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Abstract

This research studies verbal means that are used to embody the system of spatial, temporal, and personal coordinates in Ukrainian, Russian and English at the functional-semantic level of analysis, with a focus on functional-semantic fields, verbal paradigms and words.

Multy-paradigmal approach introduced in this research allowed to additionally employ inclusion notional and associative analysis, which highlighted the way native speakers of the contrasted languages conceptualize deictic representations in their typical and specific features. The dissertation considers types of reference taken in its wide meaning in the languages under analysis, including its transitive types grounded in mono- and polysemy, mono- and multyfunctionality, transsemantic and transfunctional character of the verbal units under study. The thesis proves that characteristic of all the languages compared here are deictic and referential, to a lesser degree – nominative and referential type of indication, the latter mainly in closely related languages.

Deictic and anaphoric type of indication is more common for English, while multyfunctional polysemantic type of indication is particularly specific for this language. For the other contrasted languages bifunctionalism and semantic reversibility are common.

The aim of the research

To determine typological properties of RR system in the Ukrainian, Russian and English languages by identifying the conceptual-semantic, linguistic and associative specificity of RR.

Materials and methods

The research material includes about 5000 RR of the Ukrainian, Russian and English languages (adverbs, adverbial constructions, pronouns, pronominal words, etc.), that are almost evenly represented in the compared languages, amounting, in general, to about 18000 lexical-grammatical and functional-semantic RR. Definition (Dictionary of the Ukrainian language in 11 volumes, Dictionary of Modern Russian Standard Language in 17 volumes, Oxford English Dictionary in 13 volumes, etc.) phraseological, terminology, etymological, historical and other dictionaries of the Russian, Ukrainian and English languages served as source materials (59 sources in total). Materials of the associative dictionaries of the corresponding languages were used. Analysis also involved using the material of personally conducted free association experiment (120 stimuli), mostly based on the Ukrainian language material.

To achieve the aim set in the thesis and given the nature of the analysed material the comparative method was chosen as the main method of the research. To solve specific research tasks the following methods are used in the work: 1) representative method (according to Y.Stepanov’s definition [53, p. 239-242]) – to explore the boundaries and content of RR system in the compared languages at all levels of analysis, 2) the method of observation – for the analysis of comparable material as the fragments of language and association fields of the compared languages; 3) partially experimental method (free association experiment) – to refine the survey results, 4) descriptive method – to establish the common and the specific in the studied RR types; 5) distributive method – to detect systemic-structural content of the compared RR systems; 6) elements of quantitative analysis for the visual manifestation and reasoning the research conclusions. To identify and isomorphic and allomorphic characteristics of the analyzed material the following was used: context-situational analysis – to identify and transsemantic transfunctional types of RR; functional-semantic analysis – for distinguishing and classification of pragmatic and functional-semantic types of RR, lexical and grammatical analysis – to establish peculiarities and classification of RR. Own methods of
polyparadigmatic research as a complex multi-level and multi-paradigm study of the language phenomena and categories have been developed involving scientific data on philosophy, logic, physics, mathematics, cybernetics, computer science, medicine, military arts, psychology, culture, ethics and aesthetics and other branches of knowledge in combination with the correlation of linguistic material to conceptual-semantic and free association experiment data. Repeated test methods have been involved to verify the material of the associative experiment.

Polyparadigmatic approach is a comprehensive multi-level research of the RR, which covers the conceptual or logical-semantic, functional-semantic, lexico-grammatical and psycholinguistic aspects of the analysis involving data of the multidisciplinary approach. In the course of the research at first the essence of reference and RR range were identified, the scheme of conceptual content and RR system division was established and prepared, then functional-semantic and lexico-grammatical content of the RR functional semantic field (FSF) in the compared languages was studied in the comparative aspect. The last step was to conduct psycholinguistic analysis (i.e. free association experiment and analyse its results, to compare them with data of the associative dictionaries involved in the work).

As research methods (particularly linguistic) the polyparadigmatic approach is capable of comprehensive and complete determination of the place of references and other complex structure representations as subsystem of realization of “holistic integral concept of natural language” [4, p. 46; 5, p.22] in the correlation of ethnic and national, social and pragmatic [32, p. 21], conceptual, semantic and associative peculiarities and typical characteristics of the language subsystems, taking into account previous and current knowledge. In the course of research a conceptual pattern for RR system was established, according to which the systemic-structural arrangement of linguistic material in the FSF by the typological characteristics is performed, manifestations of polyfunctionality as RR ability to perform various functions in the language and speech, transsemantics (or semantic transitivity at the level of lexical and lexico-grammatical classes of RR under research), transfunctionality, i.e. functional transitivity at the level of language units (LU) under the influence of contextual environment are analysed. At the stage of linguistic contrastive analysis FSF methods were involved, on the basis of which the FSF of spatial references, FSF of temporal references and FSF of personal references in the languages under study are established and analyzed. The fields are structured on the segment-tier principle. Description of the results is made based on the analysis of FSF, thematic groups (TG) and their components. TG dominants were determined based on the criteria of maximum semantic relativity and reference quality, functional-semantic certainty, pragmatic stability, lexico-grammatical relevancy, stylistic neutrality, stereotypes of use by the native speakers.

