

M. Greb,
candidate of philological sciences,
Berdiansk State
Pedagogical University

PERCULIARITIES OF LEXICAL-SEMANTIC PREDICATIVE PART ORGANIZATION OF COMPOUND SENTENCES WITH CONJUNCTIONS A AS A MEANS OF EXPRESSION COMPARISON

The notion of a structural scheme as a formal model of complex syntax constructions is closely related to the notion of semantics structural scheme by a general typical sense, given by a particular formal mechanism. In other words, filling the construction by specific lexical material, belonging to certain semantic types, may correspond to the semantics of the structural scheme, specify and maintain it. However, syntactic positions can be filled with lexical item of that semantic class, which does not correspond to the formation of the typical content, and as a result, separate functional variants of sentences are formed. The authors of recent researches on the syntax [1, 2, 3, 4] underline the fact that, features of vocabulary that is introduced by a speaker into constructions, depends largely on the possibility or impossibility of implementing language features typical sentence given by structural schemes.

Lexical-semantic filling of units is also important to determine the specificity and contrastive relations between parts of a complex syntactic structure of compound type. Above mentioned position **determines the importance of the researched problem. The aim of our article** is to analyze material, taken from different sources, to establish some patterns of lexical-semantic content of units of compound sentences, the structure of which provides the formation of the comparative relationship between them.

First of all it is important to underline that for building a comparative relations, the presence of two associative series represented in the structural parts of the parallelism predicate of a compound comparable sentence is necessary. It may be explained by the fact that lexical units included in comparative relations should be somehow close, similar, identical (synonymous), or contrasting, opposite (antonymous). In extreme cases, lexical units can be related by the common lexical unit in the sense or be suitable for synonymic / antonymic contextual correlation. For example, in the sentence *Весна багата на квітки, а осінь [багата] на шинки* (Folk arts) noun lexical units in the subject position of the first and second parts of sentences are semantically correlated as belonging to LSG "season", and of the nominal parts of complex predicates in the semantic analysis can be classified as lexical units combined by the meaning "result of plant growth" or "harvest" and so on.

Many researchers consider that to a large extent the nature of associative links in comparative structures is based on the phenomenon of synonymy, which is comparable structures should be considered broader than the actual lexical synonymy. Lexical unit, anaphora pronoun or anaphora zero can be synonymous, as well as synonymy can be the level lexical unit/ phrase etc. [5, 32]. Similarly, it is necessary to examine the phenomenon of antonymy, on which opposite semantic relation within variety of comparable compound sentences is built.

The analysis of the semantics of comparable syntactic units shows that characteristics of opposite components can be represented by synonymous units in the sentence [У всякому разі, щось неначе не то зашелестіло, не то ікнуло чи кашлянуло на печі, і так виразно, що] німці **причаїлися**, а Товченик **перестав дихати** (О. Довженко), where noun lexical units *німці* й *Товченик* are hyponimich correlated as belonging to the same lexical-semantic group of “man”. Predicative lexical units *причаїтися* й *перестати дихати* realized in the form *причаїлися* і *перестав дихати*, contextually are synonymous, because the seme “не дихати, перестати дихати” belongs to the semantics of lexical unit *причаїтися*.

It is important to note that, contractive relations would be weak or even absent if the predicates of both parts are expressed by the same lexical units. With such lexical filling the sentence with formal features of comparable structures may lose the sense, for example: **Німці причаїлися, а Товченик причаївся*. At the same time the contraction with the same qualitative composition will have meaning when conjunction *і / або* is used under the condition that the semantics of comparison is kept, and the necessary structural element will be the modifier of the content presented by particle *теж*, for example: *Німці причаїлися, і Товченик причаївся* і *Німці причаїлися, а Товченик теж причаївся*. However, in the latter case the contrastive relation is very weak, it is close to the connective one, and comparable semantics of expression is rather the result of the logical comparison operations, based on the presuppositions that each individual is characterized by specific manifestations which are common for people: physical, mental etc. states and actions.

The semantic similarity of contrastive lexical units is observed in the following example: *Діти навзводи кинулись до садочка, а мати посміхнулася* (М. Стельмах), in which the semantics predicate of “кинулися навзводи” includes the value of movement, vitality, enthusiasm, satisfaction and joy that in this meaning is contextual syntactic synonymous to the mother’s reaction – посміхнулася. If we represent this sentence in other words, it will look like: *Діти були задоволені, втішені, а мати посміхнулася (= теж була втішена)*.

