

expedient further studies in the field of language evolution of the semantic system in the aspect of determinant analysis of its subsystems.

**Key words:** chronological stratification, functional differentiation, language determinant, Middle English, names of physicians, occupational terms.

**Vitae**

Oksana Dobrovolska – Doctor of Philology, Professor at the Department of Foreign Philology and Translation, National Transport University, 01, Mykhaila Omelianovycha-Pavlenka Str., Kyiv, 01010 Ukraine. Area of research interests is the aspects of language development.

**Correspondence:** oxanadobrovolska@ukr.net

Serhiy Yermolenko

DOI 10.31558/1815-3070.2019.38.7

УДК 81-116.3:81'366.58:81'367.624

### MEANING SHIFT PARALLELS IN TEMPORAL DEIXIS

*Статтю присвячено проблемі ролі вторинних семантичних варіантів адвербіальних конкретизаторів у мовленнєвій реалізації темпоральних полів, показано, якими можуть бути такі реалізатори, а також їхню взаємодію з граматичними конститuentами поля і дискурсивні обмеження на їхнє застосування.*

*Ключові слова: дейксис, вторинне значення, функційна граматики, поле темпоральності, прислівник часу, транспозиція, функційно-стильовий контекст.*

Last decades have witnessed a growing interest of linguists in this country and elsewhere in functional grammar (see works by A. O. Zahnitko and his linguistic school, I. R. Vykhovanets', K. H. Horodens'ka etc.) An important place belongs here to studies realized within the theoretical and methodological framework of the field approach, such as works of O. I. Bondar, O. V. Bondarko and others. Making a major contribution to the understanding of how the grammar of natural languages operates in speech and how it interact with lexis in its speech realization, field studies, however, so far tend to ignore one significant aspect of field structure and functioning, namely, the secondary, or derivative, semantic variants of fields' constituents, both grammatical and functional, thus overlooking the role these variants play in field organization and actualization.

The object of study in this paper is some structural and functional properties of temporal microfields (i.e. temporal fields as realized in sentences); more specifically, I will analyze some lexical features of these microfields' structure that can be involved in forming the temporal perspective of the sentence (or, possibly, some larger text fragment) by means of temporal transposition, or temporal meaning transference (*translatio temporum* in terms of traditional rhetoric). My goal is to show that adverbs of time can be used in such a way as well as what their secondary semantic variants are, and what conditions and constraints are that influence the use of these variants as constituents of temporal microfields. Illustrations will mostly be drawn from various fields of the usage of Modern Ukrainian, English, Polish and Russian. In analyzing this material, I will take into account the inner form of secondary variants, including their motivation and, consequently, the character of their relation to the underlying item's primary meaning. I will also examine relevant features of the semantic structure of sentences they occur in, i.e. their immediate context, and within it, their relations to other items within temporal microfields. Yet, arguably, contextual identification in this case should not only limit itself to such narrow contexts, but should also consider wider, discourse contexts, such as language registers and styles. Taken together, these variables will provide additional parameters to be used in temporal (and possibly other) microfield structure description and analysis, making the latter more detailed and informative.

The (functional-grammatical) field is commonly defined as a group of grammatical and lexical linguistic items as well as their combinations which belong to the same semantic category (e.g. temporality or personality) and interact due to their semantic functions (Bondarko, "Osnovaniya funktsionalnoy grammatiki", 11). As such, the functional-grammatical field is one of means of structural organization of linguistic items within the language system. A fundamental feature of field-internal systemic organization is the division of fields into the center (or nucleus) and the periphery (Bondar 52–54). Realized in speech, functional-grammatical fields are manifested by contextual, or micro-, fields, this manifestation characterized by regularities concerning, in particular, the selection and configuration of a field's central and peripheral constituents. The transference of temporal meaning is the expression of a temporal meaning by the use of an item with another one. Such transference is made by means of transposition, usually regarded as the use of a tense form of the verb in a meaning and, correspondingly, context that differ from its primary, or the most usual, ones. It is this new context that provides indication as to the identity of a new, contextually determined meaning of a transferred item. Although variable with respect to individual items forming it, the context of specific transferred meanings at the same time has the invariant semantic function. In tense transposition, this function is performed by lexical items, cf. the following example of the present tense denoting past events and therefore called the historical present (*praesens historicum*): Ukrainian *Іду я вчора вулицею, рантом бачу...* Here the verbs in the present express not the present time reference but the semantic feature "perceiver" prototypically associated with the present tense, whereas the adverb *вчора* indicates the actual time of the

