

contemporary languages are undergoing noticeable changes, and especially in writing, the lexical borrowings and the syntactic calques from English start the chain mutation of the non-English languages' nativity, which in the long run will impact those languages' communicational DNA. As an effect, non-English languages will start to become denativized through the omnipresence of English wordstock and English syntactic constructions in their users' cognitive 'language minds', that is in the national *compléments cognitifs*. Similarly to the Copernicus Law stating that in any circulating currency "good" money becomes dominated by the "bad" money, vocabulary and syntactic communication conventions (the "good" norms and rules) typical of a given non-English language will become dominated by the "bad" ones – recognized in English or having the English language provenance.

Our primary goal here is to shed more light on reasons and mechanisms of "overborrowingization" of the English lexis into contemporary Polish, basing our claims on citation evidence.

W. Griebhaber (Sprachenzentrum der WWU Münster, Germany)

REPLACING MORPHEMES BY PREPOSITIONS: FROM THE OPERATIVE FIELD TO THE SYMBOL FIELD

In German L1 acquisition, it takes a long period of time for the case inflections to be acquired completely. The polysemic nature of case inflections is considered to be one reason for this. The inflectionary morpheme *-er*, for example, can indicate nominative (masculine), genitive (feminine) or dative (feminine). The difficulty of phonetic differentiation is considered a further problem (Szagun 2006; Hoffmann et al 2017). In L2 acquisition, the fact that the languages spoken within the family may be very different typologically is a further hurdle in acquiring German cases.

Inflection plays a particular role with reference to two-case prepositions (e. g. *an, auf, in*) as the case defines their meaning. *An* with accusative (*ein Bild an die Wand hängen* 'to hang a picture on the wall') is target-oriented, with dative (*das Bild hängt an der Wand* 'the picture hangs on the wall ') it is static. If *zu* refers to an object in a target-oriented way, then it is always governed by the dative, whereas directional *in* followed by an accusative includes the interior of the target object as final point. With L2 learners, it appears that in connection with the movement verb *gehen* 'to go' there is a tendency to use the two-case preposition *in* less in favour of *zu* (see Table 1).

<i>to go ...</i>	<i>in</i> + accusative	mistakes	<i>zu</i> + dative	mistakes
German (GER)	26,5%	0%	14,7%	20%
Turkish (TRK)	8,8%	17%	13,2%	22%
Serbocroatian (SCR)	14,8%	0%	29,6%	0%

Table 1: Frequency of *in* and *zu* with regard to the movement verb *gehen* 'to go'; Data basis: 121 narrative texts written by 4th-year primary school pupils on the basis of a visual impulse

GER and SCR belong to the Indo-European family of languages and possess prepositions and a highly developed system of nominal inflections. Compared to GER, SCR has even more cases, for example the instrumental case. TRK, which is an agglutinating language, also has more cases than GER but only a few postpositions instead of prepositions. The target-oriented Turkish *e- hali* encompasses both the directional meaning (*zu*) and also the interior-oriented (*in*). Accordingly, TRK-speaking pupils use *zu* even when *in* would be appropriate from a systematic point of view, e. g. (B1, L1 TRK) „*Danach ist der Dieb zur Lukis Zimmer rein gegangen.*“ ‘Then the thief went (in)to Luki’s room.’. As the “thief” went inside the room, *in* should have been used.

How often mistakes are made appears to depend on the pupils’ family languages. The TRK pupils regularly demonstrate the highest number of mistakes even though Turkish mainly employs case suffixes and a feeling for the functionality of cases and their correct use could have been expected.

Changes with regard to the use of prepositions can also be seen with *zu* in connection with verbs of utterance. With the verb *sagen* ‘to say’, the addressee is usually merely indicated through the dative and without a preposition, e.g. (B2, L1 GER) „*der geheimnisvolle Mann sagte im*“ ‘the mysterious man said to him’, [*ihm* wrongly spelled as *im*]. With proper names the dative is not expressed morphologically. In these cases, all the pupils, also the GER-speakers, use the preposition *zu* in order to identify the addressee, e.g. (B3, L1 GER) „... *und sagte zu Felix*“ ‘and said to Felix’. In this way, the addressee is not only identified morphologically but also indicated explicitly.