Multilayer polyparadigmatic study, where appropriate, was supplemented and confirmed by the associative data of the relevant dictionaries of compared languages and conducted free association experiment [33, 34, 13, p.294-316], since the associative dictionaries of the Ukrainian language available at the time of the study do not contain reference stimuli [9, 10]. In particular, a free association experiment based on the techniques of A. Zalevska and D. I. Terekhova was carried out [18, p. 16; 55 p.24-25] as an additional way of RR analysis, the essence of which is as follows: respondents – Ukrainian native speakers (600 persons) and Russian native speakers (107 persons) were asked to write in the questionnaires their response after each given word-stimulus, i.e. word / word combination, which first comes to mind in connection with the word-stimulus read (the experiment was conducted in 2004-2005, main groups of respondents – students from various regions of Ukraine and Russia). The survey results of Russian-speaking respondents were compared with data (the experiment was conducted in 2004-2005, main groups of respondents – students from various regions of Ukraine and Russia). The survey results of Russian-speaking respondents were compared with data of the relevant associative dictionaries (no significant differences were found). On the basis of the material so collected the associative fields of words-stimuli (as defined by A.A. Zalevska [18, p.16]) and the stereotypical associations were identified, which largely complemented the data of associative dictionaries of the Ukrainian language, enriched the material analyzed in the thesis regarding the specificity of compared LU and association types that are characteristic of the compared languages speakers, confirmed relevant data of the associative dictionaries of the Russian language [16;45]. Since associative dictionaries of the English language are a sufficient basis for conducting our research, they were involved in the analysis to reflect the national language and associative specificity of RR [77, 82; 83; 85]. Our research has not set specific socio-linguistic tasks (study of national identity of the compared languages speakers and so on; cf. with [12]), therefore no other experiments and calculations were conducted.
The free association experiment results were processed by counting the total number of stereotypical and specific reactions to each stimulus and, thus, determining the degree of inclusion of LU under study to the single semantic field [34, p. 91-92]. Statistical data on the associative types and distribution of individual associations were provided by proportion method. Verification of the free association experiment data was performed by repeated tests, i.e. repeated interviewing of the control group of recipients.

Thus, the synthesis of data of the conceptual, linguistic and psycholinguistic analysis based on comparison opens up new prospects for using polyparadigmatic study techniques, which provides grounds for developing an appropriate approach in modern comparative linguistics.

**Results and discussion**

Any scientific area has a source, a “reference point” (the reference point of communication as opposed to scientific subsystems traditionally is the speaker, at least – the listener, in the text – an observer [35, p. 95-98; 38], as well as the nomination of the characters and institutions) and its system of basic parameters, restrictions and definitions. So, there are a number of terms that characterize the RR system from different points of view. From the point of view of exact sciences referential RR system is traditionally two-dimensional (axes ox, oy) or three-dimensional (axes ox, oy, oz) spatial system, from the point of view of physics – it is a spatial-temporal two-, three- or four-dimensional system, which correlates speed, vectorness, physical time, distance in space, tensor and so on. In mechanics RR are defined as a component of the reference system, i.e. of such aggregate of RR and synchronized hours associated with the body, in reference to which we study motion (or equilibrium) of any other material points or solids [8, p. 1102, 29, p. 3]. These terms give a generalized concept of extralinguistic reality, which means a unity of different but comparable (related) dimensions, structured and identifiable in certain physical, mathematical, geological and other parameters. These are a kind of limits for determination of the denotation characteristics.

Method of coordinates has been used in science for a long time and was first described by R. Descartes [15, p. 30, 53-58, 59 p. 155]. Formation of RR understanding in extra-language, particularly extralinguistic, areas is based on the correlation of time and space parameters: the neutralisation, elimination of time by space, concentration on static parameters of existence (Parmenides, Archimedes, E. Meyerson, A. Einstein [68; 69], representatives of hydrostatics, mechanics, etc.), on parallelism of space and time as fundamental concepts of "real development", the study of time and space movement (Heraclides, Aristotle, E. Dubois-Raymond, J. Randall), development of modern physics, space industries and others, in which time is often regarded as the fourth dimension of space (Lagrange, H. Minkovskiy, A. Einstein, K. Tsiovkovsky, S. Korolev and others.).

Since ancient times space has been perceived as given all at once, and time appears to a person in fragments [59, p. 11]. Time and space form the three-dimensional reality (cf.: physical reality is a four-dimensional with the fourth dimension – an event [59, p. 11]), in which the events happen and people exist. The space as a form of existence creates the possibility for human existence and self-development [17, 51, p. 116]. The time is considered as: 1) universal: absolute, relative, cyclical, directed and symmetric, continuous and irreversible, 2) individual: psychological [59, p.11], sociological, biological, physiological, 3) mathematical: time as a variable, atomic time, time as sequential order [6, 14; 31 p. 49]; 4) social time, which is divided into: a) time spent on the necessary (work) and b) free time [51, p. 116]; 5) relativistic time: the time of existence, speed, finiteness of light speed, distant time determination, slowing-down of time, the correlation of spatial and temporal coordinates from the point of view of observers [67-69]; 6) continuous paradigm of space / time measurement: cosmic time, its limits, expanding universe, time asymmetry, penetration, four-dimensions [67], 7) biological time of human existence, its comparable medical indicators of life [78, p. 52]. Linguists structure it as natural, cosmic, physiological, ephemeral (local), historical, empirical, physical, chronical time [39, p. 160-161], which should be understood as types of real time. Unreal time also includes the notion of artistic time and real subjective artistic time as well as psychological, spiritual (sacred), astral, infernal, magic, mythological, fabulous, fantastic, phantasmagoric time and “time of the world behind the looking glass” [39, p. 158-163, 46 p. 81-94]. Time as a person’s way, a current [3, p. 53, 39, p. 162], a well, the sea [52, p. 153-155] is defined and modeled in fiction and mythological works [70, p. 55-60, 78-113].

The space is characterized as: four-dimensional [67-69], three-dimensional (the majority of modern physics, logicians, and mathematicians), two-dimensional; closely related with time [67, p. 46-63, 83-85], endless, affected by electromagnetic fields and gravity. It is studies as remote space,
near-Earth space [24, 25], holistic and / or fragmented ground space. Issues of the general scientific definition of identification in space and time, as well as its parameters, emerge. Space-time is differentiated as: physical, conceptual, perceptual [22, p. 169].

For the most of extralinguistic, in particular scientific, knowledge reference is identified with the parameters of the universe. The universe, i.e. space-time continuum, in general philosophical or natural terms is the product of reflection, the abstract universal and collective scientific consciousness. It is analyzed holistically, as a reality of life, mostly as an abstraction. Depending on the perception and reflection of space-time continuum person’s consciousness generates both quite adequate (realistic, objective) and virtual (unreal, distorted) view of the outer world. Objectivity and adequacy of such reflection are not always based on the mental health of people / nation, especially under the impact of “brainstorming”, in heat of passion [14, p. 21], critical social unrest, military events, diseases, etc. In such periods for human RR system is narrowed to the situational actual base model “I - here – now” [54, p. 91-137] simultaneously with alienation and disassociation from the rest of the world. Thus, the RR system actually represents related oppositional paradigms and TG “I – not I” (he, she, they, etc.), here – not here / there (nearby, far, above, below, in front of, behind, etc.)”, “now – then (in the past or future)”. In this case, procedure becomes significant at the reference point “now”, and the instantaneousness/ permanency are significantly correlated with the point “then”. That is, spatial, temporal and personal references are focused around temporary “near” constant circle of people, current time and the residence area. In such a situation not only a person, but ethnicity in general “directly perceives only a small part of the space continuum (the residence area) with a short part of time continuum ”[23, p. 148]. The opposite axis of personal RR “you / they - there – then” is perceived somewhat hostile or aloof, indifferently. In this case, fragmentation of RR system is largely aimed at unreal reflection (projection of future, conditional, potential) “within the linguo-cultural space” and are clearly outlined “in their systemic organization” [62, p. 210]. It can be expressed in the frequent manipulation of RR of the abstract semantics, which in the speech flow shifts flexibly from one specified discussion situation to the other and so on. For example, if in the nineteenth century the press focused on informing about the news inside the country, in the twentieth – twenty-first centuries “geographical space” of the communicative situation greatly expanded due to the new technologies and exploration of cosmic, geostuctural, hydrological space. Consequently, the RR system in the language and consciousness of the average person is structured with the actual space as “in the place / city / country / world where I live” (which confirms the discourse of current news in Ukrainian, Russian and British press). The first three positions of world perception by the speakers of the languages under the study are defined as “here”, and the fourth – as “there”.

