



emotions). Complexity and contradiction of interjections classification by the semantic features of “expression of emotions” is explained by the ambiguity of the classification of the emotions themselves, subjective (complexity of interpretation) and ambiguity of many emotional states.

Taking into consideration the positive features of previous classifications, we offer our own classification based on the semantic principle, taking as a basis the interconnection of semasiological, onomasiological and pragmatic aspects. At the same time, this classification is grammatical because it is based on grammatical isolation. As a rule, French grammarians divide interjections into three groups: emotional, impulsive and onomatopoeia. In this research we study the first two groups of interjections (words-phrases), i.e. those expressing manifestation of emotional-volitional sphere of speakers, taking into consideration their subjective nature.

Subjectivity as a distinguishing feature of semantics of interjections, consists in their social realization as linguistic signs used to express the emotional and volitional, subjective, but objectively existing feelings and desire; those that specifically reflect objectively existing world of human relations. The reality that causes emotions and feelings is real: emotions and desires exist objectively. Only the nature of individual-personal expression of feelings and desires inseparable from the subject in the speech is subjective. This nature makes up a specific feature of interjections called subjectivity.

Objective words-phrases express manifestations of volitional sphere of human mental activity. Their total categorical volitional meaning is implemented in more specific ways: command, motivations, requirements, appeal, exclamation, encouragement... They are apprehended as an expression of the specific dominant sense of volition even out of context.

Objective words-phrases are directed at the addressee, and this is a specific feature of their semantics. They express the motives, and this is reflected in the syntactic structure of the whole utterance and its lexical and grammatical content.

Subjective words-phrases express feelings, resulting from situational attitude of the speakers to certain objects or phenomena (emotions) as well as feelings which reflect a persistent and generalized attitude of the speakers to the objects and phenomena (feelings). That is, the category of subjective words-phrases denotes inner life of the speaker regardless of the listener. In fact, the subjective words-phrases fully reflect the emotional breakthrough of subjective, personal, interested insight into the semantics of utterance, in which communicative and functional significance of words-phrases and their relevance in the language is manifested.

Skakun I.O.

THE HUMAN DIMENSIONAL CONSTANTS IN THE MODERN HUMANITARIAN SCIENTIFIC WORLD VIEW

*Department of Social Sciences and Ukrainian Studies
Higher State Educational Establishment of Ukraine
„Bukovinian State Medical University”*

With the introduction of the concept of „anthropological constant” the modern anthropocentric paradigm is turning into the paradigm of self transformation of the human. A self transformation which is interpreted not via its substantiality but through motivational approach and through human activity, as a combination of all physical, mental, intellectual movements and impulses.

Regarding the human dimension of scientific knowledge it is possible to talk about three anthropological constants – subject-object coherence, sociocultural conditionality and the axiological relevance. The subject-object coherence means that these fundamental epistemological categories are inseparable from each other, despite variable nature of their interaction, generating an infinite number of interpretations and concepts, including extremes such as the idea of the „death of the subject”, natural supplement which was acquiring the image of „the stolen object”.

Within the classical type of rationality, in which the indicated constant was decisive, the subject being opposed to the subject was trying to perceive the object as it was by itself. In this respect, rational knowledge was considered a more or less „accurate” reflection of objective reality. No dependence on the subjective aspects of cognitive interaction was taken into consideration. Actually, the presupposed subject was not a particular person, a representative of a particular historical era or of particular culture of some time, possessing some intellectual, voluntary or sensual potencies – it was a transcendental (abstract) subject. Thus, the mechanistic (classical) natural science was clearly consistent with the classical form of subject-object coherence.

The socio-cultural conditionality as one of the constants of human dimension of science has always existed, but it took its first place only in the process of substitution of the classical paradigm by the non-classical one.

The classical understanding of the subject has been criticized by the „philosophy of life”, by hermeneutics and other anthropologically oriented directions of modern Western philosophy. The existentialist „philosophy of the subject” with its defense of the peremptory value of each individual, could also be defined as one of the reactions to Hegelian epistemology, which sacrificed the subject of cognition to the system, focused on absolute knowledge. The non-classical type of rationality is characterized first and foremost by its special attention to the subjective aspects of scientific knowledge. This position inevitably leads to reflection of social and cultural conditioning of the cognitive potential of a living, historically concrete (not abstract, transcendental) subject.

The axiological relevance is the third important constant of human dimension of the scientific knowledge that has become dominant on the stage of post-non-classical paradigm shift. In previous stages of the paradigm shift the emphasis in understanding of human dimensions of the nature of subject-object interaction was moved from one binary



category to another. This occurred in the process of post-classical and philosophy and non-classical science. Considering the Hegelian dialectical triad „thesis-antithesis-synthesis“ a kind of return (on a new level) to the subject took place, the subject including a person as an integral element, the subject of cognition. Thus, it becomes human dimensional in the literal sense of the word. Hence, there arise a new subject-subjective understanding of cognitive interaction.