The emergence of contrastive relation based on similarity contrastive components that are outside of the synonymy of lexical units in contrastive positions – are common feature in a circle of comparable structures. An important factor in the formation of such structures and their essential semantic feature that allows to recognize the contrastive not conjunctive relation is the leading one in these structures is the fact that a speaker selects synonymous but not identical lexical units. For example, in the sentence *Малий шкандибає, а старий прикульгує, [а проте ідуть, не зупиняються]* (В. Підмогильний), where lexical units *шкандибати* й *прикульгувати* and predicative lexical units are synonymous but identical. The above given examples are characterized by the fullness of syntactic positions by certain lexical units. If the compliance with is not complete, it is necessary to talk about anaphora lexical units or even anaphora zero [6, 29–38], for example, in the sentence [Потім уже стала розглядати Заболотного спокійно, мовби відсторонено. Наче перед нею був один з тих багатьох, кого вона доглядала в госпіталі, а тепер він ось уже випусаний і] йому дорога своя, а їй – своя (О. Гончар), where the identity of syntactic function of nominal positions on both parts leads to the

absence of the same lexical unit *дорога* in the second in order to avoid tautology. This mechanism of saving language means is widely used in the formation of comparative structures with the conjunction *a*. The identical nominal component of the second part can be converted into anaphora zero. As can be seen from the example, many other parts which are identical for both components may be transformed in the second part. The study of complex pre-comparative sentences proves that original principle of anaphora is their constitutive feature.

We give examples which are generally elementary both in terms of semantics and syntax positions. The comparative components perform the same functions in each of the parts. It is necessary to consider more complex cases of synonymic comparison. In the sentence [*Художник, бо ще сонце й росу не спило – вже в нього кінчився сеанс,*] *іди собі, Надько, гуляй до завтрашньої зорі, а він теж піде дивитись, як Роман порасться біля вуликів* (О. Гончар) the first part is framed as an imperative of persuasive expression, while the other has modal imperative. However, the presence of the particle *теж* in the second part of the complex construction warns about the similarity expressed in parts of the content. Thus, the first and second parts are not the same according to the type of structure, although it does not interfere the sentence to be semantically close. For example, *Надійка піде гуляти і я теж піду дивитися (= гуляти)*. The comparable component of the contest is formed as a subjective content. For the speaker *гуляння Надійки* is not the same with his own *гуляння*. His version *гуляння* is filled with a deep sense (he will observe Roman romping around hives) and Nadiya's *гуляння* (it doesn't matter what is it filled with) is less significant. Thus, we can speak about the presence of contextual synonymy components of comparable construction.

The analysis shows that the lexical and semantic content of a complex construction can form contrastive relations when synonymous predicate lexical units are contrasted with non-identical nominal spreaders, which, however, are characterized by relatedness to the same LSG. Moreover, most clearly expressed contrastive relations observed in structures where the comparative component is marked by the identity, and all other components are a part of the predicate group and characterized by the identity of syntactic functions in the sentence, the same lexical expression or anaphora presence in the second part. However, the observations show that synonymy of components can be both lexical and syntactic. It should be noted that the widespread complex sentences that fall under the synonymous principle of comparative structuring are those in which the synonymy comparative components is contextual.

Another wide-spread type of comparative constructions are those in which the comparison is based on the use of parts antonymic lexical units. This specificity of lexical-semantic filling of parts often becomes the factor that leads to the attribution of these sentences to constructive kind, that is not fully justified. The usage of antonyms as those associated correlated lexical units, also describing correlated participants of a certain state of things, does not deny the nature of the semantic comparison, as well as those formal, formal-semantic and semantic characteristics that are typical to the comparative kind of compound sentence with a conjunction *a*. So we may count constructions with of

antonymous comparative lexical units or their syntactic variants to the comparative constructions.