Thus, in broad terms, from the nowadays’ position temporal, spatial and personal identification “expands” and spreads within the Universe, in which a person is capable of identifying himself/herself and environment the most objectively. “On the scale of the Universe the period of formation and verbalization of primary perceptions of the world by one nation can be treated as a moment, a second on the clock the Universe history. In fact, the national identity that creates the initial model of the world is influenced only by a small part (a point of space-time continuum – the natural and climatic conditions of habitat that existed in the historical period of the specific ethnic group’s language development). ...Unity of the outside world determining the commonness of human psychology and thinking did not exist at the stage of formation of the national language pattern of different nations, that is it was not the unity of the world, but plurality of unities of the world, because each nation’s knowledge of the world was limited by directly perceived the natural and climatic environment, different from living conditions of other ethnic groups [23, p.148]. A person really identifies and self-identifies in the real space-time continuum. However, the generation of “virtual” space along with the expansion of “virtual” RR zone can cause self-limitation of the system and distorted evaluation of objective space-time continuum, including under cross-identification conditions (term of N. Shehurova) [63, p. 100]. Basic representation “I - here – now” assumes dual interpretation of whereabouts: “I – here (in the real world) / there (in the virtual one) – now, that is meanings here and there indicate the simultaneous presence in two places that is not actually possible, or coincidence of semantics of here and there in the conditions of the same communicative act, in relation to the same reference point (which is actually impossible as well). Such interpretations demonstrate a kind of “transitivity” in semantisation of the conceptual system analysed, which becomes the base for RR of portable semantics [54, p. 98].
Until now no holistic comparative analysis of RR was conducted. Elaborations performed in the context of general linguistic studies of work by A. Frey [81, p. 111-126], F. Boas [72, p. 1-80], M. Svodesh [84, p. 121-137] contain the first attempts of a comparative analysis of certain referential LU of different types. The first work dedicated entirely to typology of referential RR, is the study by S.A. Krylov [28, p. 140-173]. Further scientific studies, as usual, are deployed around the generalized research of anaphora [7, p. 78-127, 79, p. 315-338 and others], deixis [27, p. 25-96, 37, p. 25-96 and others] or references [40, p. 377-390, 44 p. 55-68, 47, p. 64-77 and others] as reference types [42, 43 and others] or identification [36, p. 120-126 and others]).

Almost simultaneous development of comparative approach of research reference with structural and semantic, communicative and other areas of modern linguistics allows to consider it as a separate, higher stage in the studies of linguistic phenomena (including, RR). On the one hand, such studies are the interim stage in creating general linguistic theory (definition of language universals, laws of language development, etc.), on the other hand – general linguistic bases is the foundation for creating a typology of LU, linguistic phenomena and processes determining their specific features and manifestations in languages of various types. Scientific researches of linguists-typologists are aimed at establishing classification and typology of separate meanings or specific LU in the referential system, defining their peculiarities in the cognate languages (L.B.Karpenko, V.K. Shecherbin, T.M. Holosova, O.O. Taranenko et al.) and the languages of different morphological structure (S. Rahimov, G.A. Shamova, O.M. Lazarovych et al.) at detecting deictic and other universals, in the comprehensive approach to deixis studying [56, p. 38-41]. However, the distribution of scientific research by the areas of typology (universology, contrastivistics, comparable typology and others [26, p. 3-8]) is not uniform.

In many comparative linguistics researches certain referential (mainly deictic) meanings of words or expressions are studied. The theoretical basis for them became works on typological linguistics by V.H.Hak, S.D. Katsnelson, O.O. Taranenko, S. Anderson, E. Kinan [71, p. 259-307] and others. However, there is no single point of view regarding involving cognate languages to typological studies: most researchers insist on the comparative analysis of cognate languages (Y.V Rakhlin [41 and others] S. Rakhimov [42; 43] and others), which besides clarifying the features of compared constructions, categories of language, etc., are able to identify the factors of influence, the difference between their manifestations on the language material, reflect the specificity of languages and linguistic phenomena.

O.I. Smyrnytskyi was one of the first to analyse in detail the factors of determining the direction of movement in Russian and English (the subject of movement, quality of movement, general directivity, reference point, the specific nature of the spatial relationship between subject moving and reference point) [50, p. 3-12], based on which A.Y. Kybryk introduced a method of studying semantic fields of the movement meanings and benchmarks [20, 21, p. 128-145; 56, p. 39].

In recent years typological studies of the functioning of reference means systems, different types of references have actualised (S. Rakhimov [42, 43], M. Clyne [73], D. Crystal [74], E. Danziger [1975, p. 885-907], Deictic conceptualization ... [76], M. Ettlinger [80], etc). Main characteristics of traditional reference types (deictic, and anaphoric, and referential itself) were investigated, but their specificity in languages is not studied enough. It is necessary to review and refine the typology of reference types (cf., for example, classification K. Buller [11, p.106-132], A.V. Alferov [1; 2], S. Rakhimova [42, 43], and others). Researchers suggest different models of structuring reference FSF and their fragments (e.g. model “core – periphery” in the specified works by M.A. Khmelevskva [60, p. 50-54], the model of planetary structure field by G.A. Shamova [61], S. A. Krylov [28, p. 140-173], and others).