With the preposition *zu* this indication of the addressee is explicitly expressed through a lexeme. However, with the verb *rufen* ‘to call’, for example, even L1 pupils use *zu* although the addressee is unequivocally identified through the case, e.g. (B4, L1 GER) „*Matias rufte zu seiner Mutter*“ ‘Matias called to his mother’.

When the preposition *zu*, which only governs one case, is used, the case identification of the object loses its function of differentiating meaning. Basically, the object can either be indicated randomly or not at all. This use can also be seen with some GER pupils: (B5, L1 German) „*Er ging zu Tür.*“ ‘He went to door’ [*zu* instead of *zur*].

The usage that can be observed with L2 learners are described as the replacing of grammatical means by lexical features (Romaine 2003, 418). As this also occurs with L1 pupils, a more general change in the relationship between case indicators and lexical means appears to be emerging. In the context of functional pragmatics, this change can be described as a shift from the operative field to the symbol field. The operative field serves to process propositional content (Ehlich 2007). The prepositions set two categories in juxtaposition to each other, e.g. the speaker and the addressee of the utterance (Grießhaber 2012). The propositional content of the prepositions also categorises what they refer to, e.g. as an enclosed space through *in* or as an unspecified target with *zu*. The extension of the use of *zu* will presumably also concern this categorising function of prepositions.

REFERENCES

Ehlich, Konrad (2007) Funktional-pragmatische Kommunikationsanalyse: Ziele und Verfahren. In: Ehlich, K. (2007) Sprache und sprachliches Handeln. Band 1: Pragmatik und Sprachtheorie. Berlin u. New York: de Gruyter, 9-28.

Grießhaber, Wilhelm (2010) Geringere Deutschkenntnisse mit Türkisch - Befunde und Erklärungen. In: Suntrup, R. u.a. (Hrsg.) Usbekisch-deutsche Studien III: Sprache - Literatur - Kultur - Didaktik. Teilband 1. Münster: LIT, 217-240.

Grießhaber, Wilhelm (2012) Präpositionen als relationierende Verfahren - Präpositionen vor dem Hintergrund des Türkischen. In: Thielmann, W. (Hrsg.) Wortarten im Kontrast. Jahrbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache 2011, Bd. 37. München: Iudicium, 142-159.

Hoffmann, Ludger & Kameyama, Shinichi & Riedel, Monika & Şahiner, Pembe & Wulff, Nadja (Hrsg.) (2017) Deutsch als Zweitsprache. Berlin: ESV Schmidt.

Romaine, Suzanne (2003) Variation. In: Doughty, Jessica & Long, Michael H. (eds.) The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Blackwell, 409-435.

Szagan, Gisela (2006) Sprachentwicklung beim Kind. Weinheim u. Basel: Beltz.

S. P. Halaur (Poltava National Pedagogical University, Ukraine)

VARIABLE NATURE OF THE ADDRESSING STRATEGY IN THE MODERN UKRAINIAN LITERARY TEXT

The understanding the fiction as a social, cultural, psychological process encourages to the negation the monologue *pleasure of the text*, which both the adressant and the addressee are separately found in the *words paradise garden* (R. Barthes), and the declaration the complex dialogue between the author and the reader instead. The modern literary texts demonstrate, on the one hand, a powerful figurative meaning, on the other one, a deep informative system, therefore, it isn't the good way to analyze them beyond the communicative act.

To find answers to the questions of the text ontologizing as the phase transition from an author to a reader, it is important to investigate how a writer, constructing a specific speech act, formulates an action plan, controls and corrects its implementation. That having been said, the identification in the literary text the regulatory strategies and tactics, aimed at attracting the reader to the depicted quasi-real world adequate perception, is extremely important.

Indirect and time-distant literary communication requires a special addressing regulatory strategy, with which the author creates an illusion of reality, of a contact with the reader through text, generates the effects of spontaneity, dynamism, a friendly conversation, an encouraging the recipient to joint reflection on the issues raised.

The basic tactic of this strategy is the modeling a dialogue with the imaginary reader, it facilitates a direct, personal and, therefore, complete work semantic consistency perception. There are the following strategy tactical technics in the modern literary prose: