пасивної адаптованості старих механізмів до нових умов існування, але й певних змін, що відкрили б нові шляхи розвитку, і це допомогло б запобігти новим помилкам та повторенню старих.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. Гнатенко П. И. Национальный характер: мифы и реальность / Петро Іванович Гнатенко. – К.: Вища школа, 1984. – 151с.

2. Катаєв С. Л. Сучасне українське суспільство /С. Л. Катаєв: Навч. посібник. - К.: Центр навчальної літератури, 2006. – 200 с.

3. Розова Т. В. Специфіка становлення громадянського суспільства в Україні : Монографія / Т. В. Розова, В. Ю. Барков. – Одеса: Юридична література, 2003. – 336 с.

4. Фартушний А. А. Українська національна ідея як підстава державотворення: Монографія / А. А. Фартушний /В.О. Міністерство освіти і наки України. – Львів : Вид-во Нац. Ун-ту „Львівська політехніка", 2000. – 308 с.

5. Чехович Т. В. Проблемні питання державної влади в Україні [Електронний варіант] / Т. В. Чехович. – Режим доступу: //http: www. Vuzlib.com.

Mysyk Iryna Georgievna – Doctor of Philosophy, Professor of Department of Philosophy, Sociology and Management of Sociocultural Activity of the State Institution «South Ukrainian National University named after K. D. Ushynsky»

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ЗАСТОСУВАННЯ КОМУНІКАТІВНО - ПРАГМАТИЧНОГО ПІДХОДУ В ДОСЛІДЖЕННІ МОВНИХ ОБ'ЄКТІВ

У філософії мови існує досить актуальна семіотична традиція вивчення об'єктів як знакових утворень. У статті представлений прагматичний аспект аналізу зазначених мовних явищ на прикладі дослідження лінгвістичного часу.

Ключові слова*: семіотика, комунікативно-прагматичний підхід, лінгвістичне час.*

PECULIARITIES OF THE COMMUNICATIVE-PRAGMATIC APPROACH APPLICATION TO THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE OBJECTS

In the philosophy of language semiotic tradition of studying objects as the sign formations is relevant. The article provides an analysis of the language objects pragmatic aspect as the sign formations on the example of linguistic time research.

Keywords: *semiotics, communicative-pragmatic approach, linguistic time.*

ОСОБЕННОСТИ ПРИМЕНЕНИЯ КОМУМУНИКАТИВНО-ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКОГО ПОДХОДА В ИССЛЕДОВАНИИ ЯЗЫКОВЫХ ОБЪЕКТОВ

В философии языка актуальна семиотическая традиция изучения объектов как знаковых образований. В статье представлен прагматический аспект анализа языковых объектов как знаковых образований на примере исследования лингвистического времени.

Ключевые слова: *семиотика, коммуникативно-прагматический подход, лингвистическое время.*

Semiotics has long become an integral part of modern philosophical thought and the elements of the semiotic approach are actively used in philosophical studies. Semiotics language concepts are prominent in contemporary philosophy of language (especially in the analytical and structuralist directions), in linguistics, cultural studies, anthropology, philosophical hermeneutics,

the theory of communication, etc. The notion of a computer semiotics appeared [6, p. 137-179]. The subject of the semiotic analysis has expanded considerably since the days of Ferdinand de Saussure linguistics, capturing now extensive scientific research. At the same time the very nature of the sign cannot be reduced solely to its linguistic nature, any schematization of reality relates to the coding and success of communication to decoding, sign decryption. The text refers not only to the verbal sphere, but also to any sign complex. Any fact of culture can be represented in semiotic terms such as text, discourse, intertext, denotation, referent, plan of expression, content plan and others. Even more, reality as the unknown text requires the use of a particular grammar that will be the key to the global decipherment. But in this case a matter of fundamental pansemiotic search for meaning within the ontological objectivism is considered (objectively existing "text", the reality beyond a person is declared a bearer of meaning: peace, spirit, etc.) or the ontological subjectivity (a man is the bearer of sense, the linguistic entity).

There is a known saying by Charles S. Peirce that people cannot think without the help of signs and every thought is a sign. This symbolic character of thought, coupled with the fact that life is a train of thoughts, proves that man is a sign. The ubiquitous presence of signification leads Peirce to pansemiotic conclusion that cognition, thinking and man have semiotic nature.