Contrastive relations between parts of a complex sentence, represented by the use of the phenomenon of antonymy, as in the case of synonymy of comparative components can be based on the fact that one of the components of the first part is antonym to one component of the second part, for example: *Осінь **збирає**, а весна **розсипає*** (Народна творчість), ***Вихваляють** царя і його ласки для українського народу, а гетьмана **зневажають*** (Б. Лепкий), or on the fact that the comparative components will be expressed in one part of a word, and in another by a syntactic equivalent of antonymic lexical unit, for example: or on the fact that the comparative components will be expressed in one part of a word, and in another by a syntactic equivalent of antonymic lexical unit, for example: *Майстер робив свою справу **швидко**, а хлопець **все натирав воском першу дошку*** (From the spoken language), where the part *все натирав воском першу дошку* in semantic terms expresses the opposite phenomenon to the concept of “швидко” Among expanded constructions are construction in which antonymic comparative units are not lexical units but the whole complex of words that only in the context acquire antonymous relationship. For example, in the sentence *[Якщо ж дощ захопив нас у степу, то, промоклі до рубця, ми в такий день маємо право гнати худобу додому раніше, бредемо в облиплх сорочечках, повертаючись, наче з битви,] матері нас **зустрічають перестрашено**, а ми тільки **сміємось**, збуджено ділимось щойно пережитим...* (О. Гончар) word combination *зустрічати перестрашено* has antonymy relation with the predicative lexical unit *сміятися*. Thus, a comparison based on antonymic ways of comparative components may be shown differently in terms of lexical expressions.

Antonymic comparative lexical units can mark actions, signs, situation, contrary to certain parameters, such as: *Вода була **холодна**, а повітря **аж пекуче*** (Б. Грінченко): *Тут, у цій частині Землі **смеркається**, а в іншій – **світає*** (Із підручника); *Життя в селі починалося **рано-вранці**, а закінчувалося **пізно***, [хоч і кажуть злі язика, що *лягають у селі разом із курми*] (В. Шевчук); *Петро **швидко** і **виходить**, а Полуботок **безпомічно падає** на подушку* (К. Буревій), where italicized lexical unit *встає* denotes different directions of movement (up-down); *[Вона **вийшла**, і вода з цебра **вилилась** їй на голову.] Сержога **плигав**, регочучи, до стелі, а пані **Ївга сіла** на свою лаву й **трусилась**, бо не мала в що **перевдягтися*** (В. Підмогильний), where italicized lexical units are opposed on the grounds of “movement – real estate”.

The comparison of the components may be shown in use in both parts of the same lexical unit, but in one part, it will have a negative particle *не*, which is a partial expression of comparison on the basis of antonymy, for example: *Звір **не соромиться** своєї дії, а людина **соромиться***; *[звір **прямо й чесно виявляє** себе, а людина **боягузливо ховається** за бундючними чуттями, за високими спонуками, за ідеями: вона **підліша за звіра**]* (В. Підмогильний). However, the following sentence in its semantic essence are opposite to the structures like that: *Ватра **не горіла**, а **курила** сизим тяжким димом* (О. Гончар), *Вона **не сподівалась**, а **чекала** того побачення* (Н. Неждана), where there is comparative features of the same subject, and the substitution available another feature available.

It is important to note that, formal structure construction parallel syntactic position of predicative parts are characterized by the usage of synonymous or anaphora lexical units which semantically related to antonyms in their composition. For example, in the sentence *Хлопець говорив **тихо**, а дівчина **голосно**, [ніби їй хотілося, щоб всі чули, що вона незадоволена]* (From the spoken language) *antonymic correlation of predicative lexical units enables the use of nominal positions of anaphor pronoun. These tools allow to avoid unwanted repetitions, making the expression more compact.*

Besides synonymous and antonymous comparative components, comparable relationship can be formed on the basis of hyponymy or vocabulary correlation of lexical units. So in a sentence [*Заболотний за звичкою й тут перекинувся кількома фразами з одним із юнаків, котрий, витираючи скло, похвалився, що дід його, походженням теж із Юкрейн, у пошуках кращої долі помандрував у світі*], (дід – М. Г.) **працював** із братами на тутешніх шахтах, **а батько будував** якраз оцю швидкісну трасу... (О. Гончар) underlined components are hyponyms to the common notion "робота". In such example as [*Уявляв собі цей гидкий образ,*] цю **комедію**, яку цар, мов у театрі, на глухівському майдані **виставив**, **а глухівці дивилися**, не розуміючи, що Москва насміхається над ними (Б. Лепкий) vocabulary correlated components are: *виставляти комедію / дивитися комедію*, denoting certain actions related to various theater participants. That's why we may say that these lexical unit belong to a common thematic field "theater".