situation referred to by the sentence and, accordingly, the temporal plane into which the verb forms of the present tense are transferred, and in doing this, it indicates the contextual temporal reference of actions denoted by these verbs. Correspondingly, the structural scheme of the temporal microfield featuring transposition is traditionally thought to consist of a transposed and semantically transformed grammatical nucleus, on one hand, and, on the other, peripheral lexical items denoting actual time reference and operating as the latter's contextual identifiers (Yermolenko "Obraznyje sredstva morfologii", 9–11).

The question I am going to ask in this article is this: is it really the only possible and therefore invariable contextual scheme of temporal transposition and also of the distribution of functions between the microfield's grammatical and lexical components? My contention is, another scheme is also possible, in which the lexical component is transferred, while the grammatical, i.e. the verb tense form, plays the role of the contextual identifier of a secondary meaning.

If this is the case, then how is this alternative scheme actualized? Say, if it is perfectly grammatical to say in Ukrainian *Іду я вчора по вулиці, раптом бачу...*, then will the "counterexample", in which the roles of the microfield components are reverted, be equally grammatical: for instance, can the sentence *Ішов я сьогодні по вулиці, раптом побачив...* be interpreted as referring to events of some previous day? As far as my speech intuition and experience can be trusted, the latter example leaves the impression of ungrammaticality. However, one should not overlook the fact that the usage illustrated by the first example is associated with colloquial everyday speech, so that the hypothetical and ungrammatical one is by default related to this kind of speech as well. However, different temporal transpositions can differ with regard to their stylistic markers (connotations) and are correspondingly correlated with different communicative-functional discourse varieties, everyday colloquial speech being only one of these varieties (Shmeliov 3–32). Generally speaking, it is methodologically expedient that the description of a linguistic entity usage should correlate its semantic variation with discourse varieties these variants occur in (Yermolenko "Epistemichno-komunikatyvna perspektyva dyskursu", 141–148). It was M. M. Bakhtin (writing as Voloshinov) who noted, referring to what he termed „sociologic method", that the lack of correlation between grammar and stylistic in using this method is methodologically perilous (Voloshinov 150). From this viewpoint, the emotionally expressive use of the present tense to denote the past time, as exemplified by the above sentence, is stylistically restricted to conversational speech as well as its written reflections in letters, epistolary fiction, memoirs and the like, and also in the narrative of the fictional „author" imitating oral colloquial narrative discourse (Prokopovich 261–277). As regards another variety of the present tense used to denote past events in scholarly or popular historical discourse, it differs from the former stylistically by lacking its subjective expressiveness as well as by being generally detached from the situation of close communication (one might regard this variant as a genuinely unmarked – in the Jakobsonian sense – present tense), cf.: Ukrainian *1857 р. Шевченко повертається із заслання...* (for a detailed discussion, see Yermolenko "Semiotychna struktura temporalnoho deyksysu").

It is turning to other discourse varieties than those related to conversational communication or imitating it, that instances can be detected of temporal microfields, in which lexical temporal transposition is combined with grammatical tense contextual identifiers. Consider the following examples drawn from fictional "author's" narrative (not imitating oral conversational narrative) and documentary prose, in which the deictical adverb *today* is employed alongside verb tense forms referring to past time events, real or fictional: English *There were other voices in the dark place where he went when he prayed; he heard them frequently while he was there – usually distant, like the dim voices you sometimes heard in the background when you made a long-distance call, sometimes more clearly. Today one of them was very clear indeed* (St. King); *Once again they were ushered into that cheerless... room, which, today, smelled faintly of oiled machinery* (L. Sanders); *...the site of Dwight D. Eisenhower's home during the Second World War, which I had by chance recently discovered lay more or less along the same route I was taking today* (B. Bryzon). My translating these fragments in Ukrainian does not produce sentences, which are to be prefixed with asterisk, cf.: *У тій темній місцині, куди він потрапляв, коли молився, бували й інші голоси... Сьогодні один із них був дуже розбірливим; знову їх завели до тієї безрадісної... кімнати, де сьогодні слабо пахло машинним маслом; місце оселі Двайта Д. Ейзенгауера під час Другої світової війни, яке я випадково відкрив нещодавно, лежало приблизно біля того маршруту, який я обрав сьогодні.* The same applies to the example containing the adjective derived from the adverb with that deictical meaning, cf. Polish *Odczytywał przez binokle ze swego notatnika rozkład zajęć na dzień dzisiejszy* (B. Prus); *пор.: Одягнувши окуляри, він читав зі свого записника розклад занять на сьогоднішній день.*