Indeed, the symbolic representation is the basic means of communication activity, specifically human form of reality objectification. There is a certain tradition of sign interpretation and understanding of the sign representation nature. The opposite of focused on logic American semiotics and European semiotics emanating from systems of natural language as the main base of semiotics is expressed in two main aspects. The first of these aspects is related to the principles of semiosis measurement, the second with signified and the signifier motivation or lack of motivation [399].

Saussure's sign is a system element defined solely in opposition to the other elements of the sign system, or due to differences with the other elements. Peirce defined sign as a triadic relationship. According to the scientist, three correlates are connected in it: sign-representamen; the object to which the sign refers; interpretant. Representamen represents something and produces in the mind of the one who is referred to the equivalent sign, or perhaps a more developed sign. Peirce designates the derived sign as the first sign interpretant. In a broad sense, a sign is a sign of a certain interpreting it thought; it is also a sign of the object to which it is equivalent in this thought; it is also a sign of respect or in a certain capacity, due to which a connection between it and its object is established. It is clear that interpretation is impossible without the interpreter. According to Peirce, "the whole universe is permeated with signs," signs are found even in the biological, chemical and even physical processes [277, p. 5-32].

Charles Morris in his works singled out pragmatics as one of the three sides of semiosis (sign situation in the functional dynamics), and this setting defined tradition of semiotic sign analyzing in three areas: semantic (studying the sign – designatum correlation), pragmatic (studying the "sign - its interpreter" relations) and syntactic (studying the sign connection, usually within a sign system). In the twentieth century pragmatics distinguished itself in a special branch of knowledge with theoretical and methodological apparatus.

Linguistic pragmatics aims to study the relationship between linguistic units and conditions of their use in a certain communicative and pragmatic space, while not only deixis (in the aspect of connection between message and the act of speech, speaking and listening one) has an important role in the language description, but also does the action (activity) aspect. Pragmatics in the broad sense includes adjacent areas of linguistics related to the language functioning in society, i.e. it is understood as the linguistics of speech. Everything that "falls out" of phonology, syntax, semantics (presuppositions, speech acts, cross-cultural mismatch, performatives, etc.) is often included into pragmatics. Within the logical analysis, pragmatics includes indexes of time, place and speech participants' indexes. Linguistic pragmatics has a broad range on interdisciplinary connections with such spheres as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, philosophy of language, theory of speech acts, text linguistics, text theory, cognitive science, the general theory of activity, communication theory. Pragmatics tasks, the choice of methodology and methods of research are determined depending on

the starting researchers' positions, often co-existing side by side such as the historical and comparative, structural and functional.

Communicative and pragmatic approach to the language facts consideration focuses on communication as the activity of the subject, taking into account the social and psychological factors.

There are researches in pragmatics, focused on the systematic study of language units pragmatic potential (M. Anisimova, N. Nikitin, R. Posner, P. Sgall, J. R. Searle, H.-H. Lib) and there are researches, aimed at the communication patterns studying. Thematically pragmatics has been very informative, as the theory it has been promising and appealing to a wide variety of researchers for many years already. Issue XVI of the digest "New in foreign linguistics" was completely dedicated to linguistic pragmatics and represented by the names of the major philosophers and linguists (A. Wierzbicka, Z. Vendler, H.P. Grice, G. Lakoff, P. Sgall, E. Sapir, R. S. Stolneyker, Hoang Phe and others.)

These writings are still relevant and in demand by scientists engaged in research of communicative direction (and the digest was issued over twenty years ago). V. Petrov (well-known science theorist), justifying (because of the known ideological reasons) pragmatics and linking its development to philosophical ideas of the late L. Wittgenstein, wrote in his afterword to the digest "...outlining the principle of language usage as a basic one, linguistic pragmatics appeared to be closely related in its origins with the logical semantics, logic and philosophy. In the course of development, pragmatics raised several issues that are of concern to those allied disciplines. The questions of semantics and pragmatics relation within the explanation of the language mechanisms functioning, their theoretical generalizations specific character; new aspects of the language and consciousness connection, language, and general theory of action; concept of usage development on the basis of game-theoretic approach; usage of linguistic pragmatics results in the social sciences. Further expansion of research in these areas will contribute to a more intensive development of the proper linguistic problems and solve a number of important practical problems" [281, p. 476]. Pragmatic problems legitimatization has expanded and "democratized" the field of linguistic research. It became obvious to the uninitiated with the topic that paradigms coexist and that functional linguistics does not contradict the structural one, that the language as a mental phenomenon is "observed" through verbal behavior, that the experiment is connected with sign models etc. However, it is easy for the researcher to get lost in the wide sea of pragmatics as the borders of its shores seem to be very blurred.

