma / J. Fowles – N.Y.: A Signet Book, 1975. – P. 177–231.
8. Grisham J. The Runaway Jury / J. Grisham – N.Y.: Island Books, 1997. – 550 p.
9. Higgins J. Flight of Eagles / J. Higgins – N.Y.: The Reader's Digest Association, Inc., 1998. – Vol. – P. 339–465.
10. Newsweek. – February 4, 2002. – 98 p.
11. Yeovil J. The Ignorant Armies / J. Yeovil // IGNORANT ARMIES / [ed. by D. Pringle]. – L.: BOXTREE, 1993. – P. 153–198.

References

1. Бабайцева В. В. Синкретизм парцелированных и присоединенных субстантивных фрагментов текста / В. В. Бабайцева // Филологические науки. – 1997. – № 4. – С. 56–65.
2. Баталова И. К. Квалификация высказываний с присоединением в аспекте актуального членения в английском языке : автореф. дис. ... доктора филол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 "Германские языки" / И. К. Баталова. – Л., 1974. – 28 с.
3. Беляева Т. В. Вариативность синонимия в умовно-наслідкових складних реченнях : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.01 "Українська мова" / Т. В. Беляева. – Харків, 2004. – 20 с.
4. Білодід І. К. Надфразні єдності як елемент тексту в функціональних стилях літературної мови / І. К. Білодід // Мовознавство. – 1979. – № 2. – С. 14–23.

5. Богдан В. В. Синтактика, семантика, прагматика англомовних приєднувальних конструкцій і складних речень з підрядним зв'язком : [монографія] / В. В. Богдан. – Донецьк : ЛАНДОН-XXI, 2011. – 263 с.
6. Гаибова М. Т. Присоединительные конструкции и их стилистические функции в художественной прозе (на материале английского языка) : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 "Германские языки" / М. Т. Гаибова. – М., 1973. – 21 с.
7. Дмитренко В. А. Структура, семантика и функции союзных форм связи в смысловых миниатюрах в современном английском языке / В. А. Дмитренко // Вісник Харківськ. нац. ун-ту. Сер. : романо-германська філологія. – 2002. – № 572. – С. 87–93.
8. Дудик П. С. Синтаксис сучасного українського розмовного літературного мовлення / П. С. Дудик – К., 1973. – 288 с.
9. Кобзев П. В. Присоединение и обособление / П. В. Кобзев // Хабаровский ГПИ. Уч. записки. – Хабаровск, 1969. – Т. 20. – С. 35–48.
10. Коцобовська Г. А. Приєднувальні конструкції : функціонально-текстовий аспект : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.01 "Українська мова" / Г. А. Коцобовська. – Дніпропетровськ, 2002. – 188 с.
11. Малахов С. В. Присоединительные конструкции в большевистских листовках эпохи первой революции / С. В. Малахов // Вопросы истории русского литературного языка XIX–XX вв. : Межвузовский сборник научных трудов. – М., 1985. – С. 83–92.
12. Попова И. А. Неполные предложения в современном русском языке / И. А. Попова // Труды института языкознания АН СССР. – М., 1953. – Т. 2. – С. 3–136.
13. Пронь Н. А. Присоединительные конструкции в современном русском языке (на материале произведений К. А. Федина) / Н. А. Пронь // Вопросы истории и теории русского языка. – Калуга, 1971. – Вып. 4. – С. 144–175.
14. Пустовар О. В. Номінативний і комунікативний аспекти парцеляції в сучасній німецькій мові : дис. ... канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.04 "Германські мови" / О. В. Пустовар. – Донецьк, 2006.
15. Ринберг В. Л. Конструкции связного текста в современном русском языке / В. Л. Ринберг. – Львов : Вища школа, 1987. – 168 с.
16. Тураева З. Я. Лингвистика текста на исходе второго тысячелетия / З. Я. Тураева // Вісник Київськ. лінгвістичного ун-ту. – 1999. – № 2. – Т. 2. – С. 17–25.
17. Шалимова Г. С. Современный русский язык : синтаксис ; присоединительные конструкции в современном русском языке / Г. С. Шалимова – М., 1971. – 50 с.
18. Шафиро М. Е. Присоединение как явление речевого синтаксиса : автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук : спец. 10.02.01 "Русский язык" / М. Е. Шафиро. – Саратов, 1965. – 23 с.
19. Шульжук К. Ф. Синтаксис української мови / К. Ф. Шульжук – К. : Видавничий центр "Академія", 2004. – 406 с.

The paper focuses on similar and distinctive, obligatory and optional peculiarities of the formal organization of adjoining constructions and composite sentences. The classification of adjoined parts in adjoining constructions is expanded. Structurally, the adjoining constructions and composite sentences are considered to be equivalent units at different syntactic levels.

Keywords: adjoining construction, base utterance, adjoined part, adjoining conjunction, composite sentence.

Анотація

у роботі розглянуті схожі й відмінні, облігаторні й факультативні риси формальної організації приєднувальних конструкцій і складних речень. Розширена класифікація приєднувальних частин у приєднувальних конструкціях, запропоновані критерії відмежування приєднувальних конструкцій від інших складних синтаксичних одиниць. Зроблено висновок про еквівалентність різнорівневих одиниць – приєднувальних конструкцій і складних речень – з погляду їх строевих основ.

Ключові слова: приєднувальна конструкція, базове висловлення, приєднувальна частина, приєднувальний сполучниковий засіб, складне речення.

Аннотация

В работе рассмотрены схожие и отличные, облигаторные и факультативные черты формальной организации присоединительных конструкций и сложных предложений. Расширенная классификация присоединительных частей в присоединительных конструкциях, предложены критерии отграничения присоединительных конструкций от других сложных предложений – с точки зрения их строевых основ.

Ключевые слова: присоединительная конструкция, базовое высказывание, присоединительная часть, присоединительное союзное средство, сложное предложение.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 10.09.2012 р.

ТЕОРИЯ ТА ПРАКТИКА ПЕРЕКЛАДУ

УДК 81'255.4:[82–311.4+82–312.1]

Сомкин А. А.

преподаватель,

Научно-исследовательский

Мордовский государственный университет

имени Н. П. Огарева

СЕМАНТИКО-СТИЛИСТИЧЕСКОЕ СВОЕОБРАЗИЕ СОЦИАЛЬНО-ФИЛОСОФСКИХ ТЕКСТОВ И ОСОБЕННОСТИ ИХ ПЕРЕВОДА

Становление языка социально-философских текстов как особого стиля произошло не сразу. Поэтому, прежде чем приступить к его современной характеристике, необходимо обратиться к вопросу о правомерности деления научного языка на подязыки.

Выделение научного стиля (в том или ином виде) безоговорочно принимается большинством исследователей (Ю. Л. Васильев, В. Н. Комиссаров, В. Л. Наер, А. Нойберт, Л. К. Чикина и др.). Однако нет единого мнения по вопросу о его монолитности.

Одни считают невозможным его дальнейшее членение (Р. А. Будагов, М. Н. Кожина, О. А. Лаптева, Е. С. Троянская и др.), другие предполагают в нем