Comparative study of certain problems of reference systems functioning in general and their representations (article, pronouns and adverbs, prepositions and prepositional constructions, categories of subjectivity, categorial temporal dominant, category of locality, location coordinates, temporal non-localisation, movement direction, temporality, modality, aspectuality and others) and some certain types of reference (interactional deixis, deictic identification, personal deixis, temporal references and others) has led to the emergence of a general theory of the comparative study of reference types functioning, including the establishment of typologies of deictic systems on the whole: it is suggested to differentiate monocentric and bicentric systems among three-term systems.
Thus, the RR had not been systematically studied in the compared languages. Comparative studies were conducted, as a rule, based on one or two languages, mainly for certain reference types. Unified linguistic typology of RR below is a step towards deepening and solving this issue.

The first attempts to typologise RR were made in 70’s of the twentieth century. Today RR typology remains complex and ambiguously solvable issue. Studies of the deictic type of reference conducted by Y.D. Apresyan, N.D. Arutyunova, A. Vezhbytska, U. Veinreich, D. Wunderlich, Y. Kyrylovych, J.Lions, C. Fillmore et al., demonstrate the absence of an explicit solution to the problem of perception, awareness and proper understanding of the RR, as a result, there is a need to determine the semantic, syntactic, lexico-grammatical and other types of reference semantics to unify and facilitate the use of communicative language means.

Since homonymy, being a kind of paradigmatic relations, applies at the lexical level, may relate to lexical-grammatical and syntactic forms [28, p.142-145], and the main criterion for its definition is the presence of different lexical semantics, words or combinations, which have the same form of expression and can realize their lexical semantics in different parts of speech and other functional aspects, obviously, should be regarded as multifunctional, as suggested by P.P. Shuba [66], because they depending on the syntactic conditions under the influence of lexico-grammatical and functional-semantic interaction are capable of changing reference quality along with its own functional affiliation. They are the demonstration of possibility to form further lexico-grammatical homonymy.

In the compared languages RR can be typologised based on the method of expression: according to lexico-semantic and functional-grammatical categories. General criteria of RR typology were previously approved based on the material of spatial deictic adverbs [56, p. 46-53]. Secondary means of reference expression is morphemic method (inflectional – for the Ukrainian and Russian languages; suffixal, prefixal, suffixal-prefixal – mainly for English), which influences the formation of refer, in particular, deictic semantics, but is not a direct method of its creation. With its help RR of diminutive, hypocoristic and emotionally expressive semantics, degrees and forms of reference graduation are formed in the Ukrainian and Russian languages. In English morphemic method of RR creation is not productive as typical adverb suffixes -ward(s), -ly convey the general meaning of the adverb as a part of speech and do not affect the determination of reference semantics.

The formation and representation of the reference semantics may be influenced by grammatical structure of the sentences (word order), intonation, semantic co-occurrence. In English, this tendency is more evident. But we shall not underestimate the role of intonation in the formation of the semantics of Russian and Ukrainian RR: intonation emphasis sometimes leads to enantiosemic understanding of reference. Since in the Ukrainian and Russian languages the word order in a sentence is not constant, as in English, there intonation plays a significant role in the specialisation, contextual semantisation of RR.

Considering the above factors reference categories of the compared languages were analyzed, as a result the following types of RR were distinguished:

1. Semantic types:
   1.1. Generall semantic types: a) RR with a motivated meaning / meanings, RR with the non-motivated meaning / meanings; b) absolute / relative RR c) RR of the combined semantics; d) RR of the objective / subjective (including desirative and modulative) semantics; e) RR related to the real / virtual reality;
   1.2. Lexico-semantic types: a) temporal RR (representations of the present, past, future, completeness / incompleteness of action, immediate / continuous action, RR of certainty / uncertainty; b) spatial (including toponmestic) RR: representations of direction (straight / reverse / dual vector / centrifugal / centripetal / circular), RR of localisation: on the plane (point / period) in two-, three-, four-dimensional space (point / period); c) personified or personal RR: personified / non-personified RR, subject / object RR, representations of the addressee / recipient / third person, d) interactional RR (as defined by A.V. Alferov [1, p. 3-6 ]), e) actional RR (defined by K.Buller [11]): nominative-referential and procedural-referential RR.
   1.3. Properly lexical classes of RR: somatic, locative, temporal, personal, RR of measure and dimensions, folkloremes, ritual, calendar RR, toponyms.
   1.4. Structural and semantic types: a) monosemantic / polysemantic RR, simple, composite, compound RR.

2. Stylistic types of RR:
2.1. Properly stylistic types: a) stylistically neutral / marked; b) archaisms, professionalisms, terms, outdated RR, internationalism, borrowings, commonly-used RR; c) standardized / non-standardized RR.

