

4.2 Sentences of the phraseologized structure and new processes in syntax

CHAPTER 4.2.1

Sentences of the phraseologized structure: formal organization, features

The research of Ukrainian linguists led to the resolution of the issue of the status of syntactically non-segmented sentences: they are full-fledged communicative units with their inherent sentence nature, which are correlated with formal-grammatical sentences. Syntactically non-segmented sentences can be combined with simple sentences or be included in the structure of compound complex, or non-conjunctive sentences.

In Ukrainian linguistics syntactically non-segmented sentences are considered in the simple sentence system. According to I. Vykhovanets, non-segmented sentences are one of the structural types of simple sentences, which are distinguished «by the formal features of the predicative center» (Vykhovanets 1993, p. 67). Defining syntactically non-segmented sentences as the periphery of a simple sentence, K. Shulzhuk clarifies that they «are outside the boundaries of two-syllable and one-syllable» (Shulzhuk 2004, p. 138) However, he takes into account only one type of non-segmented sentences – word-sentences and agrees with those researchers who believe that the term «non-segmented sentence» «to a greater extent reflects their syntactic nature, since they can also consist of combinations of words» (Shulzhuk 2004, p. 138).

Other researchers of the grammar of the Ukrainian language did not single out syntactically non-segmented sentences.

So, two views on syntactically non-segmented constructions have been formed in linguistics:

1. Broad, according to which syntactically non-segmented sentences are «substitutes», equivalents of sentences, because they are characterized by uncertainty and abstractness of semantics, morphological «formlessness», unclear implementation

of modal-temporal meaning, functional limitation (Dudyk 1972, p. 286–303; Ivanova 1980, p. 19; Shulzhuk 2004, p. 138).

2. Non-segmented constructions are sentence structures; a specific structural type that completes the system of simple sentences in the language (Vykhovanets 1993, p. 67). This approach is basic in linguistic-Ukrainian studies, so our study is based on it.

There is no established definition of a syntactically non-segmented sentence in the linguistic literature. This is due to the fact that their study in Ukrainian linguistics in the 20th century was limited to only one type – words-sentences (Dudyk 1972, p. 286–303; Dudyk 1973, p. 212–263; Karanska 1992, p. 156–159; Vykhovanets 1993, p. 100–102). P. Dudyk singled out the types of word-sentences, proposed their general characteristics (Dudyk 1973, p. 212–263). In our opinion, the term «sentence words» does not accurately reflect the essence of syntactically non-segmented sentences. First, because a word-sentence, or one-word sentence, in the direct meaning of this word can be any two-syllable incomplete or one-syllable sentence. Secondly, syntactically non-segmented sentences themselves do not always consist of only one word. P. Dudyk presented among the sentence-words such stable compounds that are closer to the concept of «sentence» than to the concept of «word», that is, they are not monosyllabic. For example: *Отак-то діло! Воно й правда! Та ну його! Оце тобі маєш! Що буде, то буде! Доброго ранку! Бувайте здорові!*

I. Vykhovanets and K. Shulzhuk used the term «non-segmented syntactic units» to define sentence words, expanded the set of means of their expression due to particles, modal words and exclamations (Vykhovanets 1993, p. 100; Shulzhuk 2004, p. 138). M. Karanska proposed to call a non-segmented sentence «a word or a constant word combination that is characterized by a predicate category of modality, which gives them the communicative function of a sentence» (Karanska 1992, p. 139). However, the inclusion of the concept of «fixed word combination» among the words-sentences is unmotivated. It is not clear according to which linguistic laws a fixed phrase is transformed from a nominative unit into a communicative unit and whether all fixed phrases that «have a predicate category of modality» should be considered non-

segmented sentences. By qualifying a non-segmented sentence as a word, M. Karanska actually explains the essence of sentence words.

We do not agree with the opinion of those linguists who called non-segmented syntactic constructions words-sentences. Some linguists the name «word-sentences», which consist of only one word or an indecomposable word combination, does not follow from their semantic and syntactic nature, «word-sentences», which consist of only one word or an indecomposable word combination, but is a rather conventional designation, the basis of which is purely quantitative definition – «sentence from one word».

In our research, we are not limited to just words-sentences. Syntactically non-segmented sentences are also represented by phraseologized sentences, diverse in their specific characteristics.

The definition of any concept is based on a certain set and its qualifying features. Based on these features, we distinguish two types of syntactically non-segmented sentences.

P. Dudyk emphasized the peculiarity of non-segmented sentences: from a syntactic point of view, they do not have a sentence structure, any members, are not extended with the help of explanatory words; from the functional-content – due to syntactic dismemberment, they do not express the meaning of the differentially expressed subject and object of action, various signs, quantities, etc. (Dudyk 1972, p. 290). Syntactic division in such syntactic constructions is impossible or complicated by the fact that syntactic connections between components are either absent or veiled.

Syntactically non-segmented sentences cannot be classified as formal-grammatical sentences on the basis of their important categorical property – non-segmenting.

Syntactically non-segmented sentences are communicative units, but their informative value is determined only in close connection with the context. Without connection to the relevant context, they have no communicative power. From the communicative point of view, such sentences do not belong to formal-grammatical

sentences, as they are not related to relative semantic self-sufficiency in isolated use and communicative delineation.

Non-segmented syntactic constructions are formed in the process of regular speech use. It is in speech that their special semantics and structure are formed, the main features are established: stability, structural-semantic integrity, reproducibility. Syntactically non-segmented sentences often function in dialogic speech, accompanying grammatically articulated two-syllable and one-syllable sentences, and are determined by their content.

Properly non-segmented sentences as one of the types of syntactically non-segmented sentences are sufficiently studied (Dudyk 1972, p. 286–303; Dudyk 1973, p. 212–263; Kushch 2002; Dudyk 2009). Summarizing the results of the research, we will highlight the following main features of these sentences: semantic limitation (predictability), reproducibility, conventionality and expressiveness (for certain types).

Phraseologized sentences are more specific non-segmented syntactic constructions. The specificity is evidenced by their appearance: under the influence of phraseologisation, the syntactic construction loses its usual syntactic motivation and articulation, undergoes lexical and morphological merging of the syntactic model, acquires a secondary syntactic function. There is a loss of semantic, paradigmatic, syntagmatic completeness of non-phraseologized syntactic constructions, which undergo deformation, turning into secondary language units, acquiring a secondary form and secondary meaning.

The main features of phraseologized sentences are stability, structural-semantic integrity, idiomaticity, reproducibility, emotionality and expressiveness. These features of phraseologized sentences are a certain projection of the features inherent in phraseology.

In scientific usage, two main definitions of phraseologized sentences are established. Linguists defined phraseologized sentences as constructions «with individual relationships of components and with individual semantics». In such sentences, word forms are related to each other idiomatically, official and pronoun words, «particles and exclamations do not function according to valid syntactic rules»

Such units «...are not built according to living, valid rules in the language, but are isolated structures – traces of once free and easily articulated constructions».

In linguo-Ukrainian studies, we have defined a phraseologized sentence as a syntactically non-segmented unit formed according to a stable structural scheme, characterized by a fixed order of its components and individual semantics that is idiomatic.

Summarizing the definitions of syntactically non-segmented constructions given in the linguistic literature, we propose to consider it a *syntactic non-predicative unit expressed by a word or a combination of words, correlated with a logical judgment – directly/indirectly or conveying the speaker's attitude to someone, something or emotional reaction, grammatically non-segmented, not reproducing the structural schemes of a formal grammatical sentence, performing a communicative function*. A syntactically disjointed sentence is characterized by such qualifying features as syntactic disjointness, stability, structural and semantic integrity, idiomaticity (for a particular type and certain kinds) and reproducibility.

4.2.1.1 Phraseochems of syntactically non-segmented constructions

By choosing a particular syntactic structure (structural scheme), the speaker simultaneously chooses a speech and thought trajectory for the flow of his or her linguistic consciousness. He demonstrates his attitude to what is happening, to the participants of the speech, assigns them certain speech roles, i.e. chooses the way of presenting the denotative situation. According to N. Arutyunova, this does not contradict the identification of logical and syntactic schemes, which is the basis for the distinction of sentences of different types (Arutyunova 1976, p. 357). The linear unfolding of speech according to a conventional scheme is part of the semantic program of utterance generation provided by syntax. Linguists notes that «the grammatical organization of a sentence ... is in itself an important factor for the semantic structure of a sentence that is built according to a certain scheme», that is, the structural scheme of a certain type of sentence expresses a certain semantics, and the semantics has a linguistic expression in the canonical form.

The tectonics of an utterance is a consequence of how the speaker sees the situation, how he divides it, it is part of the speech act, and is subject to the laws of distribution of meanings across different linguistic units, i.e., to the laws of semantics.

The researchers emphasize that the process of sentence formation begins with the speaker's desire to communicate a thought to a real or potential interlocutor. Therefore, the speaker chooses the necessary structural scheme of the sentence, which is determined by the degree of division of the thought, fills this scheme with the necessary vocabulary and actualizes this or that structural and semantic component of the sentence». The researcher points to the existence of congruence between the tectonics of syntactic constructions and their linguistic meaning.

4.2.1.1.1 Phrase diagrams of syntactically non-segmented constructions: non-phraseologized and phraseologized types

The concept of a structural scheme has been interpreted differently in linguistics. Focusing either on the form or on the semantics of the sentence, researchers have defined it as a structural minimum, a structural basis or a model of the sentence. In order to avoid disagreements in the interpretation of the structural scheme, linguists proposed to consider two sets of structures: the first set of structures she called minimal schemes, the second - extended schemes. The researchers covered not only the formal organization of the sentence as a predicative unit, but also its semantic structure, i.e., she took into account the actual grammatical and informative sufficiency of the sentence.

H. Shvedova included in the structural scheme of the sentence only the predicative center – the component/components that are directly related to the expression of predicativity. She pointed out the grammatical sufficiency of the structural scheme and defined it as «a syntactic pattern that has its own formal organization and its own linguistic meaning and according to which a separate uncommon (elementary) sentence can be built» (Grammar 1980, p. 84).

V. Beloshapkova has noted that the minimum of a sentence – the predicative center – does not always form a real sentence in which the obligatory positions are

lexically filled, cf: $N_1 V_f$. According to her, minimal structural schemes are the result of high abstraction, because they «contain only such components that are not conditioned by adverbial relations, are completely free from fixing the facts of word combinability and testify only to the specifics of the syntactic organization of the sentence» (Beloshapkova 1978, p. 59), while extended schemes testify to a lower degree of abstraction. Thus, both interpretations of the scope of the structural scheme complement each other.

Many linguists (Admoni 1955, pp. 103–104; Lomtev 1972, p. 26; Arutyunova 1976, p. 7; Ivanitskaya 1986, p. 252; Andersch 1987, p. 50) have pointed out the obligatory informative sufficiency of the sentence structure, i.e., all informatively obligatory extenders of the sentence are obligatory components of the structure.

The formation of syntactically unmembered sentences does not correspond to the linguistic traditions of building grammatical sentences, because they are formed according to a specific structural scheme.

The formation of actual non-segmented sentences of the non-phraseologized type, or word-sentences, does not rely on a special, defined structural scheme. The absence of a structural scheme for these sentences is motivated by their nature. Such non-membered sentences are formed mostly by a single component, which is limited in lexical and grammatical terms. Structural single-place components of word-sentences are particles, modal words and interjections. Word-sentences do not express syntactic relations and semantic-syntactic relations.

Non-integral sentences of the phraseologized type are formed on the basis of a stable (connected) structural scheme consisting of three components that are syntactically related to each other. None of the components of such sentences can be used without the other: such components are combined on the basis of relations of interdependence and interdependence.

The stable structural scheme of phraseologized sentences has components of two levels: constant, unchanging, and variable. The specificity of the actual non-membered sentences of the phraseological type is the use of repeated variable components of different morphological expression in their structure. There are always two such

components. Most of the time, the repeated components are expressed by a noun in the nominative case.

The stability of the formal organization of one of the types of phraseologized sentences with tautological components is reflected in the constant unchanging structural components expressed by individual lexemes. Variation of the fixed component is impossible.

Constants expressed by an analytical lexeme can be single or paired. In a phrase scheme, single permanent components mostly occupy interposition in relation to repeated components, less often – preposition, and paired components – pre-interposition. Mandatory components are characterized by a clearly defined positional anchoring, certain lexical and grammatical restrictions compared to optional components.

4.2.1.1.2 Component of structural schemes of semi-phraseologized sentences

Semi-phraseologized sentences are formed on the basis of a stable (connected) structural scheme consisting of two or more components that are syntactically connected.

The informative sufficiency of semi-phraseologized sentences is ensured by informative obligatory extenders, but they are not included in the minimum stable structural scheme. Their role is played by subject components expressed by the grammar of the dative or genitive prepositional case, temporal or locative determiners.

In terms of structure, stable patterns of semi-phraseologized sentences can be simple and complex.

Semi-phraseologized sentences are formed on the basis of a stable (connected) structural scheme consisting of two or more components that are syntactically connected.

The informational sufficiency of semi-phraseologized sentences is ensured by informationally obligatory extenders, but they are not included in the minimum stable structural scheme. Their role is played by subject components expressed by the grammar of the dative or genitive prepositional case, temporal or locative determiners.

In terms of structure, stable schemes of semi-phraseologized sentences can be simple and complex.

In semi-phraseologized clauses, permanent components are «a frozen form that has broken away from the paradigm of a particular word and has lost its lexical or categorical meanings to some extent» (Shvedova 1958, p. 93). D. Shmelev emphasized that in such constructions «the meaning of the reference words is shifted» (Shmelev 1976, p. 134). The role of permanent components is played by reinterpreted words or word combinations that participate in the formation of such features of a phraseologized sentence as grammatical and lexical-semantic disjointedness, idiomaticity and integrity of meaning.

Fixed and variable components of a stable scheme of semi-phraseologized sentences form a special structure – a phraseological non-decomposable complex. Constant components are expressed by particles, interjections, or desemanticized full words. Variable components have different part-of-speech expressions, but their grammatical form is clearly defined and unchanged. An indecomposable complex is formed mainly by two or more elements.

According to the number and morphological expression of fixed and variable components, semi-phraseological sentence complexes can be: *two-, three-, four- and five-place*.

1. *Two-place phrase complexes include five types:*

a) adjectival-noun phrases, the fixed component of which is the partially desemanticized adjectival lexeme good, the variable component is expressed by a noun – the name of a creature, e.g.: *Добрий дуректор!*;

b) exclamatory-noun, in which the permanent exclamatory component of the verbal nature is the verb think, used in the frozen grammatical form - second person singular future tense, the variable component is a noun of any lexical-semantic group, e.g.: *Подумаєш, товариш!*; *Подумаєш, книга!*; *Подумаєш, історія!*;

c) partial noun, as a permanent component of which the singular particles which (which, which, which); here (here, here) or derivational particles what; what for (what is that); where there (here); what there (here); which (which, which, which) there (here)

are used, the variable noun component is the name of a creature or an abstract name, e.g.: *Який там начальник!; Ото радість!; Що то за парубок!; Що там гроші!*;

d) partial infinitive, whose fixed analytical component is the derivational particles *what's there (here)* and *where's there (here)*, the variable component is expressed by an imperfective verb, mostly represents a group of verbs with the meaning of speech and thinking activity, sight, hearing, etc., e. g.: *Що тут думати!; Куди там бачити!*;

d) partial adverbial; its fixed component is a particle of pronoun nature which, the variable component is expressed by an indicative adverb, e.g.: *Яке далеко!*

