

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Факультет філології та соціальних комунікацій
Бердянського державного педагогічного університету
Маріупольський державний університет
Білоруський інститут правознавства (Республіка Білорусь)
Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University (Республіка Туреччина)



Людина в мовному просторі: історична спадщина, проблеми, перспективи розвитку

**Матеріали
II Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції**

17 – 18 травня 2018 року
Бердянськ

ЗМІСТ

Артёмова Катерина. ПРИМЕНЕНИЕ В УЧЕБНОМ ПРОЦЕССЕ ПАМЯТОК ДЛЯ АНАЛИЗА АУТЕНТИЧНОГО ТЕКСТА	8
Баранцова Ирина. ІНТЕРКУЛЬТУРНІСТЬ ЯК ОСНОВА СУЧАСНОГО ОСВІТНЬОГО ПРОСТОРУ	11
Белашанка Тамара, Насонова Татьяна. К ВОПРОСУ О ПРЕПОДАВАНИИ ДЕЛОВОГО АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА	17
Білоусова Вікторія. АНГЛОМОВНІ ЗАПОЗИЧЕННЯ З ФОРМАНТОМ -ING: ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ ХАРАКТЕР ТА ПРОБЛЕМАТИКА	20
Bohdan Valerii. COMMON AND DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF COMPLEX SYNTACTIC UNITS AND COMPOSITE SENTENCES	24
Бондар Наталія. МЕТАФОРИЧНІСТЬ ЯК ОСОБЛИВІСТЬ ІДІОСТИЛЮ ДЖОНА ДОННА	29
Вакуленко Карина. ТВОРЧІСТЬ ГРИГОРІЯ СКОВОРОДИ У НАУКОВОМУ ДОРОБКУ ОЛЕКСИ МИШАНИЧА	32
Глазкова Ірина. ПІЗНАВАЛЬНИЙ БАР'ЄР ЯК ЗАСІБ АКТИВІЗАЦІЇ ІНШОМОВНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ МАЙБУТНІХ УЧИТЕЛІВ-ФІЛОЛОГІВ	36
Глазкова Наталія. МЕТОДИ СТИМУЛЮВАННЯ ІНШОМОВНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ УЧНІВ	39
Горбач Наталія. ПАЛОМНИЦТВО ЯК ДОСВІД МІЖКУЛЬТУРНОГО ДІАЛОГУ В КНИЗІ Д. МАТІЯШ "ДОРОГА СВЯТОГО ЯКОВА"	43
Греб Володимир. ВИКОРИСТАННЯ ІНТЕРАКТИВНИХ МЕТОДІВ НАВЧАННЯ НА УРОКАХ УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ ЯК ОДИН ІЗ НАПРЯМІВ РОЗВИТКУ ПІЗНАВАЛЬНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ УЧНІВ	46
Дацер Катерина. ТВОРИ ДЖОНА ФАУЛЗА МОВОЮ КІНО	51
Денисова Анжеліка. УКРАЇНСЬКІ ТА ФРАНЦУЗЬКІ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЗМИ НА ПОЗНАЧЕННЯ ВІДЧУТТЯ ХОЛОДУ	54
Денчева Лалка. КУЛЬТУРНІ ВР'ЯЗКИ НА ГАБРОВО И ОДЕСА ПРЕЗ ВЪЗРАЖДАНЕТО (1862-1878г.)	57
Дмитренко Олена. ЛЕПБУК ЯК ІНТЕРАКТИВНА ФОРМА ОРГАНІЗАЦІЇ МІЖСОБИСТІСНОЇ БЕЗБАР'ЄРНОЇ ВЗАЄМОДІЇ СУБ'ЄКТІВ НАВЧАЛЬНО-ПІЗНАВАЛЬНОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ У СЕРЕДНІЙ ШКОЛІ	59
Дубинко Светлана, Михасенко Галина. ОБУЧЕНИЕ ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНО-ОРИЕНТИРОВАННОМУ АНГЛИЙСКОМУ ЯЗЫКУ В СИСТЕМЕ НЕПРЕРЫВНОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ	63
Dubrova Oksana. POETRY AS A KEY FACTOR IN THE FORMATION OF WALT WHITMAN'S HOMOSEXUAL IDENTITY	66
Живиця Таїсія. СИМВОЛІКА КАРТ ТАРО В РОМАНІ "СЬОМИЙ АРКАН" Н. СТЕПУЛИ	70

COMMON AND DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF COMPLEX SYNTACTIC UNITS AND COMPOSITE SENTENCES

Among the most important text units there are two that stand out: composite sentences and adjoining constructions (AC) with the adjoining connective words (CW), which are homonymous to coordinating and subordinating conjunctions. These composite sentences and ACs are the object of our research.

The subject of this research is common and distinctive features of formal structure of ACs 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.

