

- словарь / Гл. ред. В.Н. Ярцева. – М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1990. – С. 508.
7. Рубакин Н.А. Психология читателя и книги. Краткое введение в библиографическую психологию. – М.; Л.: Гос. изд-во, 1929. – 308 с.
 8. Рубакин Н.А. Работа библиотекаря с точки зрения библио-психологии. К вопросу об отношении читателя и книги // Читатель и книга. Методы их изучения. – Харьков: Изд-во «Труд», 1925. – С. 37-65.
 9. Руднев В.П. Обоснование перевода // Винни Пух и философия обыденного языка. Алан Милн. Winnie Pух. Дом в Медвежьем Углу / Аналитич. ст. и комментг. В.П. Руднева. – М: Аграф, 2000. – С. 49-55.
 10. Степанов Г.В. Язык. Литература. Поэтика. – М.: Наука, 1988. – 382 с.
 11. Тарасов Е.Ф. К построению теории речевой коммуникации // Теоретические и прикладные проблемы речевого общения. – М.: Наука, 1979. – С. 5-147.
 12. Фрейд З. Персонажи, встречающиеся в психоаналитической работе // Russian Imago 2002. Исследования по психоанализу культуры. – М.: Аграф, 2004. – С. 11-37.
 13. Шрейдер Ю.А., Шаров А.А. Системы и модели. – М.: Радио и связь, 1982. – 152 с.

V.V. Mykhaylenko (Chernivtsi, Ukraine)

DISCOURSE DIMENSIONS OF VOCATIVES IN IMPERATIVES

The issues of vocatives in the imperative sentences are rather complicated [8: 69–78] – they can be treated as noun phrases used as (1) vocative clauses, (2) vocative in the subject phrase, and (3) vocative in the sentence structure. Vocatives in English are typically separated from the rest of the clause by an intonational break. As noted in Downing (1969), when a proper name is used as a vocative, the imperative clause can be used in isolation. When it is used as a subject, the imperative clause must be followed by at least another clause (Portner, 2009). The same pattern holds for bare noun phrases: when they are used as vocatives, the clause containing them can occur in isolation, but when they are used as subjects, it cannot. We must note that our imperatives do not include the entire Deontic class [9: 149–153], but centred on the basic imperative verb form.

The point is that the vocatives are traditionally treated as personal name, title or term of endearment [4: 116–118]. Vocatives are frequent units in spoken English (the addressee's names, terms of kinship, endearment expressions). They are closely connected with social intimacy and distance in interpersonal relationships. In written English they are used in more restricted contexts, for example, salutations.

As a rule the denotative and connotative meanings of the vocative and its stylistic functions have been under study. However, the communicative,

discourse, and pragmatic aspects of the vocatives in different communicative sentence types need their investigation. There is a close cooperation of the vocative and the imperative sentence – form, distribution, roles of interlocutors, topic. Therefore the pragmatic meaning of a vocative depends primarily on the lexical meaning of the unit, the author's intention, and the discourse register type (in our case the illustrations are retrieved from fiction, Scriptures, and newspaper registers) Let's experiment with the vocatives in the imperative sentences to prove their part of a sentence status and to check if such transformations within imperative sentences are possible:

1. Ah, Genevieve, come in. Jack Higgins.

→ Ah, Genevieve. + Come in.

→ Ah, Genevieve. (← Ah. + Genevieve.)

In this case we can consider the vocative as an autonomous clause/sentence, like *Ah, is that you Genevieve?!

2. She covered that side of things in a few brief sentences and then said

They are watching me every second. Just go, Craig, while you can. Jack Higgins.

→ Just go. + Craig.

3. Go on. Be off with you and get it done, Genevieve Trevaunce. Jack Higgins.

→ Go on. + Be off with you. + Get it done. +* Genevieve Trevaunce.

While in (2, 3) such transformation is hardly possible, because the proper name denotes the addressee of the command.

Likewise in the Scriptures vocatives are inseparable from addressees (4, 5, 6) and may be treated as subjects of imperatives (cf.: [5: 570–592]).

4. Thou Son of David, have mercy on me. Mark 10:48.

In this sentence the personal pronoun, a subject, is additionally specified by a proper noun.

5. O Lord, rebuke me in thy wrath: neither chasten me in thy hot displeasure.

Psalm 38:1.

6. Lord, make me to know mine end. Psalm 39:4 (see the diachrony of vocatives [3: 258])

7. Thank you, Mr. President. Let me ask you, while we were inside this very safe and secure and beautiful convention center, some 5,000 at least demonstrators were on the outside. The Washington Post. [Sept. 25, 2009](#).

The results of the analysis on the use of second-person addresses in religion, fiction, and newspaper discourse registers show an implication that the position of addressers toward addressees in their community brings about variation in the use of second-person personal addresses during their communication (Searle and Vanderveken 1985; Vanderveken 1999; Vanderveken and Kubo 2002). There are still many cases about the use of

addresses to be explored. It is suggested to conduct a study on the use of addresses in various social positions and communities.

7. Do nothing of the sort, mother. Bernard Shaw. (daughter → mother)

8. So cheer up, Captain, and buy a flower off a poor girl. Bernard Shaw. (the flower girl → the Gentleman) subordinate → senior.

There is a breach of pragmatic relations of junior → senior marked in (7, 8), cf.: the regular frame:

9. Do hold your tongue, Clara. Bernard Shaw. (mother → daughter). The emphatic “do” underlines the addressor’s annoyance.

