МОВОЗНАВСТВО

UDC 81'367.51'367

Bohdan V.,
candidate of philological sciences,
Berdiansk State Pedagogical University

SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS
OF ADJOINING CONSTRUCTIONS AND COMPLEX SENTENCES

The complexity of semantic ties and relations among lexical elements has been repeatedly stressed in linguistic works [5]. The main aim of this study is to investigate similar and distinctive features of semantic and pragmatic organization of adjoining constructions with the parts connected by the adjoining conjunctive means that are homonymous to subordinate ones compared to complex sentences. Therefore, in order to maximize the semantic objectivity of our research while solving the issue of semantic variation of adjoining constructions (AC) with adjoining connective words (CW) that are homonymous to coordinating and subordinating conjunctions [1; 6] and composite 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). The similar and distinctive features of semantic and pragmatic organization of ACs are the object of our research. The comparison of a formal arrangement of ACs and CSs will mainly be based on complex sentences that are more demonstrative for our study because they are much more diverse in structural terms than compound sentences.

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 Victor 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, 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 [14, 67], because the lack of a dependence marker in asyndetic sentences does not preclude the differentiation of relations among their clauses.

Another important extralingual factor affecting the adequate selection of propositions in the clauses of the ACs and CSs is the situation of speech (e.g. the word *captain* is often given as an example; it has different lexical content, depending on where the events occur: in the army (a warship or ground forces), aboard the merchant ship or on the sports ground).

The functional potential of ACs and CSs is overlapped and reinforced by the semantic one [2, 30], which makes it possible for the "range of probability" of syntactic units (implicit, systemic possibilities inherent in them) to realize in the context [10, 126]. According to many researchers of propositional and semantic relations of composite units, the existence of truth in the meaning and meaningfulness in the language can be observed not in the sentence-like structures but in the propositions that reflect a denotative situation [17, 118–119]. However, domestic linguists clarify this statement by the observation that not all the propositions can be checked for truthfulness / untruthfulness [13, 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 [6]. 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.

In addition, it is important to put special emphasis to the fact that ACs have two dominant meanings – those of additional information and evaluation. All the rest are their varieties, although "muted" ones [4, 67], but those that can be identified in a context.

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

(1) "I might have stuck there till I died", the idiotic thought being in keeping with my frame of mind and my environment. **For** I should hardly have died before morning, when my boy and the coolies would have come (P. C. Wren).

The structural parallelism of the form and content also contributes to close similarity of the meanings of additional information and precise definition [3; 7]. 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 especially when those meaning are supported by modifying words.

In principle both the meaning of additional information and precise definition can be reflected by any adjoining connective words, which are homonymous to coordinating and subordinating conjunctions (the undisputed "leader" for the first meaning is *which*).

Despite the fact that the semantics of the meanings of additional information and precise definition provides a real basis for their generality, the distinctive features of ACs and CSs are clearly manifested in semantics too. If the former meaning is always represented by the narrative type of utterance, then the latter – by the interrogative one.

(2) "Is that why you haven't called? **Because** I smoke?" (J. Grisham).

(3) "Maybe I'll talk it over with one of my, how would you put it, contemporaries?" (M. Sharmat).

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.

(4) Purpose-Centered Education® encourages you to use what you learn to champion new ideas within your organization, and discover new opportunities for yourself. **Because** there is no better way to prepare for a changing world than to be the entrepreneur who makes innovation and change happen (Working Woman).

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.

(5) ["You'll still be able to fix the autopilot, won't you?" asked Tootsie anxiously.] "Maybe, he muttered. **As** long **as** I don't have alien flashback. I get the creeping horribles when I remember what happened" (H. Harrison, C. Haldeman).

3) **The meanings of cause and consequence.** They coincide with the meanings of conclusion by one of the components of their seme 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 determinant 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 connective words 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, 327].

