

ON THE ISSUE OF THE LINGUISTIC STATUS OF ADJOINING CONSTRUCTIONS AND DIALOGICAL UNITS

A comprehensive study of the relationship between systemic and linguistic as well as speech regularities of text organization within the processes of discretization and syncretization of its components requires a clear differentiation among text units. The attempts to identify composite syntactic units – an adjoining construction and a dialogic unity (a question and answer unity) encourage us to write again about the procedure for their distinction, which determines the relevance of this work. The term adjoining construction is generally understood to mean a two-component text unit divided by an external punctuation mark (a period, an exclamation mark, or a question mark) into two parts – an autosemantic base utterance and a synsemantic adjoined part. At the same time, the second (adjoined part), which is formalized by a separate sentence, is connected to the first base utterance with the help of an adjoining connecting word that is homonymous to a coordinating and subordinating conjunction that facilitates syntactic singling out of an adjoining construction in a text. [1, c. 6; 2]. Despite a significant number of works dedicated to adjoining constructions [1; 2; 3; 6], even in the latest modern studies, there continues their identification with the structures that, in our opinion, have nothing to do with adjoining constructions. First of all, we mean a dialogic unity. In the literature, the term dialogic unity tends to be used

by linguists to refer to “a pair of remarks belonging to different interlocutors and form a unitary whole in terms of a structure and meaning. It is only in total that they represent a finished elementary statement. In other words, these are two or more adjacent remarks that are combined semantically, lexically and grammatically” (here and hereinafter the translation is ours – Valerii Bohdan). So, according to the researcher H.A. Kotsiubovska, the syntactic units like: «*А знаєш, чому не милиться? Бо з петлюрівським воно душком*»(О. Гончар) (“*Do you know why doesn't it form a lather? Because it has Petliura's musty smell*” (O. Honchar) are adjoining constructions [4, с. 113, 118, 122, 131, 128–129]. In order to understand this issue, we suggest recalling generally accepted provisions regarding an adjoining construction, which practically do not cause disagreements among linguists: a) the appearance of its (second) adjoined part is not determined by anything and is often unexpected; b) there exist semantically correlative adjoined parts that semantically correlate with the content of the base utterance (predictable adjoining) and semantically non-correlative adjoined parts that semantically are not included in the content of the base utterance (unpredictable connection).

Considering dialogic units from this point of view, we can state that they do not correspond to these provisions, namely: 1) dialogic units cannot be adjoining constructions with an unpredictable connection since an answer to a question is not unpredictable, but on the contrary is expected (we mean the answer itself is expected, not its content); 2) we cannot attribute dialogical units to the predictable connection either because, in this case, the parts of the adjoining construction must easily semantically merge into one structure, forming a complex sentence. Let us try to do it with the above-mentioned dialogic unity: *А знаєш, чому не милиться? бо з петлюрівським воно душком* (*Do you know why doesn't it form a lather? because it has Petliura's musty smell*). As we can see, the grammatical and semantic well-formedness of the statement is ruined: a) the question mark is not a common phenomenon on the border of two predicative units in one and the same sentence; b) the question and the answer to it cannot be within the limits of one complex sentence, otherwise the communicative purpose of communication disappears (it is well-known that a complex sentence is already fully formed at the moment of its speech, forming a unitary whole; so there is no need to ask a question when you already know the answer to it).

Therefore, it seems that H. A. Kotsiubovska's understanding of the above problem of distinction of the composite syntactic units is questionable. On balance, taking into account what was said above, we conclude that a dialogic unity (a question and answer unity) does not accord the status of an adjoining construction.

References

1. Богдан В. В. Синтактика, семантика, прагматика англомовних приєднувальних конструкцій і складних речень з підрядним зв'язком:

монографія. Донецьк: «ЛАНДОН-XXI», 2011. С. 263.

2. Дмитренко В. А. Структура, семантика и функции союзных форм связи в смысловых миниатюрах в современном английском языке. *Вісник Харківськ. нац. ун-ту. Сер. Романо-германська філологія*. 2002. № 572. С. 87–93.

3. Князькин Ю. П. Присоединительные конструкции в мордовских языках: дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.22/ Марийский государственный университет. Йошкар-Ола, 2005. 195 с.

4. Коцюбовська Г. А. Приєднувальні конструкції: функціонально-текстовий аспект: дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.01 / Дніпропетровський національний університет. Дніпропетровськ, 2002. 188 с.

5. Приходько В. С., Шпанько Т. С. Лінгво-комунікативні основи навчання іншомовного діалогічного мовлення. URL: <http://zakon5.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1678-18> (дата звернення: 3.11.2022).

6. Valerii Bohdan. On the Problem of Differentiation between an Adjoining Construction and a Parcelled Sentence. *Іноземна мова у професійній підготовці спеціалістів: проблеми та стратегії*: матеріали V Міжнар. наук.-практ. інтернет-конф. (Кропивницький, 21 лют. 2022 р.). Кропивницький: РВВ КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 2022. С. 113–115.