2.2. Evaluation types: of positive and negative evaluation, diminutive-hypocoristic / exaggerated RR and others.

2.3. Functional and stylistic types: neutral, set expressions, journalistic cliche, tropes, figures of speech.

3. Syntagmatic types:
   3.1. Properly syntagmatic types: a) contextually conditioned RR, b) syntagmatically fixed RR, c) free phrases.

   3.2. Syntactic types: nominative, nominative-adjetival, nominative-pronominal, adverbal (i.e. adverbs, adjective constructions and adverbial pronouns, cf.: defining an adverb as a function), perfect-negation verbal RR.


5. Pragmatic types: pragmatically restricted / unrestricted RR, semantic and pragmatic, pragmatic and functional, personally-functional RR.

6. General language types:

7. Derivative types: productive / unproductive, indigenous / borrowed RR.

8. Associative types: a) direct (that correspond to the nomination of stimuli: nominative / descriptive); b) allegoric (characters, images, etc.); c) figurative: a comparison, metaphorical and analogical transfer, citing; d) zero associations; e) evaluating (negative and positive evaluation); f) oppositive, synonyms or modulative.

9. Gender types: feminine, masculine, intermediate (“children’s”); among the feminine and masculine LU or representations of masculine and feminine gender the following are distinguished: obsolete, borrowed, traditional, fictional (these types have been suggested regarding English proper names by S.V. Shykhalova [64, p. 285]) and international RR; mixed type of RR.

Thus, the above types can be unified as: 1) structural types, based on the formal indexes of RR structure; 2) structural contensive types, built on the basis of semantic features of references (temporal, spatial, personal, actional and interactional reference semantics); 3) functional types that take into account social identity of the recipient, 4) inventory types that define the types of RR by their involvement in communicative situations, a place in the structure of reference FSF 5) implication types. These types define the future directions of RR studies.

When comparing single-structured and (to a lesser extent) multistructured languages, RR characteristics and qualities, phenomena and processes, which are somewhat differently modified in each language, become clearer. Particularly clearly it can be seen when analysing relatively closed FSF of cognate languages, such as representations of references under the study. Interferential isosemia (the term S.V. Semchynskyi) as one of the manifestations of their similarity is a subject matter of direct sociolinguistic analysis, but for comparable typology it clearly reflects the types of RR and their specificity [48, p. 3-4; 49, p. 321, 331, 565-372].

Among all the types of references in the language the least studied are so-called “other referential types”, that is RR, which express non-deictic and non-anaphoric correlations between denotations and references to them in the conditions of communication. Until now they remain the least studied. Such studies were not conducted previously in languages selected for our comparison.

Other types of references in all compared languages are based on the semantics of the extent and degree (especially in the temporal RR), way of action (mainly spatial RR) and, as a rule, are realized under the influence of context. Semantics of movement, acceleration, speed has significant impact on realization of references.

Among all the types of RR in the Ukrainian and Russian languages the most common model of building proper RR is the model of Ukr., Rus. “no- + adjective ending with -omy, -emy”, which, primarily, realizes the semantics of the way of action and is mainly the basis for indirect references (in the narrow sense) to time, space or person. In compared cognate languages occurrence of additional
(secondary) reference semantics is caused not only by the conditions of context or communication. Its causes also go back to the historical development of these languages, their genetic features in bilingual [48, p.4] or polylingual environment of the linguistic existence, more broadly – in the specificity of interlingual contacts in general.

In the compared languages the following functional-semantic realizations of reference itself are represented: a) historical RR; b) national and cultural RR; c) religious RR; d) social RR; e) unspecified RR; f) RR of negative reference; g) somatic RR; h) professional RR; i) personal RR (i.e. correlated with the place, time, location, accommodation, etc, or persona of famous historical person, the character of fiction, etc).

Spatial RR may mainly have the following varieties: a) spatially-temporal; b) spatially-personal; c) spatially-quantitative; d) spatially-static; e) spatially-dynamic (direct and reverse); f) spatially-qualitative, g) spatially-evaluative.

Temporal indirect RR are differentiated into: a) periodic (“daily”, “nightly”, “24-hour”, “weekly”, “hourly”, “minute”, “second”, RR of physical and physiological state); b) instant; c) permanent; d) of refining reference; e) of indirect reference; f) of reverse reference; g) temporal and cause and effect; h) of positive reference; i) of negative reference; j) age (temporal and age, temporal and social and age); k) historical socio-personal; l) “holiday” (religious, family, public and others); m) temporal-personified; n) temporal-qualitative; o) temporal-quantitative; p) temporal-spatial.

Personal RR are divided into: a) personified: (gender, nationally personified, historically personified, somatic); b) social role play (family and ritual, professional, religious and cultural); c) generalized; d) composite.

