

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:

1) the appeal (appeal various forms to the reader): *Людино, не труси деревом! Сядь під вишнею і пом'яни останнього Хруща росою-сльозою* (Г. Пагутяк); *Завжди любив дівчат з довгими спинами, ще й тоді, коли не вдавався до психо-анатомічних подробиць. Особливо коли в них довгі ноги. І от на додаток ще потужний інтелект – хіба таке буває серед жінок?* (Б. Жолдак). Regulatory linguistic representatives of this technic are often addresses, personal and possessive pronouns, the second-person verbs, question sentences. This tactic can include forgiveness, gratitude, request, explanation, comment, then it is explicated by other lexical and / or grammatical means, the functional core of which consists of modal words, parenthetical clauses: *Але й це не він [Варцабич], перепрошую* (Ю. Андрухович); *А сакви, хто не знає, – це дві полотняні торби, щось на киталт м'якого коромисла на плечах* (Н. Найдич); *Якийсь сивий огрядний пан (у темряві складно розгледіти, але схоже, що це буркотливий Бібрінг, магістр фармації), кречучи й сопучи, намагається підвестися зі свого сидіння...* (С. Андрухович);

2) the identification the author with the reader: *Ніхто з нас не знає, коли надходить остання щаслива хвилина; Що вдієш, на цьому світі є чимало речей, яких ми не любимо, але обійтися без них уже не можемо* (В. Шкляр); *Говоримо те саме, але кожен своїм голосом* (В. Карпюк). The function of regulatory units in this case is realized by personal and possessive pronouns, the first-person verbs;

3) the motivating the reader to some actions: *Ніколи не приходьте туди, де ви одного разу вмирили* (Ю. Андрухович. Дванадцять обручів); *Якщо вам чогось не хочеться робити – краще не робіть* (Т. Брукс). This tactical technic is often visualized by imperative verbs, imperative exclamations or other lexical and / or grammatical means demonstrated the order semantics: *Коли прощаєтесь, обійми мусять бути міцними. Тоді ви нібито залишаєтесь поруч із близькою людиною* (Є. Положій);

4) the modelling a real dialogue with the reader: *А було як? Розпочати хочеться, як у казці. Ото жив собі на світі чоловік – Олексій Неживий, котрий усіх пережив! «У який спосіб – запитаєте ви. – Довгожитель?!» Ні! Мав шістдесят сім, як помер. «Ага! Вчинив подвиг! Воював проти ворогів, збивав їхні літаки, пускав під окіс їхні вантажені військовим добром поїзди?! Або був космонавтом, вченим-відкривачем?!» Знову ні! Працював звичайним слюсарем у колгоспі. «Може, цілитель народний, знахар, ворожбит?! Ото, як сьогодні у телевізорі й газеті?!» Коли б то! Сільський веселун і дотепник! Любителю випити і почудити!* (І. Гургула). Since the author, telling, directs the reader to tell the word also, this tactical technic is often structured by means of classical representation direct speech;

5) the intertextuality and the intermediality (the appealing to other cultural signs background knowledge of the recipient): *Мефістофель дуже реготався б: люди гинуть не за метал – за металобрухт* (Л. Костенко); *Утім, коли маю дуже хороший настрій, мені найбільше до вподоби саме Паганіні, надто його каприс номер двадцять чотири. Трохи пафосно, правда? А так, зазвичай, Вівальді* (І. Хомин). In this case the regulatory means becomes intertextual and intermedial units.

The auxiliary tactics of addressing strategy can be the iteration, contrasting, speech portraying, non-verbal expression of meaning. If the based tactic is correlated to the identification (according to age, sex, status-role criteria the addressee naming), vocative (attracting the addressee attention to the future main information presenting), appealing (impulse to the attentive reading, communication) functions of regulatory units, than auxiliary tactics are aimed more at the addressee emotional feedback and the creation a favorable background for the author's necessary ideas presenting.

In the modern literary text, the most common form of identifying an addressing strategy is multitacticity, syncretism of basic and auxiliary tactics various tactical technics.

D. V. Skivitski (National Academy of Sciences, Minsk, Belarus)

FAITH – LANGUAGE – NATION IDENTITY IN THE BASILIANS' CATHECHISM 1722

In the 17th cent. in Eastern Europe was created a new Church – the Ruthenian Uniate Church what we call today the Greek Catholic Church. Strictly speaking, it was not, in full of meaning, a new kind of the Church that offers to believer new ideas or worship. Technically the Ruthenian Uniate Church did not have any differences from the Orthodox Church, but creation the Greek Catholic Church was politically necessary for the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth government and the Kingdom of Hungary as well.

A liturgical language remained the same as it was for the Orthodox Church – the Church Slavonic language. Using the Church Slavonic language was a distinctive mark for the Orthodox Church among the Slavs despite that this language was not equally native to them. Each eastern Slavic protonation at that period used for liturgical purposes their own version of the Church Slavonic language. This phenomenon considered as deviations from a pure sacred language. This kind of bilingual existence was inconvenient for common believers who practiced orthodoxy. Prayers and sermons at church become less and less understandable. Such type of relation between liturgical and national (popular) language was quite usual for Europe with a small exception. Liturgical language for the Roman Catholic Church was Latin but the catholic believers did not consider themselves as the Romans. Contrariwise was for the Eastern Slavs who belonged to the former Orthodox Church, despite that they were not belong to a single nationality, but thank for using a single liturgical language *славенсїй, славенорвсскїй* the Eastern Slavas considered themselves as a single nation *славене, славенорвссї*. This was a remarkable point because even in the Eastern part of modern Slovakia, where at that time significant part of population belonged to the Orthodox Church but their language according features belonged to the West Slavic languages, called themselves as the rest of the east Slavs. This phenomenon was possible in the late Medieval.

Conversion to the Ruthenian Uniate Church caused new processes in a construction faith-language-nation identity in a territory between Slavia Orthodoxa