Similar examples can occur in free indirect speech representing inner monologue (yet it should be emphasized that the linguistic character of this monologue can be rather arbitrary and variable, vascillating between inner speech proper and the expression of "stream of consciousness", i.e. thoughts as well as wordless feelings, visual images, and impressions, and conveying in this way the perceptual viewpoint of the literary character, which in such a case replaces that of the narrator, cf. O. S. Akhmanova's definition of this kind of narrative: "A linguo-stylistic device serving in fiction to depict emotional experience of a character and permitting to replace the description of actual events by the thoughts, impressions etc. caused by them and expressed in the character's inner speech" (Akhmatova 239) (on the transposition of perceptual viewpoint, see Yermolenko „Person in artistic discourse" 25–26). Merging with the fictional author's narrative in the past tense, in particular, in cases when it is impossible unambiguously to attribute the inner voice either to the narrator or the character, this kind of narrative also provides contextual environment for lexical temporal transposition, cf. English *So he had made the reservations, and today – if it was still today – they had been on U.S. 50, the so-called loneliest highway in America, headed west across Nevada to the High Sierra* (St. King).

The meaning of the temporal adverbs in these illustrations cannot be identified with their primary meaning, yet neither should they be treated as homonymous. Instead, the former is to be considered secondary and derivative, and accordingly defined as follows: „temporal reference from the perceptiv viewpoint of the moment in the past that is

synchronous with reported events”. Detecting and identifying such meanings of lexical temporal deicticals can be felt as somewhat unusual not only because they are secondary rather than primary and the most habitual; one should also take into consideration that it may be so because they occur not in everyday speech, where the contrast between the narrator’s present and the narrated past is self-evident for interlocutors, but in other kinds of discourse whose inherent characteristics make this contrast arbitrary and a matter of stylistic choice rather than that of actual time reference (on fictional time, see Ingarden 110–112; Yermolenko “Deyaki pytannia gramatychnoyi semantyky” 43–49).

Other temporal adverbial deicticals as well as their derivatives, too, can be transposed in this way, cf. Ukrainian *Бертгольд перевів швидкий погляд з обличчя прибулого на посвідчення, що лежало на столі. Так, безперечно, перед ним оригінал, з якого зроблено фотознімок. От тільки волосся зачесане не назад, як на фото. Тепер його рівною рискою розділяв проділ. Від цього риси обличчя здаються ще виразніше окресленими* (Ю. Дольд-Михайлик); рос. *Второй случай касался трехлетней девочки, простудившейся зимой во время прогулки и теперь погибавшей от воспаления легких. Доктор Иванов не взял ее в больницу на попечение фельдшера, а сам ухаживал за ребенком. Сейчас эта девочка (правда, сильно измененная годами) часто гуляет со мною аллеями киевского университетского Ботанического сада* (Ю. Булаховская); *И полозья санок, как коньки, засвистели под изволок по мерзлому снегу. Еле тлела далеко впереди сумрачно-алая заря, а сзади уже освещал поле только что поднявшийся светлый стеклянный месяц. Теперь они неслись в Гренландию* (И. А. Бунин); English *Delaney could see her triangular face clearly now. High cheekbones – Indian blood there? – tight skin, somewhat slanted eyes, widely spaced. Open, astonished eyes* (L. Sanders); *They were in rocky, lava country by now, and approaching the big pines. Tomorrow they would strike the Feather River canyon. The creek where they camped was mountain water ...* (M. Foster); *His mind went over every instant of the time that had elapsed since he'd stood in Ethel's apartment yesterday and listened to her sarcasm, her ridicule, her threats* (M. H. Clark); Russian *...Появился в моих дверях Демьян Кузьмич, расшаркался и вручил мне приглашение пожаловать завтра в четыре часа дня в театр. Завтра не было дождя. Завтра был день с крепким осенним заморозком. Стуча каблуками по асфальту, волнуясь, я шел в театр* (М. А. Булгаков) (note that Bulgakov, as different from Foster, uses *завтра* with reference to the time point synchronous with the narrated event): *Завтра была война* (a Soviet film’s title); *11 мая газета «Рабочий», где в это время служил Булгаков, сообщила, как и другие газеты, о вчерашнем отлете Есенина с Айседорой Дункан в Кенигсберг, а 14 мая «Накануне» уже печатает отклики о пребывании поэта за границей* (М. О. Чудакова) (here, as in the example from Y. Dold-Mykhaulyk’s novel, the transferred meaning of the adjectival deictical in the first of the two co-ordinate clauses of this sentence is repeated, *mutatis mutandis*, by the present tense form in the second); пол. *Zobaczył pusty pokój z rozgrzebanym tapczanem i resztkami wczorajszej kolacji na stole* (K. Brandys).