The majority of listed varieties have so-called additional reference, i.e. the one, which appears secondarily, based on the semantics of the way of action. It is less inherent in personal RR.

Using LU of one or another type of RR may be made conditioned by the context, as well as functional-stylistic and genre and stylistic type of the text as a whole: for non-fiction informative texts it is a bit more typical to use RR of specialized references or deictic dominants, in formal-business ones – neutral anaphoric RR as well. In fiction and colloquial style the mixed types of RR (deictic, semi-deictic LU and secondary types of RR) are more common.

Thus, the correlation of reference in the language is not equated with the relations of identification, although their combination is not rare. They are the varieties of references along with deictic and anaphoric LU. As to the manner and type of manifestation the spatial, temporal and personal RR can be differentiated as follows: 1) deictic; 2) anaphoric; 3) comprehensive references of mixed-type RR: a) comprehensive references of mixed identification semantics; b) comprehensive references of mixed referential and non-referential semantics (mainly deictic and of the way of action). In most cases, in the structure of meanings of comprehensive references additional spatial, temporal or personal meanings, and their mixed types occur mainly based on the semantics of the way of action (among compared FSF they are the least manifested in English). Isosemic model of Ukr., Rus. “no- + adjective ending with -оhy, -еomy”, as a typical manifestation of secondary (“other”) reference is mostly common among temporal, personal and topomnestic RR (among other spatial LU it is mostly represented by colloquial and vernacular lexemes). Such RR are usually monofunctional. Obviously, generation and dissemination of multifunctionality are often facilitated by both conversivity as a quality and transposition as a way of creation. RR of different parts of speech are multifunctional.

Comprehensive study of the above types of RR is optimally performed by method of comparative poly paradigmatic study.

Formation of poly paradigmatic approach in linguistics was a gradual process: at first it was based on non-systematic and patternless involvement of some extralinguistic knowledge mainly on methods of analysis. The emergence of new philosophical views and scientific and technological development caused the convergence of researches in mathematics, physics, philosophy, logic, psychology, linguistics, and later, cybernetics, synergetics, hermeneutics etc. Studies of the XIX - early XX centuries were prerequisites for this.

In the mid-twentieth century the main areas of linguistic research (including spatial, temporal and personal relations) were defined by the elaborations of representatives of structuralism, generative grammar that significantly expanded the parameters of language developments. A lot of attention was paid to the historiography of studies of spatial and temporal semantics of identification functions and referential functions of the language units. Representations of space, time and person were studied in
the numerous scientists’ works separately as lexico-grammatical classes of words. Thus, RR network of parts of speech was gradually formed, though the nomination as such was not involved in the analysis.

Another aspect of the RR study was their structural arrangement within the language system that was somehow encouraged by integration processes in society and science. General theoretical elaborations in lexicon and semantics were taken as a basis of research lexical semantics of space and time, to a lesser extent – of person. It was proved that the spatial and temporal RR are capable of changing their contextual semantics. Representation of spatial, temporal and personal identifiers in the form of a field allowed exploring their explication methods regarding space, time and space-time relations, pronominal oppositions, derivational potential, the spatial component in the structure of meaning of prepositions, categorical space of locative and temporal adverbs, adjectives.

Analysis of the ways of representation of spatial, temporal, and personal semantics allowed globalising the techniques of linguistic study and identifying the types of relevant nominations. Criteria and principles of differentiation of the analyzed semantics contributed to the establishment of typical and specific features of RR in each of the developed languages [57, 58] and confirmed their universal status. This enabled to reproduce national language world views in general and their specific spatial, temporal and personal fragments, to research national specificity in the ways of thinking and language world views, to determine the typical characteristics of mental and linguistic categories, principles and types of interlingual relations.

An important step in the development of polyparadigmatic approach was reasoning of emotional deixis based on a combination of semantic and psycholinguistic approaches and social deixis, other types of references. So, based on previous scientific studies, it may be determined that in the narrow sense the term reference nominates correlation, i.e. reference which refers to the referent. In a broad sense the term reference is used to denote any referential relations in language (deictic, anaphoric, properly referential etc.) [57, 58, p. 58]).

An interdisciplinary approach, common in scientific researches in the late twentieth century, allowed involving the latest methods, techniques and methodology of related scientific knowledge to carry out the linguistic analysis. In fact, it is reflected in the use of extralinguistic scientific knowledge as background, subsidiary ones. Anthropological, cognitive and pragmatic branches of linguistics become the main. On the other hand, it enabled to resume the elaborations in mathematical linguistics, review linguophilosophical paradigms, disseminate gender analysis of linguistic material as a kind of manifestation of personal relations and communicative behavior of native speakers, associated with psycholinguistic characteristics of linguistic identity, to determine factors influencing the formation of individual concepts, especially the personal cognitive influence, referential transparency / opacity of expression, to investigate particular ethnolinguistic peculiarities of time, temporal component of intonation of dialectal language, and cultural foundations of the formation of spatial, temporal, personal and other notions / concepts, to define among them national marked RR, to consider related semantic fields specifying a category, the mechanisms of elimination referential conflict, correlation of reference and nomination etc., and to involve comprehensive polyparadigmatic approach in the linguistic material analysis.