According to the analysis of compound comparative structures, sentences of vocabulary correlated components constitute a significant part among sentences of this kind. May be it is determined by the fact that the formation of such sentences does not require additional effort from the speaker especially for finding correspondent components among synonyms or antonyms. In addition, very often the construction of such components does not require the evaluation criteria, and therefore often act as descriptions (location, environment, conditions etc.), For example: *Тут же біля неї продавалася терта кабака і тютюн у пашуках; а там – залізний товар: підкови, гвіздочки, сокири, підвіски, ухналі й усе, чого треба* (Г. Квітка-Основ'яненко); *Падав на сірі осінні кураї, а зараз сніги біліють, безкрая розлука біліє, хоч, здається, тільки б радіти, бо все найстрашніше нарешті минулося* (О. Гончар).

Interesting examples of comparative constructions are: *Не місце прикрашає людину, а людина місце* (Народна творчість); *Літа ніколи не повертаються до людини, а людина завжди повертається до своїх літ* (М. Стельмах), where lexical filling of parts are the same, but the second part acts like a mirror image of the first. Thus the rearranged component of the first part forms the comparative relation based at the same lexical units but in different parts performing different functions. This is due to the particular kind of rema-thematic division of the content of the first and second parts: one component that in the first part is rema, in the second part is a part of theme and vice versa, cf.: *Не місце^R прикрашає людину^T, а людина^R прикрашає місце^T; Літа^R ніколи не повертаються до людини^T, а людина^R завжди повертається до своїх літ^T*. It also affects the manner outlined words order. The additional means of actual division in such

structures is intonation, i.e. accented pronunciation of rema in each of the parts, i. e. the presence of dedicated rema.

The contrastive relationship can be formed on the basis of context-correlated lexical units, at the same time these components are differently associated with each other. For example, in the sentence *Яковлев, збуривши Старий і Новий Кодак, післав в оден бік підполковника Баріна і нашого полковника Кандибу, а в другий царського війська підполковника Башмакова, [щоб ловили й мордували де якого лиш стрінуть запорожця, мазепинця, одним словом, українця]* (Б. Лепкий) context-correlated forms are numerals (*один – другий*) the quality of which could potentially be limitless, for example: *Один їв, а другий спав, а третій ними поганяв* (Folk arts). In this case, the context-correlated units are lexical units denoting certain manifestations of multiple realities reality. Thus, a comparison can be formed with words *один – другий, перший – другий, один – інший, частина – решта* та ін. Thus, in the sentence *Частину козаків Хмельницький залишив на першому рукаві, куди вела стьожка від усього загону, а решту, заглибившись у плавні, розбив на дві частини і послав на крила, наказавши замаскуватись, щоб уранці й птахи не могли помітити серед очеретів коней і людей* (П. Панч) words *частина і решта* context-correlated, i.e. *частина = some, not all, решта = other, not all, but those who stayed*. The common to them is integrity relation (to all of them). У конструкції *Одну з склянок Альбіна Романівна випила сама, аіншою щедро полила сплячих, [які, мов ошпарені, позіскакували з ліжка]* (О. Миколайчук-Низовець) context-correlated lexical units are *один – інший*. For example in the sentence: *Триста товаришів стояли тут у залі пліч-о-пліч, триста танкістів, артилеристів, десантників, офіцерів і політпрацівників, а більше простого сержантського й рядового люду зустріли Івана та Уляну* (О. Довженко) the same context-correlated comparative unit is expressed in different way (*триста – більше = one part of the whole – the rest of the unit, which was even more*).

Another case of compound comparative structures where contextually correlated lexical units are available is a sentence where these two lexical units related to each other in meaning as a whole to the parts and vice versa, for example: *Андрій жартував, а серце його повнилося смутком* (Ю. Мушкетик); *Всі гуляють. А де ж Гонта? Чом він не гуляє? Чом не н'є з козаками? Чому не співає?* (Т. Шевченко); *...тоді полум'я стовпом шарахає вгору, обличчя робляться червоними, веселими, а брови майже в усіх руді, поприсмалювані* (Гр. Тютюнник).

The difference between the two cases is that in the first case the integrity (or the same gender relatedness) is not found in context, it is implicitly available content component (if there is a part, the other, another, the second, it must be the integrity, collection, number), and in the second case the integrity or same gender affiliation can be found at the lexical level.