(6) The editors waste no time scarfing it up, either, since we hold the contest just after most of the staff have returned from their noontime workout (Runner's World).

(7) You sweetest thing, oh God, listen – you're life and death to me, you're my whole existence. That's why I've come. **So that** we can talk about it, and trust each other (J. Fowles).

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.

So as we can see, the direction of conditionality of these structures is directly opposite. According to M. Liapon, in these syntactic structures the dominant meaning of cause – consequence is modified into consequence – cause [9, 116].

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*) [8, 63; 11, 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" [12, 35].

(8) However, **when** I saw **how** much my students learned from each other, **how** much they interacted and learned English, **how** much they seemed to enjoy it, and **how** successful they felt about the activity, I was glad that I had taken the risk (English Teaching Forum).

(9) It was of the many skills he wouldn't have acquired had he been a better shot at a sixteen. **If** his shaft hadn't missed the deer and pierced Wolf's shoulder... **If** Cicatrice's

band hadn't chosen to lay waste the von Mecklenberg estate ... **If** old Baron had employed more men like Vukotish, and less like Schunzel, his then-steward ... **If**... (J. Yeovil).

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 [13, 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* [12, 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 seme 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 modifying words. That is, when the relations of contrast in the parts of composite structures exist in an explicit or implicit form, then the "denial-of-expectation" [15, 168] or "the contrary-to-expectation" effect [16, 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" [9, 152].

(10) Well, you are not alone**. Because** for more than 40 years, people have been losing sleep over Corvettes (Forbes).

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 modifying 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.

References

1. Богдан В. В. Синтактика, семантика, прагматика англомовних приєднувальних конструкцій і складних речень з підрядним зв'язком : [монографія] / В. В. Богдан. – Д. : "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. : Либідь, 1993. – 368 с.
5. Денисова С. П. Лексичне значення у контексті сучасної лінгвістики / С. П. Денисова // Актуальні проблеми іноземної філології: Лінгвістика та літературознавство : [міжвуз. зб. наук. ст.] / [відп. ред. В. А. Зарва]. – Бердянськ : БДПУ, 2011. – Вип. VI. – Ч. 1. – С. 135–142.
6. 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.
7. Иофик Л. Л. Сложное предложение в новоанглийском языке / Л. Л. Иофик – Л., 1968. – 214 с.
8. Кухаренко В. А. Інтерпретація тексту : [навч. посіб. для студ. старших курсів фак.-тів англ. мови] / В. А. Кухаренко. – Вінниця : НОВА КНИГА, 2004. – 272 с.
9. Ляпон М. В. Смысловая структура сложного предложения и текст. К типологии внутритекстовых отношений / М. В. Ляпон – М. : Наука, 1986. – 200 с.
10. Мельников Г. П. Типы мыслительных единиц, обозначаемых языковым знаком / Г. П. Мельников // Вопросы семантики. – М., 1971. – С. 58–75.
11. Мороховский А. Н. Стилистика английского языка / Мороховский А. Н., Воробьева О. П., Лихошерст Н. И. – К. : Вища школа, 1984. – 247 с.
12. Проблемы варьирования языковых единиц: материалы к спецкурсам и спецсеминарам / [авт.-сост. Арнольд И. В. и др.]. – К., 1990. – 199 с.
13. Прокопчук А. А. Сложноподчиненное предложение и текст / А. А. Прокопчук. – Х. : Изд-во "Основа" при Харьков. ун-те, 1990. – 192 с.
14. Ширяев Е. Н. Бессоюзное сложное предложение в современном русском языке / Е. Н. Ширяев. – М. : Наука, 1986. – 223 с.
15. Lang E. The Semantics of Coordination / E. Lang. – Amsterdam : Benjamins, 1984. – 300 p.
16. Rudolph E. Contrast, Adversative and Concessive Relations and their Explication in English, German, Spanish, Portuguese on Sentence and Text Level / E .Rudolph. – Berlin ; N. Y. : Walter de Gruyter, 1996. – 544 p.
17. Ziff P. About Ungrammaticalness / P. Ziff // Mind. – Edinburgh, 1964. – Vol. 73. – №. 290. – P. 110–130.