Since temporal adverbs are units of the lexical system, and since such instances of their use as given above are typical, it would be natural to expect corresponding usages to be registered in dictionaries. Examining them, however, proves this not to be the case, the lexicographical registration of these semantic variants being, at best, inconsistent or, more frequently, absent. For instance, Dictionary of modern standard Russian, while having examples of Russian *теперь* with past time reference (cf. *Он там хозяин, это ясно; И Тане уж не так ужасно; и любопытная теперь немного растворила дверь; Никогда ему еще не было жаль матери, как именно теперь, и никогда он так не желал ее видеть, как в настоящую минуту*), gives them as illustrations of this adverb’s primary meaning “at the same time; at this moment” (DMSR 15; 298); yet for *сейчас*, no such examples are provided, although the transposition of this adverb to the context of the past is quite grammatical and wide-spread too, cf.: *Только сейчас он почувствовал себя в относительно безопасной обстановке* (А. Бестер). Webster’s Third International Dictionary defines the sixth meaning of *now* as follows: “at the time under consideration; at the time referred to” (*the people now proceeded to give him almost every important honor with their gift*) (WTID 1546), yet no corresponding secondary meanings are assigned to such deictical temporal adverbials as *today* чи *tomorrow*. Similarly, in New English-Russian Dictionary, the third meaning of *now*, marked “in narrative”, is explicated as “then, at that moment, at that time” (*now he tried another plan, the war was now practically concluded, now Caesar marched East*) (NERD 2; 110), but there is no indication given that *today* or *tonight* can be used in the same way, although cf. the following examples: *...he began seeing her home after class. Tonight, Thursday, there was no class, but Tim was coming to fetch Pamela when the library closed at nine o'clock and take her out to dinner. It was now eight-fifteen...* (G. McCallum 2). In The Dictionary of the Polish Language ed. by W. Doroszewski, the entry *teraz* has, along with other illustrations, these ones as well: *Jak ongi w szkole do wakacji, tak teraz liczyłem dni do odjazdu; Pod stołem listów leżały zaschnięte róże: jedna niegdyś biała, druga ongi czerwona. Teraz obie były żółte*, but all of them exemplify, according to the compilers, the same meaning “at that moment, at the present moment, now, currently” (DPLD 8; 437).

As temporal deicticals, all these items share, as their common semantic feature, orientation towards the moment of actual oral speech as their reference point, and therefore also towards the speaker and the perceptual viewpoint associated with him. The same applies to the present tense as a grammatical deictical. Also, they all can be transposed to the past time context, this transposition demonstrating the same semantic motivation, based on the metaphorical identification of the narrated past with the present as perceived by the speaker. Arguably therefore, underlying the transposition of both these adverbials as well as present tense verb forms, at the deeper sentence semantic structure level there is metaphor “*praesens pro praeterito*”, which at the surface structure level can be manifested grammatically or lexically, or even both grammatically and lexically (but not in the same clause), differing in that adverbs are capable of more specific, as compared with the grammatical tense, temporal indications. At the same time, lexical and grammatical deicticals metaphorically denoting the past seem to be in a sort of (not very strict) complementary distribution with respect to

discourse varieties they occur in, oral colloquial narration generally favoring the historical present, and written language varieties, such as fiction and documentary prose, preferring temporal metaphor realized by lexical items.

Yet transpositions of adverbial deicticals are not limited either to this stylistic register, metaphoric motivation, or the plane of the past. They also can be transposed in the context of the repeated, generalized, and even virtual present, cf. Russian – *Об усах что-то сказано? Да. – «Черные и густые». – Большие ничего? – Большие ничего. Да ведь усы вообще не приметя. Сегодня есть, а завтра сбрил* (А. Адамов). In this example, the adverb *сегодня* and *завтра* can refer to the feature of the specific present situation discussed by the interlocutors, and at the same time they, and the sentence containing them, can be interpreted in a wider, generally applicable sense which temporally and spatially goes beyond the limits of this situation. Correlated with, and at the same time demonstrative of, the generalized meaning of these temporal adverbs is the use of the verb *сбрить* “to shave off” in the form of the past perfective (primarily denoting a single accomplished action in the past) as well as the absence of the explicit subject related to it: this absence can be caused by the ellipsis of the noun denoting a specific person, and also it can be considered a case of meaningful omission expressing the generalized zero subject (the zero pronoun) requiring the predicate in the singular. Therefore this can be regarded as a case of metonymy of the *pars pro toto* kind (with one action symbolically representing all other similar actions) jointly expressed by the lexical and grammatical deicticals. At the same time, it should not be overlooked that since this transposition is based on the associative relationship of similarity, it therefore must be considered metaphorical as well, or, using the recently coined term, as a particular case of metaphonymy, i.e. a combination of metaphor and metonymy (semiotically, the motivational relationships of similarity and contiguity, while differing from each other, are at the same time essentially interrelated, any manifestation of similarity implying contiguity and vice versa (Yermolenko “Epistemichna perspektyva dyskursu” 50).

The combination of the semantic features of metaphor and metonymy as represented by grammatical and lexical temporal deicticals has a different character in the following fragment from W. Shakespeare’s „Henry VIII”, in which the adverbs *today* i *tomorrow* convey the repeated character of certain actions, so that the resulting description is a generalized one; yet this generalization is temporally limited to a rather short period in the past during which the meeting of two kings, Henry VIII of England and Francis I of France, took place: *Each following day / Became the next day's master, till the last / Made former wonders it. Today the French, / All clinquant, all in gold, like heathen gods, / Shone down the English; and tomorrow they / Made Britain India... Now this masque / Was cried incomparable, and th'ensuing night / Made it a fool and beggar* (W. Shakespeare). Thus in this fragment, a generalizing metonymy is combined with a temporal transposition, or rather, the former is realized within the latter.

The use of adverbs for “today”, “tomorrow”, “yesterday” to denote some state of affairs that is inherently prone to changes typically finds place in paroemias, cf. Ukrainian *Що маєш зробити завтра, зроби сьогодні, що маєш із їсти сьогодні, із їж завтра; не тепер, так в четвер; сьогодні густо, завтра пусто*; Latin *hodie mihi, cras tibi*; Italian. *oggi fave, domani fame*; Polish *co mnie wczoraj, to tobie dziś; co dziś komu, to jutro każdemu*; German *heute mir, morgen dir*; English *here today, gone tomorrow* and the like.

Comparing the generalizing and purely temporal secondary meanings of deictical adverbs, it should be noted that they are opposed not only in what regards their motivation and inner form, (mostly) metonymical in the former and metaphorical in the latter. They also differ in the field of their usage: the former commonly occur in everyday colloquial speech, while their use to express past time reference is characteristic of written discourse (fiction and documentary prose). Besides that, their another difference concerns the extent of involvement of their primary meaning in the generation of the secondary: in temporal transposition, it is only their general temporal reference, equivalent to the tense meaning, that is changed, but in the generalizing use of *today*, *tomorrow*, *yesterday* and their correlatives in other languages, the semantic change affects all of their primary meaning, so that the concepts of „today”, „tomorrow” and „yesterday”, originally related to the sequence of daily periods with respect to the speech moment („the day before the day when utterance takes place; the day when utterance takes place; the day after the day when utterance takes place”) become symbols of changeable situations and various transformations, accomplishments and vagaries of human life.