The same type of structures should be counted those which the contextually correlated are temporal indicators, for example *ще... вже, колись... нині, сьогодні... завтра, зараз... потім, вранці... увечері* тощо. Constructions of this type are extremely common because the semantics of comparison is given by time-opposition. Formation of logically comparative content in a complex construction requires from the speaker to compare any

situation, among which he sees a definite connection. The only requirement for this is their proximity and the ability to set a minimum of two associative rows. In the case of the temporal component of the content one row is provided due to their presence, and the other is formed according to the speaker's wish. Thus, in the construction: **Час від часу** жінки обмінюються докорами між собою, поскаржаться льотчикові, що ця ось, борозенна, весь час заламує корінну, **а потім** і на нього перекинуться, [жартома стануть уявляти, як підкинуть комусь оце загіпсоване глиною "немовля", авоно потім, коли стане на ноги, опиниться в небі, та й забуде про них, хоч би, як знову літатиме, при нагоді записочку кинуло або крилом помахало над їхнім Синім Гаєм!] (О. Гончар) components with a time meaning provide the opportunity to a comparison of the actions of the participants in various time periods, which is consistent with the requirements that apply post-positive content parts. By the same principle the next sentence is built: **Буває, вона вечорами** читає льотчикові при вогнику блимавки когось із поетів, а коли він, знеможений, задрімне, ще й після того біля нього посидить, тихо чатуючи його сні, льотчицькі, фронтові, чи, може, ще довоєнні. **А вранці** потім запитає:

– По-якому то ви говорили вві сні? (О. Гончар).

У реченні ж **Сьогодні ти порушив клятву, а завтра кожен зрадить Батьківщину!** (О. Довженко) situations may be comparative under special circumstances, for example: **Ти порушив клятву, а всі зрадять Батьківщину**, but due to the introduction of temporal concretizations, the parts of situations can find the semantic extension that makes the expression quite logical and complete.

The same kind of lexical and semantic relatedness should be assigned the constructions which have existing local concretizations like **тут... там, попереду... позаду** тощо. As an interesting example we may demonstrate the next sentence: **Мати Софійчина та її сусідка, тітка Василина, нагнувшись повагом ідуть в упряжці, а ззаду** з санчат очей не зводить Софійка – де підсобить, підіпхне, а то просто стежить пильнує, щоб довготелесе, вмощене на збитих дошках "немовля" не випало із саней, коли їх десь занесе на ковзому (О. Гончар), where the position of one of the local concretization is substituted by the predicate and its spreader of manner action, for example: **повагом іти в упряжці** = **йти попереду**, which in this sense refers to the local index **ззаду** of the second part.

As has been stated in elementary comparable structures to reveal associative relationships between the components is in general a simple operation. It is much harder to identify series of lexical units in such structures as, **Революція заскочила була в село на конях, а нині тільки курява на далекому обрії** (М. Куліш), where the meaning of comparison, supported by structural scheme on the level of vocabulary needs additional means of its explication. In this example, there is only obvious contextual correlation of lexical unit, **в село – на обрії**, which are connected by the common thematic affiliation, such as locative meaning, while the other rows must be uncovered. Thus, the form of long-past time verb **заскочити** (**заскочила була**) in the first part can be correlated (and then opposed) with adverb **нині** in the second part. However, lexical units **революція і курява** cannot be correlated with any feature. This fact does not meet the requirements to formation comparative relations. In order to save the adverbial modifier of manner **на конях** is used in

the first part of the sentence, in which the presuppositions has the judgment “бір коней створює куряву”. Due to the detection of associative connection we may combine the first and second parts of a complex structure. Therefore, it satisfies the requirements of relevant content comparability and, in particular, by contextually correlated lexical units (була створила = колись створила / нині), for example: **Колись** революція на конях створила куряву в селі, **а нині** ця курява видніється тільки на обрії.

Formation comparative relation can occur under the circumstances of correlation of comparative components according to the degree of display of symptoms. Such a realization of relationship can display itself in different ways. One of the display is the comparison for completeness / incompleteness, desirability / undesirability, voluntary / involuntary of an action, represented by one of the predicative complex construction.