Semantics of vocatives can also reveal the addressor’s attitude to the addressee (10, 11, 12):

10. Tell me, ma petite chere. Katherine Mansfield. (young man → young woman)

11. Come down, dear. James Joyce. (mother → son)

12. Say, Paul, old man do you ever put anything on horse? D.H. Lawrence. (uncle → nephew).

In the following illustration the addressor’s annoyance is expressed by a vocative clause.

13. Now don’t be troublesome: theres a good girl. Bernard Shaw. (the Gentleman → the flower girl) superior → subordinate

Social meanings of the addresses done by [1] were included in dimensions of social distance scale containing close solidarity relationship between the participants, social distance scale containing distant solidarity relationship between the participants, function scale containing positive affective message toward the addressee, and function scale containing negative affective message toward the addressee. Social meaning of the addresses done by the common people toward superior was included in dimension of social distance scale. Social meanings of the addresses done by superior toward the common people were included in dimensions of social distance scale containing close solidarity relationship between the participants and function scale containing positive affective message toward the addressee (Busse, 2006).

We suggest to father conduct a study on the use of second-person personal addresses in other social positions and social classes. In this paper we have taken vocatives within imperatives in English. The focus of various investigations has been on the relation that holds between the notion of addressee and the subject of imperatives. Though the referred unit has never been under study as a polifunctional one, the number of its functional semantic features revealed depends on the speaker's intention and the discourse register. Two main hypotheses can be put forward: (1) the syntactic representation of imperatives encodes the notion of addressee by means of a functional projection with 2nd person features (jussive phrase); (2) in English core imperatives, the head of Jussive Phrase enters a syntactic relation with the subject that results in the sharing of person features. My objective is to reveal the functional complexity of vocatives in the imperative sentences and to show the ways of their interpretation.

The complex pragmatic, compositional, structural, and semantic analysis of vocatives in the fiction, Scriptures, and newspaper discourse registers results in revealing the interdependence of the compositional structure, the type and the "quality" of information and the "addressee's factor"; the models of interpersonal communication within discourses are highlighted:

family relations – senior \leftrightarrow junior
 social relations – superior \leftrightarrow subordinate
 friendly relations – young man \leftrightarrow young woman
 equal relations – colleague \leftrightarrow colleague

Vocatives play a pragmatic role with respect to the addressee of a command. But it is still not clear what the interaction between the syntactic and pragmatic behaviour of the vocative is (Osenova, Simov, 2002; Kubo, 2004) Here we are not concerned with encoding or decoding the speaker's intentions in BACKGROUND feature (Green 2000)] or with metapragmatic phenomena like honorifics. Vocatives are very similar to sentence topics, cf.: family (7, 9, 11), friendship (10), faith (4, 5, 6), trade (8), gambling (12), professional relations (1, 2, 3), officialdom (7) [cf.: 2]. Paul Portner (2009) considers that the point is more significant in Italian (Zanuttini 2004) and French (Lambrecht 1996). Zanuttini shows that vocatives are extremely similar to a particular syntactically distinct variety of topic in Italian [7: 135–152].

This connection (and possible identity) between vocatives and topics suggests that we should consider an analysis of topics as expressives (7–13) [6: 679–705] as well.

The discourse functions of vocatives are revealed: summons, turn management, ritual, social status, softening/lessening threat, topic management, joking aspect.

The vocatives are registered in three positions in the imperative sentences: front position, mid-position, and end position (the most frequent in the imperative of the fiction and newspaper, registers, while in the Scriptures it is mainly in the front position. There are four types of vocative pragmatic functions: interpersonal management, conversational management, informational management, and illocutionary force management. The last one must be in the focus of a special investigation. Such an analysis of vocatives in imperative sentences is promising because it may allow an understanding of the common and differential features between vocatives and topics because vocatives and topics achieve expressivity due to identifying the target object/image of the speaker's attention and emotion, which encourages shared perspectives of interpretation.

REFERENCES

1. Карасик В.И. Язык социального статуса. / В.И. Карасик. – Москва: Институт языкознания РАН, 1992. – 330 с.
2. Карпчук Н.П. Адресованість в офіційному та неофіційному англomовному дискурсі (комунікативно-прагматичний аналіз). Автореф. дис... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04 / Н.П. Карпчук; Харк. нац. ун-т ім. В.Н.Каразіна. – Х., 2005. –20 с.
3. Михайленко В.В.Парадигма імператива в древнегерманських мовах. / В.В.Михайленко/ Докт. дисс. – Черновці, 2002. – 395с.
4. Carter R., McCarthy M. Cambridge Grammar of English./ R.Carter, M. McCarthy. – Cambridge: CUP, 2006. – 973p.
5. Downing Bruce T. Vocatives and Third-Person Imperatives in English./ Bruce T. Downing //Papers in Linguistics.- 1969. –1. – Pp.570–592.
6. Maynard Senko K. Expressivity in Discourse: Vocatives and Themes in Japanese/ Senko K. Maynard // [Language Sciences](#).-2001. – [Volume 23](#). – [Issue 6](#). – Pp. 679–705.
7. Mauck Simon, Miok Pak, Portner Paul, and Zanuttini Raffaella. Imperative Subjects: A Crosslinguistic Perspective. //Georgetown University Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics, ed. Corinne Brandstetter and Dominik Rus. – Washington, DC: Georgetown University, 2005. – Pp.135–152.
8. Thorne J.P. English Imperative Sentences / J.P. Thorne //Journal of Linguistics. – 1966. – 2. – Pp.69–78.9.Warren Andy. Modality, Reference and Speech Acts in Psalms / Andy Warren //Tyndale Bulletin. – 2002. – Vol.53. –N.1. – Pp.149–153.