A comprehensive study of text as a maximum unit of language activity is an increasingly important area in modern linguistics. This global problem cannot be solved successfully without conducting research on different text components – their structure, semantics, pragmatics, function and regularities in their connections.

Despite a considerable amount of literature regarding textual problems, to date, there are few studies that have investigated the criteria for dissociation of ACs from composite sentences, different types of adjoining that exist, and, especially, parcelling. Nevertheless, modern linguistic research in that direction has made it possible to learn 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 [8, 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). The 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) *"Not long after Vayden left, there was a big rain, and a flood^{BU}. Because^{CW} the creeks and rivers are choked off, the water is diverted to other runoffs^{AP}"* (John Grisham).

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.

Considering grammatical principles of ACs and CSs, linguists point to 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, the possibility for a syntactic unit similar to a composite sentence to be the part of an AC structure; 5) 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 the text level.

We support the idea that some communicatively important information can be transmitted by both a subordinate clause of a CS and an AP in an AC [4, 10; 5, 57; 6, 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 [2, 11, 19; 7, 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) [3, 9 – 14] 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 [7, 18].

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.

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 [9, 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, word combinations, units structurally similar to elliptical predicative units, complete predicative unit and b) complex ones – with several predicative units in the form of a CS or a sequence of sentences.

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 [1, 2]. 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:

(3) *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} (H. Harrison, J.C. Haldeman).

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 4, heterogeneous (example 5, and mixed subordination (example 6).

(4) *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} (C. Davidson).

The relations among the BU and APs in (4) – *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. However, such relationships cannot exist in structures with heterogeneous (parallel) collateral subordination (5) and mixed subordination (6) among their parts due to the fact that several APs are in several different semantic and syntactic relationships with a BU.

(5) *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).

(6) *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^{AP}₃. What it means as evidence of his real nature^{AP}₄. (J. Fowles).

All the APs are introduced by the CWs of different syntactic types: (5) AP₁ is introduced by *Which* (the equivalent of an adjoining clause), AP₂ – by *As ... as* (the equivalent of a time clause); (6) 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:

(7) *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*^{AP}₁. *Bitchy ones*^{AP}₂. *Where no one really believes anyone else's reputation – especially if they are successful*^{AP}₃. *Which is all rather healthy, in a way"*^{AP}₄ (J. Fowles).

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.

References

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.

5. Коцюбовська Г. А. Приєднувальні конструкції: функціонально-текстовий аспект: дис. ... канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.01 "Українська мова" / Г. А. Коцюбовська. – Дніпропетровськ, 2002. – 188 с.
6. Пустовар О. В. Номінативний і комунікативний аспекти парцеляції в сучасній німецькій мові: дис. ... канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.04 "Германські мови" / О. В. Пустовар. – Донецьк, 2006.
7. Ринберг В. Л. Конструкции связного текста в современном русском языке / В. Л. Ринберг. – Львов: Вища школа, 1987. – 168 с.
8. Тураева З. Я. Лингвистика текста на исходе второго тысячелетия / З. Я. Тураева // Вісник Київськ. лінгвістичного ун-ту. – 1999. – № 2. – Т. 2. – С. 17–25.
9. 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.

Бондар Наталія,

студентка,

Мелітопольський державний педагогічний університет
імені Богдана Хмельницького

МЕТАФОРИЧНІСТЬ ЯК ОСОБЛИВІСТЬ ІДІОСТИЛЮ ДЖОНА ДОННА

Створення художнього твору – процес, під час якого автор має змогу виразити усі свої думки, мрії та переживання, порушити проблеми та питання, що його хвилюють. Художній твір є відображенням внутрішнього світу людини, тією стежкою, що приводить читача до розуміння автора. Та не кожний читач може одразу зрозуміти, про що саме йде мова, чому цю тему обрала людина для своєї розповіді, що насправді вона хотіла сказати і чому використала ті чи інші слова. Тому вивчення індивідуальних особливостей творчості того чи іншого письменника є актуальним для літературознавства та лінгвістики. Не зважаючи на численні роботи у сфері вивчення ідіостилю як феномену, не встановлено єдиної точки зору щодо цього питання. Саме цим і зумовлено **актуальність** роботи.

Ідіостиль став предметом дослідження багатьох науковців, таких як В. В. Виноградов, Ю. М. Караулов, Б. О. Ларін, Ю. М. Лотман, В. П. Григор'єв, І. А. Тарасова, Н. С. Болотнова, В. А. Піщальникова, М. П. Котюрова, О. Г. Фоменко та ін. Кожний дослідник підходить до розгляду цього питання з різних точок зору. Хтось досліджує загалом ідіостиль як феномен, інші науковці зосереджують свою увагу на розгляді окремих аспектів у творчості певного письменника. В залежності від того, який шлях дослідження обрав науковець, у сучасній науці прийнято виокремлювати такі підходи до вивчення ідіостилю: семантико-