Extralinguistic reality manifests itself in every language in its own way. Each language has an original set of linguistic resources, which provide a sign binding of reality elements. To carry out a detailed temporal relations pragmatic analysis one needs interdisciplinary methodological resource, the conceptual coherence of the tasks, techniques, methods and results of research.

The purpose of the article is more modest. It is to reveal features of a pragmatic approach to the study of linguistic time as a linguistic method of temporality representation basing on the theory of three perspectives by C. Hagège. The chosen approach to the study dictates a sequence based on the theory of three perspectives (morpho-syntactic, semantic-referential, statement hierarchy) [10, pp. 196-221].

In terms of statement hierarchy, sentence is considered in its relationship to subject pronouncing it, which is in some relationship with the listener. The speaker selects a particular strategy or method of presentation, establishing a hierarchy between what he says and the matter being discussed [10, p. 197].

Two-pronged nature of the statements, the existence of the subject and predicate of thought and speech were distinguished by F. Buslaev, F. Fortunatov, A. Shakhmatov, representatives of logical and psychological approaches in linguistics. B. Mathesius (the Prague linguistic school) introduced the concept of the topic-focus articulation. That is, the division of the sentence within the context to the original part of the message - the theme (from the Greek thema – what is in the basis, the given) and to what is stated about it - rheme (from Greek rhema - the word, saying, literally - said, new). The theme corresponds with the logical subject of the statement and rheme is

its logical predicate (A. Shakhmatov, L. Shcherba, V. Vinogradov). Rheme is what is stated or asked about a topic, something that creates predicativity and forms descriptiveness, completeness of thought expression. H. Paul and J. Firbas "distinguish the third component as a transitional or connecting element expressed by verbal predicate (or the verbal part of the predicate) containing temporary and modal indexes (the question of the third component of the topic-focus articulation of the sentence is controversial)" [214, p. 22]. In the mononuclear syntactic constructions which do not have the focus-topic articulation of the sentence the predicative relation is shown in theme and rheme combination. "Topic-rematization" methods are very diverse and include logical stress, intonation, position, context, word order, etc. Some researchers (A. Shakhmatov, H. Paul, O. Jespersen) assert the dominant theme position, as speaker's attention is focused on it. Others, on the contrary, (J. Firbas, F. Danesh) believe that the theme occupies a secondary position according to the communicative importance. The whole proposition and a variety of theme and rheme combinations are important, of course, to achieve communicative purposes.

Theory of the three perspectives is not limited to the searching of three types of connections between the elements. There is the solidarity relationship between the perspectives. The same reality becomes the background for the statement analysis from three positions. The pragmatic value of the theme-rheme connections lies in the fact that verbal expression interpretative basis, which allows to organize the information hierarchy is formed thanks to them. The theme serves "as an element defining the boundaries of the discourse universe, setting something, what will be discussed, in other words, the theme as the basis (support) is opposed to rheme as a contribution (apport); ... as the old information or a repetition of a known information, in contrast to the rheme as a statement of new information or less known. "Being known" implies in this case, a certain degree of knowledge or awareness of speaker about what he says; the speaker can expect the hearer to possess the same knowledge" [10, p. 210].

Statement temporal context, if expressed hierarchically, shows the relevance or insignificance of the information. Compare the "сегодня вечером (tonight)" and "вечером сегодня (this evening)." Even with a neutral intonation contour statements carry different informative power. The alignment of expressive, articulated emphasis (explicit information) depends on the speaker. But this is just some part of it that is in focus. Sense perception is not possible outside the context of peripheral, implicit information.