It will also be emphasized that the metaphoric use of temporal adverbs to denote past events seems not to co-occur with tense metaphor within the same proposition (The following fragment from the commentary to J.Hoffmann’s documentary „Ukraine: the making of a nation”, Polish *Ale jeśli bunty hajdamaków i koliszczyzna w granicach dawnej Rzeczy Pospolitej leżały w interesach Rosji, to teraz chłopskie rebelie w granicach Imperium będą likwidowane w zarodku*, seemingly illustrating the contrary, in fact rather proves my point, since both the adverb *teraz* and the future tense of *będą likwidowane*, besides referring to the past and events of the past, seen as the future from some point in the past, also express the opposition between two periods, the one synchronous with this time point, and the other preceding it. This question, however, merits additional consideration.) Be it as it may, in generalizing metonymy, the same semantic feature can have a multiple surface manifestation, as in the already mentioned Russian *Сегодня есть, а завтра сбрил* or *Сегодня жив, а завтра жил*, a Russian equivalent of Italian *Oggi in figura, domani in sepoltura* (IRD 550), where it is expressed both by the lexical items (*сегодня, завтра, oggi, domani*) and by the grammatical ones (the tense-aspectual forms *сбрил, жил*), as well as by a zero pronoun.

Proverbs and sayings about unstable human condition, exemplifying such multiple manifestation, can also utilize the opposition of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> persons, as in Russian *Сегодня ты, а завтра я* (an adage, widely known from Herman’s aria in P. I. Chaykovskiy’s opera “Queen of spades”, libretto by M. I. Chaykovskiy), where this opposition is reinterpreted essentially along the lines parallel to the generalizing reinterpretation of the “today” vs. “tomorrow” opposition.

Summing up, the transferred use of deictical lexical items must be recognized as such and accordingly taken into account in describing the structure and operation of functional-semantic fields, one of important and promising vistas of

research in this field being the study of correlation of general and language- as well as culture-specific features and factors influencing the use of the said items in the secondary meaning(s). Also, the present discussion gives another cause to reiterate the necessity for stylistically stratified models of grammar descriptions and studies on the borderline of functional grammar and functional stylistics. Last not least, codified secondary semantic variants of temporal adverbs should be consistently taken into consideration in lexicographic practice and registered in dictionaries.

### References

- Akhmatova, Olga. *Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov (Dictionary of linguistic terms)*. Moscow: Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, 1969. Print.
- Bondar, Oleksandr. *Systema i struktura funktsionalno-semantichnykh poliv temporalnosti v suchasnyy ukrayinskiy literaturniy movi (The system and structure of functional-semantic fields of temporality in Modern Standard Ukrainian)*. Diss. Odessa National Illia Mechnykov U, 1997. Manuscript.
- Bondarko, Aleksandr. "Osnovaniya funktsionalnoy grammatiki. Foundations of functional grammar". *Teoriya funktsionalnoy grammatiki. Vvedeniye. Aspektualnost'. Vremennaya lokalizovannost'. Taksis (Theory of functional grammar, Introduction. Aspectuality. Temporal localization. Taxis)*. Leningrad: 1987. 5–39. Print.
- Ingarden, Roman. *O dziele literackim. Badania z pogranicza ontologii, teorii języka i filozofii literatury (On a work of literature. Studies on the borderline of ontology, language theory and philosophy of literature)*. Warsaw: PWN, 1988. Print.
- Prokopovich, Yelena. *Glagol w priedlozheniyi. Semantika i stilistika vido-vriemiennykh form (Verb in sentence. The semantics and stylistics of aspect and tense forms)*. Moscow: Nauka, 1982. Print.
- Shmieliov, Dmitri. "Funktsionalno-stilisticheskaya differentsiatsiya yazykovykh sriedstv (Functional-stylistic differentiation of language means)". *Grammaticheskiye issledovaniya. Funktsionalno-stilisticheskiy aspekt. Suprasegmentnaya fonetika, Morfologicheskaya semantika (Studies in grammar. Functional-stylistic aspect. Suprasegmental phonetics. Morphological semantics)*. Moscow: Nauka, 1989. 2–32. Print.
- Voloshynov, V. N. *Marksizm i filosofiya yazyka: Osnovnyye problemy sotsiologicheskogo metoda v naukie o yazykie (Marxism and the philosophy of language. Principal problems of the sociological method in the science of language)*. Leningrad: Priboy, 1929. Print.
- Yermolenko, Serhiy. "Deyaki pytannia hramatychnoyi semantyky u vysvitleni O. S. Melnychuka (Some problems of grammatical semantics as seen by O. S. Melnychuk)". *Movoznavstvo (Linguistics)* 208 (2001): 43–49. Print.
- Yermolenko, Serhiy. "Epistemichno-komunikatyvna perspektyva dyskursu yak parameter funktsionalnoho opysu hramatyky (Epistemic-communicative perspective of discourse as a parameter of the functional description of grammar)". *Visnyk Poltavskoho derzhavnogo pedahohichnoho universytetu im. V. H. Korolenka. Filologichni nauky (Journal of V. H. Korolenko Poltava State Pedagogical University. Philological Sciences)* 18 (2001): 141–148. Print.
- Yermolenko, Serhiy. "Person in artistic discourse", *Movoznavstvo* 282 (2015): 23–32. Print.
- Yermolenko, Serhiy. "Semiotychna struktura temporalnoho deyksysa i komunikatyvno-funktsionalnyj kontekst (The semiotic structure of temporal deixis and communicative-functional context)". *Movoznavstvo (Linguistics)* 254 (2010) : 156–167. Print.
- Yermolenko, Serhiy. „Epistemichna perspektyva dyskursu i aspekty varyatyvnosti movnoho znaka (Epistemic perspective of discourse and aspects of linguistic sign variability)". *Mova i kultura (Language and culture)* 1, 1 (2000): 49–53. Print.
- Yermolenko, Serhiy. *Obraznyje sriedstva morfologii (Means of morphological imagery)*. Kyiv: Naukova Dumka, 1987. Print.