In the context of classical approaches, the subject of cognition in relation to the object of cognition is taking essentially an evicted point of view, even if on the subjective level it is axiologically not indifferent to it. It is not because the postnonclassical paradigm does not provide such an abstraction, but it directly points to its impossibility, that is to say to the inseparability of the author from his/her scientific interests, especially when it comes to socially significant problems.

Thus, in full compliance with the etymology of the word, it is appropriate to consider the leading anthropological constants as the permanent, non-variable, unchanging characteristics of human essence, a certain anthropological potential which manifests itself in different ways and is realized in the historically changing context of scientific cognitive activity.

Skrypnyk I.I.

THE „MAP“ OF LINGUOCIDE IN THE WORLD

*Department of Social Sciences and Ukrainian Studies
Higher State Educational Establishment of Ukraine
„Bukovinian State Medical University“*

Linguocide always was and still is present in all multinational states where there are conflicting interests between the „dominant“ and „oppressed“ peoples. The UNESCO statistics estimates that every week one language disappears in the world. According to unfavourable assessment of linguists, in 25 years only one tenth of now existing „living“ languages will remain. Currently there are 6809 languages. Due to the fact that 90% of the world languages are spoken today less than by 100 000 people, these languages have a problematic future. Several hundred languages are on the verge of extinction: 357 languages are spoken only by 50 speakers and 46 languages are spoken only by one person! After the death of each of those 46 people the language they represent will die. The scientists affirm that in order to live and successfully develop the language should be spoken by at least 1000 000 of people. There are no more than 250 such languages in the world today. Therefore, scientists are confident that in the nearest decades up to 90% of all world languages will disappear. The scientific exploration published in the journal „Nature“ by Bill Syuzerlenda, (the biologist) reported that the number of spoken languages on the Earth decreases faster than the rare species of birds and animals disappear. Only within the last 500 years the Earth has lost some 4.5% of all the languages known by the science. During this time the world has lost 1.3% of birds and 1.9% of mammals. The article reads: „The mankind has realized the need to protect animals and birds, but so far has not worried about the fate of peoples and their languages!“. It should be mentioned that all the languages in the world are the heritage of humanity.

A comparative analysis of all the levels of the linguistic structure can detect the universal properties of a language. Each language contains a unique historical and cultural experience of certain people, therefore all the conversations, opinions and theories that consider dying of languages as a natural regularity in fact mean an attempt to approve the theory of linguocide and ethnocide in particular.

Linguocide – is a purposeful, deliberate destruction of a particular language as the main feature of ethnicity – nationality, nation. Linguocide is directed primarily against the written forms of speech. The ultimate goal of linguocide is ethnocide – the elimination of the people as a distinct cultural-historical community, the degeneration of ethnos. Hence, linguocide is a precondition for mass denationalization and „mankurtisation“ purposing to rid the nation of its historical memory and ethnic immunity, ethnic identity and execution of assimilation. That's why the conquerors so thoroughly destroyed the languages of the oppressed peoples.

Linguocide has been known for a long time. In ancient India, the speakers of non-Aryan languages had no hope to get out of the lower castes. In China in order to take even the lowest position, it was necessary to pass the exam with hieroglyphic writing, and those who did not know the Chinese language, had the slightest chances to make their living. A typical example of linguocide in Europe in the 20th century was prohibition of Catalan language by Franco's regime when the Spanish Nazis occupied Catalonia. It was forbidden to teach Catalan language in schools and universities, to publish its newspapers, magazines and books, serve the Mass, correspond and talk in the workplace, be called by Catalan names, use Catalan geographic names including the word „Catalonia“.

The Ukrainian language has been suffering particularly brutal oppression for several ages although it is spoken by more people than those of the Spain (Castilian, Galician, Catalan, Basque). Intervention into the structure and functioning of the Ukrainian language began in Tsarist Russia. „Censors even cared about the purity of our Ukrainian language – it was not allowed to use neologisms, new words showing some new cultural understanding ...“ (I. Ohienko). In the plays the use of Ukrainian allowed only for peasant characters. It was allowed to print Ukrainian texts only by Russian spelling „yeryzhka“.

However, a really total attack on the structure of the Ukrainian language began in the USSR. One of the dogmas of the XIX century was the statement on the merger of nations into a single universal nation with universal language. For the practical implementation of this dogma into life there stood the Russian Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks' realization of progress really has become a kind of „pagan idol, who did not want to drink the nectar otherwise but from the skulls of the dead“ (A. Kamyu). At the cemetery of languages there had to triumph the Language. But as soon as