In particular, the following types of comparative are displayed in structures, where the first part of lexical unit is imperfective verb, and the second – perfective verb completeness / incompleteness, in one part the verbal lexical unit has modal desirability that points to another irreal / real result or display of action, status process. For example, in the sentence *Рабіндраната Тагора **сподівається** читати в оригіналі, **мріялося** чути музику різних мов, хай то навіть найдальші мови світу, **а натомість доводиться** ось тут слухати тужливу мову вітру, [що ночами так тривожно гуде в димарі й торгоче віконницею]* (О. Гончар) such components are correlated *сподівається читати, мріялося чути* (modal desirability of action, expressed by personal verbs) with *доводиться слухати* (modal involuntary). The predicative lexical units of parts of the construction, which are almost identical (synonyms) in the meaning can vary according to the degree of the display of symptoms action i.e. they may be accompanied by auxiliary lexical units that indicate incomplete action, as in the sentence *Співають було на буряках дівчата, а я їм допомагаю* (І. Ле), where the components *було співають* і *допомагаю співати* are identical by the main meaning, but they are different according to the degree of participants' activity, as *допомагаю співати* is identical to the lexical unit *підспівувати*. On the basis of this difference in semantics comparative constructions are built. Under the circumstances that the second participant carried out the identical (same) effect, the possibility of comparative relation would disappeared, for example: ***Співають було** на буряках дівчата, **а я співаю** і *Співають було на буряках дівчата, а я співаю аж заливаюся*.

An important feature of the complex syntax constructions with comparative relation between their parts is that the comparison is based on finding out the similarity or dissimilarity (until the complete opposite) of two different realities of reality. This is a precondition for proper construction of comparative design. The only exception is the construction of identical components subject in the first and second parts, at the same time in the second part it is represented by anaphora lexical unit – reflexive pronoun *сам*, for example: *Бурхливим морем налітала **пісня** на стінки, підхоплювала їх шаленим виром, трощила на шматки, **а сама** рвалась в обійми ночі; **Він** гладив, тискав ті ручки, ворушив ними, **а сам** палав, як багаття, робився млявим, нездатним до мислення (обидва – В. Підмогильний), **Маковейчик** передає команди Брянського, **а сам** думає, закликає, щоб знову де-небудь не порвало кабель* (О. Гончар). Such

structures are close to connecting compound sentences, for example: *Бурхливим морем налітала **нісня** на стінки, підхоплювала їх шаленим виром, трощила на шматки і рвалась в обійми ночі; **Він** гладив, тискав ті ручки, ворушив ними і палав, як багаття, робився млявим, нездатним до мислення, **Маковейчик** передає команди Брянського і думає, закликає, щоб знову де-небудь не порвало кабель.* However, with the exclusion of the comparative relation index from sentence the related semantics disappears. Due to the formal index and the use of reflexive pronouns two states of the same speaker are represented at the same time. This meaning enriches the semantics of expression. So, for example, in the first sentence of the matching forms such semantics: *ніч тікає з одних лещат, а потрапляє в інші*; in the second and third – the outward and internal displays of human feelings are opposed to, they serve as an indication of the versatility of these plans, their simultaneous, parallel flow.

So, one of the most important factors in creating comparative meaning in the structure of complex syntactic structures are lexical-semantic formation of their predicative parts. The peculiarity of which was determined by the presence of both thematically correlated predicative and non-predicative lexics.

Література

1. Вихованець І. Р. Граматика української мови : синтаксис / І. Р. Вихованець. – К. : Либідь, 1993. – 368 с.
2. Загнітко А. П. Український синтаксис : [науково-теоретичний і навчально-практичний комплекс] / А. П. Загнітко. – К. : ІЗМН, 1996. – Ч. 2 : [навч. посібник]. – 240 с.
3. Гуйванюк Н. В. Формально-семантичні співвідношення в системі синтаксичних одиниць / Н. В. Гуйванюк. – Чернівці : Рута, 1999. – 336 с.
3. Ломакович С. В. Роль лексики у формуванні змісту складного речення / С. В. Ломакович // Лінгвістичні дослідження. Наук. вісник.– Харків : ХДПУ, 1997. – Вип. 3. – С. 149–153.
4. Крейдлин Г. Е., Падучева Е. В. Значение и синтаксические свойства союза *a* / Г. Е. Крейдлин, Е. В. Падучева // Научно-техническая информация. Серия 2 : информационные процессы и системы. – 1974. – № 10. – С. 32–37.
5. Корельская Т. Д., Падучева Е. В. Трансформации в симметрических конструкциях : сочинение и эллипсис / Г. Е. Крейдлин, Е. В. Падучева. – Научно-техническая информация. Серия 2 : информационные процессы и системы. – 1973. – № 9. – С. 29–38.