Summary

The paper explores similar and distinctive features of semantic and pragmatic organization of adjoining constructions with the parts connected by the adjoining conjunctive means that are homonymous to subordinate ones compared to CSs. The semantic classes of the adjoining constructions are determined and their peculiarities are revealed. Propositional meanings, in which the informative function performed by the adjoined part is concretized, are established.

Keywords: adjoining construction, base utterance, adjoined part, adjoining conjunction, complex sentence, propositional meaning.

Анотація

У роботі розглянуто схожі й відмінні риси семантичної організації приєднувальних конструкцій з частинами, поєднаними приєднувальними сполучними засобами, омонімічними підрядним у порівнянні зі складнопідрядними реченнями. Визначено семантичні класи приєднувальних конструкцій і виявлено їхні особливості. Встановлено пропозиціональні значення, у яких конкретизується інформативна функція, виконувана приєднуваною частиною.

Ключові слова: приєднувальна конструкція, базове висловлення, приєднана частина, приєднувальний сполучний засіб, складнопідрядне речення, пропозиціональне значення.

Аннотация

В работе рассмотрены схожие и отличительные особенности семантической организации присоединительных конструкций с частями, соединенными присоединительными союзными средствами, омонимичными подчинительным, в их сравнении со сложноподчиненными предложениями. Определены семантические классы присоединительных конструкций и выявлены их особенности. Установлены пропозициональные значения, в которых конкретизируется информативная функция, выполняемая присоединённой частью.

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

Гаврилова В. В.,
аспірантка,
Бердянський державний педагогічний університет

ТЕОРЕТИЧНІ ЗАСАДИ ВИВЧЕННЯ ПАРЕМІЙ

Стійкі вислови відіграють особливу роль у передачі досвіду від покоління до покоління, адже паремії у стислій місткій формі відображають найважливіші для людей ідеї та є фрагментом мовної картини світу. Паремії мають суб'єктивний характер, адже вони не лише описують світ з точки зору індивіда, а й інтерпретують, оцінюють, виражають суб'єктивне ставлення до нього.

У системі жанрів народнопоетичної творчості паремії посідають проміжне становище між одиницями мови і фольклору. Ці сталі вислови – важливий аспект духовного життя народів як комунікативний, ідеологічний та естетичний елемент їх культур. Природна значеннєвість паремій щільно пов'язана із фоновими знаннями носіїв мови, із системою цінностей, моральних устоїв, з культурно-історичними традиціями, що склались у певному соціумі.

У сучасній науці наукове осмислення прислів'їв, приказок, примовок тощо проводиться як у загальнотеоретичному аспекті, так і в аспекті конкретного вивчення окремих пареміологічних фондів та їхніх взаємозв'язків. Оскільки теоретичні узагальнення можливі лише на основі докладного вивчення національного паремійного матеріалу, учені, представники різних напрямів, інтенсивно досліджують етноспецифічні особливості паремій своїх народів. Теоретичні питання світової та слов'янської пареміології знайшли відображення у працях багатьох лінгвістів: О. О. Потебні, Ш. Баллі, Л. П. Сміта, Л. А. Булаховського, В. М. Мокієнка, М. Ф. Алефіренка, Л. Г. Скрипник та ін.

Проте, незважаючи на значні результати у цьому напрямку, говорити про всебічне вивчення так званих прислів'їв і приказок ще зарано. У вивченні паремій залишається низка проблемних питань, суперечливих тверджень, зокрема й тих, що стосуються не лише походження, структурно-семантичних, функціонально-стилістичних, прагматичних особливостей. Серед вчених досі немає одностайності щодо статусу та місця паремій в ієрархічній будові мови; відсутні чіткі, універсальні