### List of Abbreviations

- DMSRL Dictionary of the modern standard Russian language (Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo yazyka). Moscow, Leningrad: Izdatiel'stvo AN SSSR, 1955–1965. V. 1–17.
- IRD Italian-Russian dictionary (Italyansko-russkiy slovar'). Moscow: Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, 1972.
- NERD New English-Russian Dictionary. Moscow: Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, 1972. V. 1–2.
- PLDD Polish language dictionary ed. by W. Doroszewki (Słownik języka polskiego pod red. W. Doroszewskiego). Warszawa: PWN, 1958–1969. V. 1–11.
- WTID Webster's Third International Dictionary. Springfield, Ma.: Webster-Merriam, 1982.

Надійшла до редакції 15 жовтня 2019 року.

### MEANING SHIFT PARALLELS IN TEMPORAL DEIXIS

**Serhiy Yermolenko**

Department of General and Comparative Linguistics, O.O.Potebnia Institute of Linguistics, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Ukraine

#### Abstract

**Background:** Secondary (derivative) semantic variants of lexical deicticals constitute an important yet largely unexplored part of functional-semantic field of temporality. As well as giving insights in deictical meaning development, the study of temporal adverb transferred meaning elucidates the way temporal fields operate within sentence context.

**Purpose:** The purpose of the analysis is to establish principal features of lexical deictic item transpositions as compared with grammatical tense ones.

**Results:** In investigating the secondary meanings and usage of adverbial temporal items, to encompass the whole range of relevant aspects, it is advisable to use an approach that takes into account their inner semantic structure, their relations with other items within sentential temporal microfields, and their distribution with respect to language styles and registers. Within such a framework, secondary temporal adverbial meanings will be analyzed from the viewpoint of their transposition motivation as well as conditions and constraints influencing their use in various functional-communicative contexts. Analyzing the secondary usage of deictical adverbs against grammatical tenses will elucidate their interaction within microfields as well as show parallels and differences in the semantic shifts of grammatical and lexical deicticals.

**Discussion:** Results yielded by employing such an approach bear significantly upon studies in functional and stylistically stratified grammar, especially ones employing the functional field approach, also being relevant for research of deictical semantics. Coincidentally they will stimulate lexicographers' attention to the secondary meaning of deictical adverbs and the elaboration of methods and techniques of grammatical semantic analysis.

**Keywords:** deixis, secondary meaning, functional grammar, temporality field, temporal adverb, transposition, motivation, functional-stylistic context.

#### Vitae

Serhiy Yermolenko is Doctor of Philology, Professor, Leading Researcher at the Department of General and Comparative Linguistics, O. O. Potebnia Institute of Linguistics, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. The fields of his research interests include general and linguistic semiotics, general and historical linguistics, theory of grammar, ethnolinguistics, and phraseology.

**Correspondence:** signum70.1@gmail.com

Przemysław Józwickiewicz

DOI 10.31558/1815-3070.2019.38.8

УДК 811.161.2

## Z BADAŃ NAD UKRAIŃSKIM I POLSKIM SŁOWNICTWEM MYKOLOGICZNYM – SYNONIMIA NAZW GRZYBÓW MIKROKOPIJNYCH

*Статтю присвячено проблемі синонімії в українській і польській мікологічній термінології. Досліджено лексико-семантичні відношення в мікологічній термінології, з'ясовано роль синонімів у сфері офіційних та неофіційних назв макроскопічних грибів української та польської мов, виділено основні характеристики і види синонімічних рядів з назвами грибів.*

*Ключові слова: українська мова, польська мова, мікологічна лексика, синонімія, синонімічний ряд, назви макроскопічних грибів.*

Autorem hasła „synonimia” zamieszczonego w Encyklopedii Językoznawstwa Ogólnego jest Kazimierz Polański, który opisuje to zjawisko jako „wyrażanie tej samej treści za pomocą dwu lub więcej form językowych” („Encyklopedia językoznawstwa...” 533–534). I choć można by w tym miejscu przytoczyć dziesiątki, jeśli nie setki definicji synonimii, zarówno badaczy polskich, jak i ukraińskich<sup>1</sup>, większość z nich oscylowałaby zapewne wokół cytowanego ujęcia. Nie oznacza to jednak, że kwestie synonimii poruszane w pracach naukowych, omawiane w podręcznikach językoznawstwa stanowią zamknięty etap badawczy. Pomimo zróżnicowanych badań i licznych opracowań, wciąż do rozstrzygnięcia pozostaje wiele aspektów – tak ogólnych, jak i bardzo wąsko ukierunkowanych.

Zagadnieniem niezmiernie ciekawym, a przy tym ważnym, jest funkcjonowanie synonimów w terminologii. Poza Stanisławem Gajdą (Gajda „Wprowadzenie...” 73–76), Ałłą Kowal (Koval' 157–168), Iryną Koczan (Kochan 32–34), Oksaną Martyniak (Martyniak 100–103) czy Tetianą Mychajłową (Mykhaylova 53–57) jak do tej pory stosunkowo niewielu badaczy zechciało zająć się tym problemem na poziomie polskich / ukraińskich ustaleń teoretycznych. Nieco odmiennie rysuje się tu kwestia praktyki i badań prowadzonych na płaszczyźnie ustalonych dziedzin, zwłaszcza w odniesieniu do języka ukraińskiego<sup>2</sup>.

Mając na uwadze powyższe rodzi się pytanie, czy synonimia, której przyczyn upatrywać należy głównie w zapożyczeniach z języków obcych, dialektów i innych odmian języka, jest w obrębie terminologii dopuszczalna? Bez

<sup>1</sup> Zob. m. in. (Bartmiński 121); (Cegiela, Markowski 381–387); (Grabias 234); (Handke 206); (Karwatowska 139–144); (Łachut 152–161); (Rittel 60–80); (Schabowska 109–115); (Siekierska 229–238); (Skorupka 7–14 i in.); (Skubalanka 421–445); (Wyderka 127–135); (Zdunkiewicz-Jedynak 101, 164); (Bulakhovskyy); (Koval 157–168); (Kocherhan 203–204); (Nechytaylo); (Rusaniv's'kyy); (Taranenko 3–9).

<sup>2</sup> Zob. m. in. (Chorna 187–194); (Fetsko 65–70); (Haponova 60–65); (Jankowiak); (Khyriv's'ka 167–172); (Kolhan 82–87); (Kornodudova 135–137); (Madyar 54–61); (Maryanko 85–87); (Mykhaylova 53–57); (Novostav's'ka 102–106); (Petryna 138–144); (Petrova 148–151); (Pol'shchukova 42–44); (Rozvodov's'ka 259–267); (Struhanets' 193–199); (Zadoyana 246–249); (Zolota 70–74).