Experienced participant of communication process can use the hidden mechanisms of informative and linguistic hierarchy in order to achieve certain goals. This is one of the tools to influence the outcome of the dialogue and the power of the interlocutor, the reader, a way to attract attention to the subject, in a wider sense it is the social interaction simulation. For example, the choice of the word order in a sentence indicates the intention to highlight or obscure the problem under discussion, "таких не берут в космонавты (people like you don't become cosmonauts)" – "не берут в космонавты таких (they won't let people like you become cosmonauts)." Direct order of theme - rheme prevails and is referred to as progressive, objective, non-emphatic. Reverse order rheme - theme is regressive, subjective, emphatic, though the latter is not always driven by the goals of emphasis [214, p. 23]. Emphasis (from the Greek emphasis - clarification, indication, expressiveness) is singling out of semantically important part of the statement, which provides speech expressiveness [214, p. 592].

Rheme position at the beginning (or in the middle) of sentence can be determined by the need of positional contact with its correlated member of the previous sentence; the segmentation of extended rheme; rhythm; the speaker's desire to express the most important information faster. In this case, rheme is recognized by context that is by subtracting from the sentence the excessive self-evident theme which is usually omitted or moved to the end [214, p. 23]. In the example with "cosmonauts" hopelessness of the situation and the disappointing prospects for a communicative act participant is amplified by means of linguistic time. This refers to such kind of limitative relations in functional-semantic aspectuality fields grouping as action limitedness / unlimitedness. This is the most abstract and grammaticalized opposition, for example, in the Slavic languages, underlying grammatical category of aspect and covering all verbal lexicon [359, 54]. We remind that the

aspectual values (internal action time) are not specific to the predicate, but to the statements as a whole [265, p. 17-22]. "Не берут (don't become/ won't let)" expresses the most important, the specific meaning of the imperfect tense, the action, which is not limited by the limit, the absence of limitation. The first statement out of two is more demanded in the speech "таких не берут в космонавты (people like you don't become cosmonauts)." A fixed position of the verb indicates that it contains the main (new) information and has the greatest communicative dynamism degree, i.e. performs rhematic function.

Linguistic time is an integral part of the substantive aspect of the utterance. Any sentence can be characterized in terms of the relationship to time. The well-known linguist V. Vinogradov claimed that syntactic time is one of the predicative components, along with the modality and syntactic person [69, p. 226-229].

In addition to "natural" sentence temporality temporal relations are expressed in morphological units such as the verbal categories of time; in lexical units as words with temporal meaning (day, time of day, minute, moment, blink, time, hour, etc.), temporal nominators (past, present, in the past, former, from now on, today, yesterday, the day after tomorrow, etc.); in syntactical units in the form of temporal syntax constructions. Grammatical means include some cases such as ablative, prepositions (before, after, above, below), etc. Temporal pattern of any language includes anthropic indicators as childhood, adolescence, youth, maturity, old age.

There are following signs of temporality (for example, determined by the nature of the temporary deixis (indication of value which serves to update the speech situation components and statement denotative content components): the relevance / irrelevance of orientation at the time of the speech, absolute / relative temporal orientation, fixed / unfixed nature of temporal relationship, the expressiveness / unexpressiveness of time action remoteness degree from the time of the speech and are also significant for the of the statement pragmatic component characteristics.

Functions of nomination, predication and location (that is the function of naming objects and phenomena of the real world, establishing their relationships, localization in time and space) are set in the basis of sign usage of any language. It is easy to notice that these functions correspond to the three semiotic aspects: semantics, pragmatics and syntactics in common semiotic model: user - sign - object.

Semantics considers the nomination object and the sign, syntactics deals with the relationship sign correlation and pragmatics investigates the relationship between the sign and the language user. In terms of pragmatic aspect, the use of signs and their relationship with user's time and space, the statement modality are important.

The theory of three perspectives correlates with given semiotic aspects: within morphological and syntactic analysis with syntactics; semantic-referential with semantics; statement hierarchy with a pragmatics. Correlation between users and the language cannot be independent from the sense creation as the purpose of communication. The common communicative model component for pragmatics and statement hierarchy is the speaking subject activity. In order to study the linguistic time, this approach is optimal as it focuses not only on language studies or speech linguistics (known division by Ferdinand de Saussure) but connects the advantages of the first and the second, bringing the lively reality rhythm in language theory. Both, language system is only a dead code without speech, and speech without language is impossible.