Conclusions

Studies of RR in the Ukrainian, Russian and English languages aimed at exploring and presenting relatively coherent typology of RR in these languages, which is not available in the modern comparative linguistics, with the peculiarities of their native association by the speakers of the languages under the study.

The very antropocentrism defines the genesis and nature of analysed relations in the RR system. This system is a system of spatial, temporal and personal representations, which center is the reference point, “I – here – now”. The widespread use of relative RR in the language communications is observed. Due to this certain parametric shift takes place in the scientific systems, i.e. if for biology, medical knowledge space and time are the parameters of research in the system of human (in broad meaning – a living being), then in logical, physical, mathematical, geographical scientific areas, by contrast, a person is the subject matter of analysis of space and time. In the linguistic situation (communication) the necessary setting of triple coordinates is observed: the axis of spatial, the axis of temporal and axis of personal references, in which the combination of specified types of reference in the semantics of linguistic representations (spatial-temporal, spatial-personal, temporal-personal) is
quite frequent. This prevents confusion and communication barriers and characterizes features of RR at the conceptual level.

In the analysed languages not only deictic, anaphoric and properly referential types of the reference are common, but other, transsemantic and transfunctional types. They get a semantic and functional development.

Polyparadigmatic approach introduced in the study as a comprehensive multi-aspect research of language paradigms (a set of logical-semantic, functional-semantic and psycholinguistic approaches), provides for a three-tiered analysis of the mental, properly linguistic and associative material.

Multifunctionality is inner structural feature of FSF of RR, at which lexical semantics of RR is preserved in its different functional manifestations, and only acquires partial semantisation of the parts of speech, pragmatic or stylistic connotations. Ukrainian and Russian RR are mainly characterized by bifunctionality as a specific manifestation of multifunctionality. Pronoun-noun bifunctionality is typical of personal representations in all compared languages. For English referential RR of spatial and temporal semantics multifunctionality of the parts of speech is more typical.

The main types of RR are general semantic, structural and semantic, stylistic, paradigmatic, syntagmatic, pragmatic, functional-stylistic and others. Most attention is paid to the identification and characterisation of transsemantic and transfunctional types of RR.

Transfunctional types of reference in the RR system are: deictic-referential, deictic-anaphoric, referential-anaphoric, nominative-deictic and referential-nominative types. Formation of transsemantics transfunctionality is often accelerated by the associative relations. Multifunctionality of RR largely determines the complexity of differentiation of nominativeness, identification and reference.

Mechanism of actualisation / disactualisation of referential semantics is that under the influence of internal factors and extralinguistic factors (including functional-semantic neutralization of one referential feature by another one) RR can acquire or lose referential semantics in the context. Such things are gradually formed in the compared languages as transsemantics and transfunctionality, and later – as multifunctionality.

Grammatical representation of reference acquires versatility depending on the degree of prevalence of polysemantics and multifunctionality of RR. The degree of polysemantics of the analyzed LU is approximately the same in the Russian and Ukrainian languages. The dynamics of functional-semantic representations development comes from monofunctional monosemantic (sometimes ambiguous) to polysemantic multifunctional RR of all semantic types of reference.

Conceptual differentiation of functional-semantic field of temporal coordinates in compared languages is different in their polyparadigmatics, ability to be focused on any area of human life. Multifunctional personal pronouns are the egocentrically oriented center of RR system, including their first-person singular form.

Analysed English RR are always associated oppositively. For the speakers of the Ukrainian and Russian languages opposition in associations is less typical; for them more frequent are associations in the form of set expressions. The following ways of association are found to be typical: a) oppositional; b) the triple “correlations”; c) synonymous association; d) neopositive type. Basic communicative-pragmatic functions in the analysed LU are as follows: empathic, intensifying, emotionally expressive, invasive, attractive.

Deictic-referential, less – nominative-referential types of reference (significantly – in closely cognate languages) are typical of all compared languages. In English, deictic-anaphoric type is more common. Multifunctional polysemantic type of reference is specific for the English language. For other compared languages bifunctionality and semantic recurrence are characteristic.

Further scientific research on comparative linguistic study of RR linguistic realization is seen in involving cognitivistics, prototypal semantics, functional grammar, psycholinguistics, linhvosynergetics etc. in such an analysis of paradigms under the study.
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