Summary. There is a known saying by Charles S. Peirce that people cannot think without the help of signs and every thought is a sign. The very nature of the sign cannot be reduced solely to its linguistic nature. Charles Morris in his works singled out pragmatics as one of the three sides of semiosis and this setting defined tradition of semiotic sign analyzing in three areas: semantic, pragmatic and syntactic Linguistic pragmatics aims to study the relationship between linguistic units and conditions of their use in a certain communicative and pragmatic space. There are researches in pragmatics, focused on the systematic study of language units pragmatic potential (M. Anisimova, N. Nikitin, R. Posner, P. Sgall, J. R. Searle, H.-H. Lib) and there are researches, aimed at the communication patterns studying.

Two-pronged nature of the statements, the existence of the subject and predicate of thought

and speech were distinguished by F. Buslaev, F. Fortunatov, A. Shakhmatov. B. Mathesius introduced the concept of the topic-focus articulation. That is, the division of the sentence within the context to the original part of the message - the theme and to what is stated about it - rheme. Rheme position at the beginning (or in the middle) of sentence can be determined by the need of positional contact with its correlated member of the previous sentence; the segmentation of extended rheme; rhythm; the speaker's desire to express the most important information faster.

Linguistic time is an integral part of the substantive aspect of the utterance. There are following signs of temporality: the relevance / irrelevance of orientation at the time of the speech, absolute / relative temporal orientation, fixed / unfixed nature of temporal relationship, the expressiveness / unexpressiveness of time action remoteness degree from the time of the speech and are also significant for the of the statement pragmatic component characteristics.

Semantics considers the nomination object and the sign, syntactics deals with the relationship sign correlation and pragmatics investigates the relationship between the sign and the language user. In terms of pragmatic aspect, the use of signs and their relationship with user's time and space, the statement modality are important. Correlation between users and the language cannot be independent from the sense creation as the purpose of communication.

REFERENCES

1. Ageev V. N. Semiotika / Ageev V. N. – M. : Ves mir, 2002. – 254, [1] s. – (Ves Mir Znaniy).

2. Azhezh Klod. Chelovek govoryaschiy: vklad lingvistiki v gumanitarnyie nauki / Azhezh Klod; per. s fr. Narumova B. P. ; [otv. red. Mazo V. D.]. – M. : Editorial URSS, 2003. – 304 s. – (Seriya Pushkin Programma).

3. Vinogradov V. V. Issledovaniya po russkoy grammatike : izbrannyie trudyi / V. V. Vinogradov – M : Nauka, 1975. – 559 s.

4. Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar / AN SSSR, In-t yazyikoznaniya ; gl. red. Yartseva V. N. – M. : Sovetskaya entsiklopediya, 1990. – 682, [3] s.

5. Myisyik I. G. Lingvisticheskoe vremya v rakurse aspektualnyih znacheniy / I. G. Myisyik // Perspektivi. – 2005. – #1(29). – S. 17–22.

6. Net V. Pirs Charlz Sanders / Net V. // Kritika i semiotika. – 2001. – Vyip. 3–4. – S. 5 –32.

7. Novoe v zarubezhnoy lingvistike : Vyip. 16 : Lingvisticheskaya pragmatika : sbornik statey / per., sost. Arutyunova N. D., Paducheva E. V. – M. : Progress, 1985. – 500 s.

8. Teoriya funktsionalnoy grammatiki: Vvedenie. Aspektualnost. Vremennaya lokalizovannost. Taksis / Otv. red. A. V. Bondarko. – L. : "Nauka", 1987. – 348 s.

9. Shatin Yu. F. Tri vektora semiotiki / Shatin Yu. F. // Diskurs [Elektronnyiy resurs]. – 1996. – #2. – Rezhim dostupa: http://www.nsu.ru/education/virtual/discourse2_8.htm

Нерубасская Алла Александровна кандидат философских наук, доцент, доцент кафедры философии и истории Украины Одесской национальной академии связи им. А.С. Попова

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ НЕКОТОРЫХ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИК ЛИЧНОСТИ

В статье проводится сравнительный анализ качеств харизматических, флюгерных, бифуркационных личностей. Исследуются понятие «сверхчеловек» Ф. Ницше и современные типы личностей. Определены их сходные черты характера и поведения.

Ключевые слова: *личность, харизма, бифуркация, аттрактор, система.*

ПОРІВНЯЛЬНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ДЕЯКИХ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИК ОСОБИСТОСТІ

У статті проведено порівняний аналіз якостей харизматичних, флюгерних,