2. Triple phrase complexes formed from two fixed components and one variable component. They include:

a) verb-pronoun-pronoun phrases such as *I listened (was afraid)...*, the fixed component of which is expressed by a verb lexeme in a fixed grammatical form-past tense masculine singular – and the pronoun noun *I*, used in a fixed grammatical form – nominative singular, the variable component is the pronoun noun *you (you)* in the accusative case, e.g.: *Слухав я його!; Боявся я їх!*;

b) verb-pronoun-infinitives such as *There is someone (what, what, to whom, why, on what, with whom, what, on whom, on what)...*; *There is no one (what, to whom, why, in what, with whom, what, on whom, on what)...*, the fixed components of which are the verbal lexeme *is* and the pronoun noun expressed by the indirect case grammar, the variable components are expressed by the infinitives of verbs from the lexical and semantic groups of speech, observation, human condition, etc, e.g.: *Є кому їсти; Є з ким поговорити; Нема в що збирати;*

c) verb-adverb-infinitive patterns *There is where (from, when, where)...*; *There is no where (from, when, where)...*, the fixed components of which are the verbal lexeme and the pronoun adverb, the variable component is the verb infinitive, mostly with the meaning of a specific physical action, e.g.: *Є куди поїхати; Нема коли піти;*

d) verb-pronoun-infinitive complexes such as *There was whom (what, to whom, why, by whom, with whom, what, with whom, on what)* and *Found at whom (what, to whom, why, by whom, with whom, what, with whom, on what)*, the fixed components of which are the verbal lexeme *was* or *went* in the past tense form and a pronoun noun

expressed by a grammar grammar of the indirect case, the variable component is the infinitive of a verb of any lexical and semantic group, e. g. *Було чого поїхати!; Знайшов про що говорити!*

d) bi-pronoun-noun (pronoun) such as *What to me (you, him, her, us, you, them)*, which uses pronoun nouns as its fixed components: that, expressed by a grammar grammar of the nominative case, and *I (you, he, she, we, you, they)* – by a grammar grammar of the dative case, the variable component is expressed by a noun – mostly the name of a person - in the form of the nominative or genitive case, rarely by a pronoun, e.g.: *Що мені люди!; Що мені до Василя!; Що їм до батька!; Що мені до вас!;*

e) bi-particular noun pattern *That's so...*, the fixed components of which are the particles that and so, devoid of the grammatical meaning of indicative and affirmative, the variable component is expressed mostly by an abstract noun, e. g.: *Оце так радість!; Оце так зустріч!;*

e) bi-particular noun (adjectival) such as *From and...*, the fixed components of which are the particles from and and, the particle from is partially grammaticalized; the variable components are nouns – names of beings or abstract names or qualitative adjectives, e.g.: *От і книга!; От і вечір!; От і поганий!;*

f) bipartite verb phrases such as *And you (w)...*; *So am I...*; the specificity of phrase complexes is the particles a and too in combination with pronoun particles in clearly defined grammatical forms: *you – nominative case, me – dative case*; the variable component is expressed by a verb in the past tense singular or plural, e.g.: *А ти говорив!; Теж мені здивували!;*

f) verb-pronoun-infinitive pattern *I'll go...*, the fixed components of which are the partially desemanticized verb form *I'll go* and the pronoun noun *I*, the variable component is expressed by the infinitive of the verb only in the imperfective form, e. g.: *Піду я робити!;*

g) bi-adverbial-verb like *It was very necessary!*, which is characterized by lexically and grammatically frozen forms of fixed and variable components: only the

adverbs very much and necessary and the past tense neuter form of the verb-conjunction be;

h) the conjunction-pronoun-verb pattern *To me (you, he, she, we, you, they)...*, the specificity of the phrase complex is the grammaticalized conjunction *to* and the pronoun noun *I (you, he, she, we, you, they)* in the nominative case, the variable component is expressed by a verb in the past tense singular or plural, e. g: *Щоб я та говорила!*

k) exclamatorily-pronominally-nominal, for example, *Ах ти.., Ех ти..*, the specificity of phraseological complexes is the exclamations *ах* чи *ех* in combination with the pronominal noun *ти* in the form of the nominative case, the position of the variable component is mostly filled by nouns denoting persons with a negative evaluative value , e.g.: *Ах ти гад!; Ех ти негідник!*

l) exclamatorily-partially-nominal, for example, *Ах ти.., Ех ти..*, constant components are expressed by single exclamations *ох, ех, ух, ну* and the conjunction particle *і (ї)*, the variable component is expressed by a noun of any lexical-semantic group, e.g.: *Ох і картина!; Ех і дівчина!; Ну й темрява!*

m) exclamatorily-partially-verbal, for example, *Ох і.., Ех і.., Ух і.., Ну й..*; single exclamations *ох, ех, ух, ну* and the participle *і (ї)* are used as invariable components, the variable component is a verb lexeme, e.g.: *Ох і сніває!; Ух і біє!; Ох і дощить!; Ех і вдарило!*

3) *four-seater*; phraseological complexes create three mandatory constant and one variable components:

a) nominally-partially-prepositionally-nominal of a pattern *...не до..*; the two-element permanent component includes participle and preposition; variable components, left- and right-sided, expressed by noun lexemes; e.g.: *Максиму не до балачок*;

b) pronominally-conjunctively-partially-nominal (pronominal), for example, *Хто (кого, у кого, для кого, кому, з ким, на кому), як не..*, the invariable components of which are the pronominal *хто* in the form of nominative and indirect cases, the conjunction *як* the participle *не*, the variable component is expressed by a noun - the

name of a creature, its own or a general one, rarely - a pronoun; the specificity of the phraseological complex is the correlation of the grammatical forms of the constant and variable components, e.g.: *Хто, як не батько; Кого, як не тебе;*

c) verbally-pronominally-adverbially-infinitival, for example, *Є мені де (коли, куди, звідки)...*, the invariable components of which are the verbal lexeme *є*, the dative form of the pronoun *я* and the pronominal adverb, the variable component is the infinitive of the verb, mostly with the meaning of a specific physical action, speech-thinking activity, etc., e. g.: *Є мені коли думати!;*

d) verbally- bipronominally- infinitival, for example, *Є мені кого (кому, з ким, на кому, що, чого, чому, через що, про що, (з) чим, на чому)...*, the invariable components of which are the verb lexeme *є* and two pronominal nouns: the first *мені* in the form of the dative case, the second - in the form of the indirect cases; the variable component is expressed by the infinitive of a verb mostly with the meaning of a specific physical action, e. g.: *Є мені з чим жити!;*

e) verbally-partially-conjunctively-infinitival of a pattern *Немає (нема) того, щоб...*, the invariable components of which are the verb form *немає (нема)*, the pronominal noun *ти* in the form of the genitive case and the conjunction *щоб*, the variable component is the infinitive of the verb, e. g. : *Немає того, щоб перевірити!;*

f) partially-pronominally-partially-nominal, for example, *Чим я (ти, він, вона, воно, ми, ви, вони) не...*, the invariable components of which are the pronominal participle *чим*, the pronominal noun *я (ти, він, вона, воно, ми, ви, вони)* in the form of the nominative case and the participle *не*, the variable component is mostly a noun with the meaning of a person, e. g.: *Чим я не козак!; Чим вони не люди!;*

g) partially- pronominally-partially-verbal of a pattern *Так я (ти, він, вона, ми, ви, вони) й...*, for example: *Так ми й почули!*

h) a three-partially nominal, for example, *От тобі й...*, the invariable components of which are the de-semanticized particle *от*, the pronominal participle *тобі* and the conjunction participle *й*, the variable component is expressed by a noun, e.g.: *От тобі й слава!;*

i) a three-partially nominal *Ось вам і ...*, e. g.: *Ось вам і сюрприз!*

j) a three-partially verbal *От тобі й ...*, e. g.: *От тобі й маєш!*

k) *Мало що (хто, чого) там...; Мало де (коли, куди, звідки) там...; Хоч би тобі...; Мало що там сказав! Хоч би тобі подумав!*

bipartially-infinitival *Мало що (хто, чого) там ...*, the invariable components of which are the verbal lexeme and the pronominal adverb, the variable component is the infinitive of a verb mostly with the meaning of a specific physical action, e. g.: *Мало що там думати!*

l) biparticiply-pronounly -verbal *Чого б (же) я ...*, e. g.: *Чого б я мовчав!*
biparticiply pronounly

m) exclamatorily-partially-pronounly-nominal *Ох (вже) цей мені ...; Ах цей мені ...*, e. g.: *Ох цей мені хлопець!*

4) five-seater; partially-pronominally-verbal of the sample *А то ми не...*; the phraseological complex is formed by a four-element invariable component of a partially pronominal nature and a variable verbal component, e. g.: *А то ми не виконали!*

Syntactically indecomposable compounds may include optional components, mostly particles or pronouns. Permanent components can be single-element, in particular expressed by an adjectival lexeme, such as: *Добрий (добра, добре, добрі) ...: Добрий послушник! Цур їм таким послушникам ...* (І. Нечуй-Левицький) or a derived participle, such as: *Що то ..., Що то за ..., Що там ..., Який (яка, яке, які) там ..., Куди там, Де там тощо: Що там гроші! Що то за день!*

Variable components of the syntactic scheme of semi-phraseologized sentences are grammatical forms of full-meaning words that are filled with semantically relevant lexemes, in particular, enable their partial lexical-grammatical membership.

The permanent and changing components of the structural scheme are connected by syntactic connection and form a syntactically indecomposable complex. Syntactic connectedness as a defining feature of sentences of a phraseological structure implies the internal compatibility of the grammatical forms of the components of the structural scheme and determines the broad lexical-grammatical potentials of the dependent variable components. For example: «*Та чекай, Шу! Чого ти така пихата? Це я*

*зізнаюся у дурному смакові...» – «Ах ти ж гад!» (Л. Денисенко); А Чумак, ніби між іншим, докинув пального у вогнище. – **Та що там деталі!** Он треба за тракторами людей посилати, сім машин занаряджено (Ю. Збанацький).*

Changeable dependent components have different part-language expressions – from nouns, verbs as the most active meaningful parts of speech to adjectives, adverbs, particles, etc. Mostly, dependent components are expressed by a noun in the nominative case form.

Variation of one of the components of the phraseologized scheme of semi-phraseologized sentences is strictly limited and can be traced in case of the obligatory component expression by two or three elements. Despite the maximum degree of dismemberment in some types of semi-phraseological sentences, there are changes in the formal organization. Variations form grammatical, in particular case, genitive and numerical forms of the pronominal, less often, adjectival component. This is especially clearly represented in phraseological schemes *добрий (добра, добре, добрі); який (яка, яке, які) там; де мені (тобі, йому, їй, нам, вам, їм); куди мені (тобі, йому, їй, нам, вам, їм); що мені (тобі, йому, їй, нам, вам, їм); є кого (кому, з ким, на кому, що, чого, на що, чому, з чим, на чому); нема (немає) кого (кому, з ким, на кому, що, чого, на що, чому, з чим, на чому); чим я (ти, він, вона, воно, вони, ми, ви) не; ох вже цей (ця, це, ці) мені; ах цей (ця, це, ці) вже мені; хто кого (у кого, для кого, кому, з ким, на кому)*. Наприклад: – *Та то якийсь послушник побіг до келій, – говорив один чоловік. – Еге! **Добрий послушник!** Цур їм таким послушникам...* (І. Нечуй-Левицький); – *...Що тобі, доню? – Нічого, мамо, нічого! – **Де вже там нічого!** Журиш ти мене дочко!* (Марко Вовчок); *Гріх мовити таке про князя. Справді має хворі очі. – **Та що мені до його очей!*** (П. Загребельний); *Деві. Якби ви почули, як стане дядько правити про бали, комедії та всякі маскаради, що він набачив на світах. **Ото є про що послухать!*** (Леся Українка); *А потім я йду нічним містечком, я знову самотній і майже щасливий, якби не припухлість правої руки. Моя стрижена голова є вінцем творіння. Я сміливий і зухвалий, мов Бельмондо. Мене чекає солодка нагорода. І вино, і чисті простирадла, і тіло жінки – легке, мов тростинка, глибоке, мов*

колодязь. **Чим я не Адам!** (Ю. Андрухович); **Ах цей вже мені хлоп!** Він мусить провчити його (Н. Рибак).

The obligatory changeable component is represented by morphological forms that are characterized by a full or partial lexical-grammatical and morphological paradigm. From the point of view of the degree of phraseologisation, this component of a semi-phraseologized sentence is a less formalized element of the syntactic structure. It is characterized by grammatical limitations, but it has high variability in lexical terms.

A stable (connected) structural scheme of phraseologized syntactic constructions is determined by the possibility / impossibility of the distribution of the supporting component by dependents. The internal connectivity between the components of the stable structural scheme of the phraseologised sentence is determined by the order of location of the supporting permanent component relative to the dependent. Internal strong conjugation is found in: a) prepositional, e. g.: – *Пам'ятаю, дисертацією ти хвалився ... Конфузливо відмахуючись, Обух почервонів з досади. – **Яка там дисертація!*** (Ю. Збанацький); b) interpositional location of a constant component, e.g.: – *А чому ж ні? Людина є людина* (О. Гончар). Internal weak conjunctiveness can be traced in the mixed position – prepositional-interpositional location – of the constant component, such as: – *Краще жартувати, аніж хорувати, – затям собі теє, Василю. – **Тільки мого сміху, що з тобою*** (Б. Лепкий).

A syntactically indecomposable complex in the structure of a semi-phraseologized sentence makes syntactic division of its components impossible. For example: – *Хабар? – суворо насупив брови Гнат і показав ногою на кошик. – **Який там хабар, голубчику!** На базарі купила* (Г. Тютюнник); – *Приставайте й ви до нас! – промовив до неї Радюк дуже весело. – **Куди вже мені тепер співать!*** (І. Нечуй-Левицький). Formal characteristics of communicative meanings in the following sentences – «*Не хабар*», «*Тепер не співать*» testify to a formal understanding of the subject status of the lexeme «bribe» and the predicate status of the lexeme «sing» in phraseologized sentence formations.

Free lexical variation of some structural components of stable schemes of semi-phraseologized sentences makes it possible to consider them as units of language and

speech. Optional components expand the structure of semi-phraseologized sentences, but the distribution of their stable schemes is limited.

4.2.1.1.3 The specifics of structural schemes of partially phraseologized sentences

A stable structural scheme of partially phraseologized sentences has its own specifics. It is a combination of a specific word or indecomposable unit located in the main part of the sentence with a conjunction that begins its second part. In the prepositive part of the structural scheme, there can be a separate noun, verb or adverb lexeme or an indecomposable unit. An invariant component of a partially conjunctive or conjunctive nature performs a double function: the final part of the permanent component and a means of expressing specific semantic-syntactic relations. In the role of a constant component, the opposite conjunctions «but», «and» (with the meaning «but») are used, which are specialized means of expressing permissive-opposite relations, or subordinating conjunctions «like», «to», «when». With their help, the following structural schemes of partially phraseologized sentences were created: 1) *noun (infinitive, verb, adverb) + particle that + noun (infinitive, verb, adverb), and (but, and)...* (N_1 (Inf, V_f , Adv) then N_1 (Inf, V_f , Adv), and (but, and)...); 2) *noun (infinitive, verb, adverb) + particle not + noun (infinitive, verb, adverb), but (only, but)...* (N_1 (Inf, V_f , Adv) not N_1 (Inf, V_f , Adv), but (only, but)...); 3) *noun in the form of the nominative case + noun in the form of the instrumental case, a...; N_1 + N_5 , and...;* 4) *enough (enough only, enough only) (was) + infinitive (noun or quantitative noun compound, pronoun, verb, adjective or adverbial lexeme), as (what, to, and)...;* 5) *it hasn't passed + a temporal lexeme, as (so as not to)...;* 6) *did not pass and + temporal lexeme, as (in order not to) ...;* 7) *did not pass + temporal lexeme, so as not to...;* 8) *for that and ..., so that...;* 9) *that he (she, it, they) and..., so that...;* 10) *worth (worth only) (was) + infinitive, as (to, and)...;* 11) *didn't have time + infinitive, as (and, until, when)...;* 12) *only (only that) + verb, as (even, when)...;* 13) *just that + verb, as (even, when)...;* 14) *only + verb, as (even, when)...;* 15) *hardly + verb, as (even, when)...;* 16) *just now + verb, as (even, when)...;* 17) *who (what, which, how much, how, when,*

where) not + verb + (would, b)..; 18) *a miracle (not a miracle, happiness), but (how, what)...* Е. g.: – *Доля долею, а якби таки ви краще людей розпитали, чи що ...* (Леся Українка); *Але досить було прокинутись чоловікові, як Галина, закусивши уста, здушила свій плач і так пролежала до самого досвіта...* (М. Стельмах); – *На те бій,* – сухо сказав Брянський, радіючи в душі, що хоч сам Вася, його улюбленець, залишився живий (О. Гончар); *І не встигла* зовсім уже скам'яніла Тетяна *ворухнути* вустами, *як* він ухопив її руку і, похитнувшись, приклався до неї мокрими губами (А. Дімаров).

A partially phraseologized sentence consists of two parts: the first part is filled with obligatory – invariable and variable components, the second part is a sentence structure represented by a formal-grammatical sentence.

4.2.1.1.4 Phraseosyntactic meaning of the structural scheme of phraseologized sentences

A syntactically indecomposable complex of two components – constant and variable – is the reason to qualify the value of a stable structural scheme as syntactic, and models, according to the definition of V. Arkhangelsky, as lexical-syntactic (Архангельский 1964, p. 202). Phraseologized meaning, which has the status of syntactic, appears as a result of certain changes in the stable structural scheme of the phraseological sentence. Deactualization of the meaning of the constant component, phraseologisation of the mandatory declinable component, a clearly defined place of their location, loss of relevance of syntactic relations between the components – the way to increase the value, the appearance of a new quality meaning – phraseosyntactic. This value in the structure of the stable scheme is mandatory, but has an additional, secondary nature. The main role is performed by the modal, propositive meaning of the phraseologised sentence. The modal component constantly accompanies all implementations of any phraseologized model in speech, which determines their specificity as syntactic units.

Phraseosyntactic meaning has its own specifics. Given the fact that phraseological sentences are mainly related to the emotional and volitional sphere of a person, they

are signs of attitudes and feelings, not representations and inferences as formal-grammatical sentences.

The meaning of phraseological sentences cannot be measured by a concept, but it is subjective, just like the meaning of any word or syntactically articulated sentence. The difference can be traced in the nature of objectivity: in formal-grammatical sentences it is defined as the abstract essence of the subject, for phraseologised sentences it is a combination of subjective, logically undivided and morphologically explicit/implicit meaning.

The meaning of unarticulated phraseologized constructions is a complex and multifaceted combination of specific semantic components.

The isolation of the phraseologized component is determined by the following factors: 1) the meaning of the phraseologized sentence is not the sum of the values of its separate lexical and grammatical components; 2) in the structure of this meaning there is a component that has a generalized nature and does not depend on the specific lexical content of syntactic constructions, but is stable, invariant and identifies the syntactic – stable structural – scheme of the phraseological sentence [Kudelkina 2008, p. 12]. The meaning of a phraseologized construction is the mixing of several lines of content, the formation of a complex combination.

According to the stable structural scheme of tautological phraseologized and semi-phraseologized sentences, the following generalized meanings are the following:

Confirmation

1) assertion of normality:

a) the components of the structural scheme are the nominative form of the singular or plural full-valued changeable parts of speech or an adverb:

N₁ як N₁, e. g: Хлопці як хлопці;

Adj₁ як Adj₁, e. g.: Старша як старша;

Adv як Adv, e. g: Краще як краще;

b) components are expressed by nouns and pronouns in the forms of indirect cases, verbal lexemes, in particular, genitive or personal-tense forms:

N₄ як N₄, e. g: Розмову як розмову;

N₆ як N₆, e. g.: На війні як на війні;

Pronom₅ як Pronom₅, e. g.: За мною як за мною;

V_f як V_f, e.g.: Жив як жив;

2) internal agreement, meaning of tolerance, acceptance of action, status:

a) Inf, так Inf, e. g.: Грішитъ, так грішитъ;

N₂, так N₂, for example: Посла, так посла;

Num₁, так Num₁, e. g.: Вісім, так вісім;

Adv, так Adv, for example: Треба, так треба;

Interj, так Interj, for example: Гайда, так гайда;

b) N₁, так (y) N₁, e. g.: Дівчина, то дівчина;

V_f, то (y) V_f, e. g.: Робив, то й робив;

Adv, то (also) Adv, for example: Добре, то й добре;

Cop, то (and) Cop, for example: Так, то й так;

Що is V_f, то(and) V_f, e. g.: Що буде, то й буде (значення – згода з тим, що в попередній частині;

Що Adv то Adv, for example: Що довго, то довго;

3) perception of the action as usual for everyone; commonly known:

a) Як Adj₁, то Adj₁, e.g.: Як гарна, то гарна;

Як N₁, то N₁, e .g.: Як робота, то робота;

Як Inf, то (also) Inf, e .g.: Як давать, то давать;

Як Adv, то (and) Adv, e. g.: Як завтра, то завтра;

Як Cop, то Cop, e. g.: Як ні, то ні;

b) Коли Adj₁, then Adj₁, e. g.: Коли весела, то весела;

Коли N₁, то N₁, e .g.: Коли робота, то робота;

Коли Inf, то Inf, e. g.: Коли давать, то давать;

Коли Adv, то Adv, e .g.: Коли завтра, то завтра;

Коли Cop, то Cop, e. g.: Коли ні, то ні;

Якщо Adj₁, то Adj₁, e. g.: Якщо весела, то весела;

Якщо N₁, то N₁, e. g.: Якщо робота, то робота;

Якщо Inf, то (and) Inf, e. g.: Якщо будувати, то будувати;

Якщо Adv, то (and) Adv, e. g.: *Якщо вдень, то вдень*;

Якщо Cop, то Cop, e. g.: *Якщо ні, то ні*;

4) the value of absolute identity; the «reconciliation with reality» model; meaning «so it should be»; invariable components of this phraseologized scheme are the particles *taki, te, is*, which combine nouns in the form of the nominative case:

$N_1 \in N_1$, e. g.: *Життя є життя*;

N_1 *таки* N_1 , e. g.: *Папірус таки папірус*;

N_1 *це* N_1 , e. g.: *Війна це війна*.

Additional components can be added to this structural diagram, in particular:

a) adverbial words *всюди* or *скрізь*, e. g.: *Мати – всюди мати. Вона вже простила недавню синову провинність, вона зовсім забула про неї* (Панас Мирний); *Закон всюди закон. Винятків нема ні для кого* (В. Собко);

b) particles *це* or *таки*, for example: *Але люди таки люди. Вони не відступили* (Ю. Винничук); *Як жив [Антонович], так і вмер: спокійно, просто, малопомітно. Війна це війна...* (О. Гончар);

c) the prepositional-excellent form of the pronominal component *всі*, e. g.: *Закон для всіх закон. Сват чи брат – винятків ні для кого нема* (О. Гончар);

d) the pronominal component *він* (*вона, воно, вони*), e. g.: *Катерину мама вважала не тільки своєю розумною, але й доброю дитиною ...Мама вона і є мама* (Ірина Вільде); *Жінки знову почали сваритися. Жінки вони і є жінки* (Ю. Збанацький);

5) revealed a sign, an action as such, corresponding to the name of it; the performed action expresses a feeling of confidence, determination: *Як Adj₁, так Adj₁*, e. g.: *Як жовтий, так жовтий*;

Як V_f, так V_f, e. g.: *Як сумує, так сумує; Як написав, так написав*;

Як Inf, так Inf, for example: *Як їхати, так їхати!*

6) complete conformity of the object or phenomenon, sign, action to the idea about them: *Cop* (*я, ти, ми, ви, він, вона, вони*) *не...*, напр.: *Чим вони не люди? Чим я не козак!*

7) confirmation of the appropriateness of the action specifically for the person defined by the dependent noun as a potential subject of the action: *Pronom₁* (кого, у кого, для кого...), *як не...*, *напр.: А хто ж, як не ти! А хто, як не ми!*

8) confirmation of the possibility to perform an action or acquire a state or the existence of an action performer or a state bearer:

Є Adv (where, from where, when, where) + *Inf*, e.g.: *Є куди поїхати*; *There is Pronom₂₋₆* (who, what) + *Inf*, e.g.: *Є з ким поговорити*.

Denial

1) absence of someone, something: *Як V_f, так V_f*. In this proper-negative model, the place of the variable component is filled by the verb form *nema*, e.g.: *Як нема, так нема*;

2) negation of the subject, fact, event, action, state or their importance, etc.:

Потрібний + Pronoun₁ (я, ти, він, вона, ми, ви, вони) + *Pronoun₃*, e.g.: *Потрібний він мені!*

Pronom₁ *Який, яка, яке, які + Adv* (тут, там) + *N₁*, for example: *Яка там радість!*

3) rejection, reluctance, untimeliness of something for someone:

Pronom₃ *не до ...*, e.g.: *Мені не до начальства; Йому не до зустрічі*;

4) disapproval of the implementation of what would be appropriate:

Нема щоб + Inf, e.g.: *Нема, щоб допомогти*;

Немає (нема) того, щоб + Inf, e.g.: *Немає того, щоб зрозуміти*;

5) lack of conditions for performing an action or acquiring a state:

Нема чого (де, коли, куди, чим) + Inf, e.g.: *Нема де заварити чаю*.

Rating

1) positive or negative assessment of a being, object, etc.:

Ox i + N₁ (*V_f, Adj₁*), e.g.: *Ox i жеребчик! Ox i хурделить!*

Ex i + N₁ (*V_f, Adj₁*), e.g.: *Ex i чоловічок! Ex i короткі!*

Ux i + N₁ (*V_f, Adj₁*), e.g.: *Ux i люди! Ux i бахнуло!*

Hy y + N₁ (*V_f, Adj₁*), e.g.: *Hy y порода ж! Hy y менший!*

*Ох (вже) цей (ця, це, ці) мені + (Adj₁) N₁, e. g.: Ох вже цей мені Васька! Ах
цей (ця, це, ці) (вже) мені + (Adj₁) N₁, e. g.: Ах ці мені вчені-педагоги!
Ах ти + N₁ (7) (mostly a lexeme with negative semantics), e. g.: Ах ти негіднику!
Ех ти + N₁ (7), e. g.: Ех ти бабій!*

Що (то) за + Substant₁, e.g.: Що то за парубок!

2) selection of the subject, features as special from among ordinary, typical:

Ом (оце, це) + N₁ (V_f, Adj₁), так N₁ (V_f, Adj₁), e. g.: Оце дуби так дуби!

*Що V_f (N₁, Adj, Adv), то (те й) V_f (N₁, Adj, Adv), e. g.: Що бідує, то бідує; Що
сила, то сила;*

3) high degree of characteristic of the noted person or object:

N_{1 sing} 3 (із) N_{2 pl}, e. g.: Йолон із йолонів!

Із + substantiv_{2 pl} + substantiv_{1 sing}, e. g.: Із письмених письменний!

N_{1 sing} над N_{5 pl}, e. g.: Цар над царями;

4) high degree of symptom manifestation, action, etc.:

Inf, так Inf, напр.: Веселитися, так веселитися!

Як + Inf, так Inf, напр.: Як танцювати, то танцювати;

Що Inf, так Inf, напр.: Що бити, так бити!

Що Adv, то Adv, напр.: Що ніколи, то ніколи!

*Ом (оце, це) + N₁ (V_f, Adj₁), так N₁ (V_f, Adj₁), напр.: Ом ускочили, так
ускочили!*

5) evaluative meaning of unimportance, insignificance of someone, something in
something:

Що там + N₁ (Inf), e. g.: Що там інститут!

Що Pronom₃ (я, ти, він, вона, вони, ви) + N₁, e. g.: Що нам люди!

6) evaluation of a creature, object, emphasizing their importance or exclusivity:

Що то + N₁, e. g.: Що то молодість! Що то жінота!

Emotional reaction

1) expressing an emotional reaction to the content of a message or event, e. g.:

*Далі не знайшлося про що говорити, дарма що колись разом училися в школі,
писали бузиновим чорнилом, билися в кулі, парубкували в сосні з обклеєною*

газетами балалайкою, щоб не розпалася, та саморобною бубною. **Коли те було!** (Г. Тютюнник); **ОЛЯ. Сірники є? АЛІНА. Ображаєш!** (С. Новицька); – Візьмеш, звиняй, Денисенкову землю? – недовіжливо подивився на Горицькіта. – Та візьму, що ж з тобою робити, – зітхнув Тимофій, збираючи зморшки навколо очей. – А мені панську дасиш? – іще опасається повірити полісовицик і припадає до рукава Тимофія. – **А яку ж!** (М. Стельмах);

2) expressing an emotional reaction to the behavior of the interlocutor or a third person, e. g.: *Поправивши кріплення, Олесь почав видиратися на протилежний схил. Падав, зводився і знову падав, аж поки й не вибрався на вершину. – **Ну й упертий же!** – Іван похитав головою* (І. Головченко, О. Мусієнко); *Але сидить на бруствері ... шахтар Кость Барвенко, прикриває свій відступ, і вже надія ворухнулася в серці.., а його погляд, зовні байдужий і чомусь трохи презирливий, ніби говорив кожному з відступаючих: **“Ех, ви, вояки!”*** (В. Собко); ***Дивись, які! Карамзіна, Бачиш прочитали!*** (Т. Шевченко).

We classify the structural schemes by which the values expressing emotional reactions are fixed as properly situational. The context determines the component composition of sustainable structural schemes. It is worth noting that among the components there are fully meaningful substantive or verbal lexemes, partially or completely de-semanticized. Mandatory analytical components.

Declaration of will, which includes the following meanings:

1) threats:

От (тільки, ще, б) + V_f , e. g.: От побачиш! Тільки підійди! Ще віддячу! А хто б посмів!

Мало + чого ($Propom_1$ – він, вона, вони, хто) + V_f (захоче), e. g.: Мало чого він захоче!

2) order, e. g.: – **Ну ж бо! Вернись! Не будь тварюкою безрогою!** (П. Загребельний);

3) desire, e. g.: – **Моєї допомоги? Для тебе, Зінько? – А хоч би й для мене!** (П. Загребельний).

The generalized directive meaning, secured by a stable structural scheme, is

mostly conveyed by verb components in the form of the imperative plural. It is expressed by the particle *би* (*б*).

The following generalized meanings are attached to the phraseological schemes of partially phraseologised sentences:

1) permissive-opposite:

N_1 (*Inf*, V_f , *Adv*) *то* N_1 (*Inf*, V_f , *Adv*), *а* (*але*, *та*) ..., напр.: *Бог то бог, та не будь і сам плох*;

N_1 (*Inf*, V_f , *Adj*, *Adv*) *не* N_1 (*Inf*, V_f , *Adj*, *Adv*), *а* (*тільки*, *але*) ..., напр.: *Купити не купила, а поторгуватися треба*; *Стара [сорочка] не стара, а носити можна*;

$N_1 + N_5$, *а*; $Inf + V_f$, *а* ..., напр.: *Жарти жартами, а робота не чекає*;

2) temporary:

Не встиг + *Inf*, *як* ..., напр.: *Не встиг повечеряти, як гості зайшли в хату*;

Не пройшло (*і*, *й*) + *темпоральна лексема*, *як* ..., напр.: *Не пройшло й десяти хвилин, як вийшли з лісу*;

Не минуло (*і*, *й*) + *темпоральна лексема*, *як* ..., напр.: *Не минуло й півгодини, як доїхав до села*;

г) *Тільки й* ..., *що* ..., напр.:...

г) *Тільки* ..., *як* ..., напр.:...

3) conditional-consequential:

а) *Варто* (*варто лише*, *варто тільки*) ..., *щоб* (*як*, *і*) ..., напр.:

б) *Досить* (*досить лише*, *досить тільки*) ..., *як* (*щоб*) ..., напр.:

4) conditionally acceptable:

Хто (*б*) *не* + V_f , *а* ...; *Що* (*б*) *не* + V_f ; *а* ...; *Який* (*би*) *не* + V_f ; *а* ...; *Скільки* (*б*) *не* + V_f , *а* ..., напр.: *Де б не була, що б не робила, а тривожні думки не давали спокою*;

Де (*б*) *не* + V_f ...; *Куди* (*б*) *не* + V_f ..., напр.: *Куди б не зверталася, та допомоги не було*;

5) affirmative modality:

а) *На те* (*і*) + N_1 , *щоб*..., напр.: *На те і сонце, щоб світило*.

1) *noun (infinitive, verb, adverb) + participle to + noun (infinitive, verb, adverb)*,

a (але, ма)..; N₁ (Inf, V_f, Adv) мо N₁ (Inf, V_f, Adv), a (але, ма)..; 2) noun (infinitive, verb, adverb) + participle not + noun (infinitive, verb, adverb), a (тільки, але)..; N₁ (Inf, V_f, Adv) не N₁ (Inf, V_f, Adv), a (тільки, але)..; 3) noun in the form of the nominative case + noun in the form of the instrumental case, а..; N₁ + N₅, а..; 4) enough (enough only, enough only) (was) + infinitive (noun or quantifiable noun compound, pronoun, verb, adjective or adverbial lexeme), як (що, щоб, а, і)..; 5) has not passed + temporal lexeme, як (щоб не)..; 6) did not pass and + temporal lexeme, як (щоб не)..; 7) did not pass (y) + temporal lexeme, щоб не..; 8) on that and.., щоб..; 9) on that he (she, it, they) and.., щоб..; 10) worth (worth only, worth only) (was) + infinitive, як (щоб, і)..; 11) didn't have time + infinitive, як (а, аж, коли)..; 12) only (only that) + verb, як (аж, коли)..; 13) just that + verb, як (аж, коли)..; 14) only (only, only) + verb, як (аж, коли)..; 15) аж (коли) + verb, як (аж, коли)..; 16) just now + verb, як (аж, коли)..; 17) who (what, which, how much, how, when, where) не + .verb + (by, b)..; 18) a miracle (not a miracle, happiness), але (як, що)...

In the structure of a partially phraseological sentence, the lexical meaning of the reference components is maximally abstracted, and full-meaning components undergo grammatization. Constant components help to assign a generalized meaning to the phraseological scheme, which fully corresponds to the grammatical meaning of the phraseological syntactic construction.

4.2.1.1.5 Syntactically non-segmented sentence and logical judgement

In linguo-Ukrainian studies, there are controversial questions about the connection of syntactically non-segmented sentences with the sphere of language and speech, with the concept and judgement, about the correlation of the conceptual and emotional in syntactically non-segmented sentences.

A sentence in a language is a basic form of thinking, a form of the language system that, serving as a means of communication, always expresses a certain logical judgement about something: objective reality, its realities, a specific situation, the interlocutor, his behaviour, emotional state, etc.

Sh. Bally noted that «a sentence is the simplest possible form of communicating a thought» (Bally 1955, p. 43].

The logical and grammatical division reflects the structure of a logical phrase - a statement-message, a question-message and a statement-exclude. V. Panfilov pointed out the universal nature of logical and grammatical division (Panfilov 1971, p. 229].

As noted by O. Melnychuk, each language «is characterised by a syntagmatic division of the general content of the sentence into separate semantic complexes of different levels, ... in which one of the complexes is understood as the main one, essential for the content of the sentence (as the predicate of the thought or its part), and the second one – only as a starting point for the construction of this thought or only as an additional one in this main complex (as the subject of the thought or its parts)» [Suchasna 1972, p. 28].

In ancient grammar, the theory of sentence and the theory of judgement overlapped, and sometimes they were even identified. For a long time, the term «sentence» was used to denote a judgement, as well as the form of its linguistic expression (Vynogradov 1954, p. 4).

Sentences and judgements are interconnected, because a judgement is an act of thinking, an opinion that reflects things, phenomena in their relationships, connections, affirms or denies the presence of a certain feature or its belonging to the subject of thought.

Aristotle was the first to attempt to combine linguistic and logical issues. He pointed out the direct connection between thought and word, and then put judgement in the foreground.

Ancient philosophical thought considered a judgment as one that corresponds or doesn't correspond to the facts. Logic since the time of Aristotle distinguished between judgment and the means of its expression – sentences.

In ancient times, grammar researchers tried to combine linguistic and logical issues. «The first and main step that they did was to associate the word with thought and the second – they brought to the fore judgments as a kind of model that exhausts

all the phenomena of natural «language» with its properties» (Vdovichenko 2007, p. 17].

Reality (at the level of fact – situation) is perceived by a person, because the situation includes everything that is around a person, and everything that is in the consciousness of a person, that is, a person observes, perceives, creates, provides for everything that can be the content of the communicative process. The situation is possible only when there is a person. If we try to take a person away from the world of reality, then the world will remain, and there will be no situations (Zvegintsev 1996, p. 188).

The consequence of a person's relationship with real reality is a thought in which «the object of thought» and «the opinion about the object» are distinguished. There is a direct connection between the structure of thought and language, although, according to linguists, there is no parallelism between them: «between a thought that can materialize in a language and a language that has no other function than «mean», it is necessary to identify a specific connection, because it is obvious that their relations are not symmetrical» (Benvenist 1974, p. 105).

Considering the specific connection between thought and language, V. Yurchenko suggests the concept of a collapsed and expanded subject-predicate structure (Yurchenko 2006, p. 139). The collapsed subject-predicate structure is expressed by the composition of the subject and verb predicate; the expanded structure is expressed by the sentence structure: attribute – subject – predicate. The collapsed subject-predicate structure has a cognitive nature: it is the structure of thought – a virtual logical judgment, and therefore, speech – a thought represented on a linear axis of real time.

The parameters of membership / non-membership indicate a close connection between the judgment and the structure of the sentence. O. Shakhmatov noted: «significantly distinguishes between their syncretism of communication members and the dismemberment of the sentence; the sentence- *Злякана нами ворона вилетіла на високу лину* – corresponds to communication, the subject of which is a crow frightened by us, and the predicate – flew to a high linden tree; two members of communication

are contrasted with seven words that correspond to six members of the sentence» (Shakhmatov 1941, p. 508).

There are still discussions among both logicians and linguists about the correspondence / inconsistency of the structure of a logical judgment and the form of a sentence. Some of the researchers pointed out that the sentence belongs to the denotative situation through the significance (Alefirenko 1999, p. 204 and other).

The ability of a judgment as a signifier to serve as a means of communication between a sentence (sign) and a situation (denotate) is due to the two-level nature of the judgment. The lower level of its structure is the propositional function (logical A R b), which reflects objective relationships and relationships between elements of the denotative situation. Judgment as a propositional function correlates with the syntactic division of a sentence and is expressed at the syntactic level in the members of the sentence. The second level of the judgment structure has a subject-predicate organization (S – P) and correlates with the logical and grammatical division of the sentence.

Universal for all languages of the world, the subject-predicate structure of judgment, which combines logical variants of the propositional function that underlies it, has various formal ways of speech expression.

During dividing a judgment into parts – the subject and predicate – they always take into account its meaning, and when qualifying the members of a sentence-mainly by a formal morphological and syntactic criterion.

For example, determining the subject of a judgment involves establishing the main idea about the subject of a statement, taking into account the logical stress, the meaning of previous and subsequent phrases.

The definition of the subject is based on a formal grammatical criterion: a certain case design, syntactic position, of course, the first one on the left.

I. Kucherenko noted that the subject is «an object (person, phenomenon) named in the direct case, which occupies a central place in the thought expressed by the sentence as a process of cognition» (Kucherenko 1961, p. 131). Of course, the position of the subject helps to clarify the meaning of the judgement, since it is the subject that

serves to express the subject of the judgement. In order to understand the meaning of a sentence, we need to find out the structure of the sentence as a whole and the place of the sentence in the system of other sentences.

Although the judgment is in an organic connection with the sentence, it is impossible to absolutize this connection and, moreover, to identify the judgment with the sentence. V. Degtyarov singled out some types of sentences that do not express judgments: «If thinking really has two plans - logical and communicative, then it is necessary to recognize that judgment is a unit of the logical plan, and questions and prompting are units of the communicative plan of thinking. Therefore, they are multifaceted relative units of thinking... Judgments are not expressed only by interrogative, persuasive and vocative sentences, peculiar «miscertainties» such as yes or no, monosyllabic Suteniye sentences. Frost, but also most two-syllable sentences» (Degtyarov 2002, p. 286–287).

To determine the semantics of different types of sentences, it is not enough to establish the corresponding types of judgments; it is necessary to find out the specific features of their linguistic semantics. Explanations should be made by tracing the relationship between the structure of the sentence and the logical nature of the judgment expressed in it. A linguistic analysis of different types of sentences is necessary, taking into account the specifics of the logical nature of the relevant judgments.

It is impossible to identify the members of a sentence with the members of a judgment, words with concepts. The unity of language and thinking is concrete, which necessarily has elements of differences. However, the following conclusion cannot be postulated: if the subject of the judgment did not find a verbal expression in some sentence, then there is no subject in the thought or in the judgment itself. This subject can be understood from the situation, from the context, which means that it must be in the thought, otherwise the judgment cannot be realized.

T. Desherieva analyzes the monosyllabic nominative sentence *Winter!*, which, in her opinion, expresses the connection of subject and predicate with one main article and such means as intonation, context, situation, etc., which confirm that it is not a

concept that is expressed, but a judgment. For example, the semantics of the word winter differs from the meaning of the nominative sentence *Winter!* precisely because the first expresses a concept, and the second - a judgment. The semantics of the word winter is an abstract generalization of the common features of a certain natural phenomenon that we perceive and highlight. The meaning of the nominative sentence *Winter!* there is a specific judgment in which the presence of a certain state of nature at a certain time of the year is ascertained (Desherieva 1985, p. 35).

The syntactic center of a two-syllable sentence consists of a subject and a predicate, and a one-syllable sentence consists of the only main member of the sentence. All other words are grouped around this center, entering into certain syntactic relationships with the main members of the sentence and with each other. The syntactic center expresses the basis of the judgment, the connection between the subject and the predicate in it, and the sentence - in general, the entire content of the judgment.

There is only a predictive relationship between its members in a logical statement, while in sentential communication other relationships are possible.

A complete and particular communication should correspond as much as possible to the formal structure of a sentence. However, there is no direct correspondence between the members of a communication-sentence and the members of a sentence. The structure of a statement and the structure of a sentence are fully consistent only under one condition: when the sentence is narrative, two-part, and non-common.

In orally produced speech, some members of the statement may not be formally expressed, due to the speaker's reliance on the situation, the listener's background knowledge, etc.

In a sentence, an idea is expressed in formal-syntactic and semantic-syntactic components. However, an opinion can also be expressed by a full word or a function word morpheme, as well as by the indivisible unity of function elements. A syntactically non-segmented sentence is an incomplete form of expressing a sentence, so it requires additional means of expression, including context, situation, facial expressions, and signs.

Taking into account the specificity of the sentence and the statement, as defined by K. Shulzhuk (Shulzhuk 2004, p. 47–48), and the important features of these two concepts, we offer a comparative characterization of the statement and syntactically non-segmented sentences, in particular, one of its types – actually non-segmented sentences:

1) a statement is always a sentence, syntactically non-segmented sentences do not express a statement, as they express only the speaker's attitude, emotional reaction to the content of the message, event, speaker's behavior, etc.; syntactically non-segmented sentences – word-sentences – correlate with a statement directly or indirectly;

2) a statement is necessarily two-element, consisting of a subject and a predicate, and syntactically non-segmented sentence are the only component that conveys the total sentence semantics;

3) there are always two main members in a statement, and in the structure of syntactically non-segmented sentences, neither main nor secondary elements can be distinguished.

Syntactically non-segmented sentence as sentence formations do not combine in their content a logical statement with its constructive members – subject and predicate, but they perform a communicative function. V. Vynogradov noted that in the content and structure of such syntactic constructions «neither the subject nor the predicate can be distinguished...» (Vynogradov 1975, p. 267).

Analyzing one of the types of syntactically non-segmented sentences - word-clauses, I. Vychovanets noted that such syntactic constructions correlate with the judgment as the logical basis of the sentence (Vykhovanets 1993, p. 100). K. Horodenska identifies an important classification feature of this type of non-segmented sentences – the nature of correlation with situations of the extra-linguistic world (with judgment) (Teoretychna morfologiya 2004, p. 376). On this basis, two types of word-sentences are distinguished: 1) word-sentences that are directly related to situations and refer to these situations; 2) word-sentences that are indirectly related

to extra-linguistic situations and express the speaker's emotions, feelings and will be related to these situations.

The subject of the statement in non-segmented sentences is expressed in the prepositional context. On the basis of perception of some characteristic features of an object, an unexpectedly appearing phenomenon, or emotions, feelings of speakers, etc., the subject of reality is specified and verbally expressed by desemanticized full or service words.

The object of statement, i. e. what we affirm or deny, is the subject of the statement.

The logical aspect determines the nature of the sentence division and its scheme, reveals the most abstract component of its semantics. However, in word-clauses correlated with statements, the subject and predicate are expressed by a single component - a full-meaning word or a service word-morpheme or an indivisible unity of service elements. This can be explained by the fact that such syntactic constructions are mostly emotionally charged, appearing in speech at the moment of strong emotional stress.

V. Bogorodytsky pointed to the unbroken thought during the unexpected perception of an object, phenomenon of reality, etc. He examined the expression of «non-segmented thought about an unexpectedly received perception» on the example of certain types of single-membered sentences (Bogorodytsky 1935, p. 43). O. Tomson also emphasized the lack of segments of ideas in the sentence (Tomson 1906, p. 302–303).

The absence of logical segments is a characteristic feature of implicit statements, unlike logical and psychological statements, whose two-part nature determines their logical and syntactic segments. The undifferentiated nature of the thought and the way it is expressed directly depends on the emotional state of the speaker, the emotional description of a certain object, phenomenon, etc. of objective reality. It is worth noting that the moment of surprise and suddenness is a kind of indicator of the emotionality scale. The absence of the effect of surprise or suddenness makes it possible to interpret the speaker's state of mind and behavior as normal, habitual, while the unexpectedness,

suddenness of appearance, discovery of an object or phenomenon of reality generates strong emotional feelings, determines the nature of the speaker's behavior as violent, unrestrained, etc. That is why syntactically non-segmented sentences are directly related to the emotional reaction that appears at a particular moment in reality.

4.2.1.1.6 Correlation of syntactically non-segmented sentences with formal grammatical ones

Syntactically non-segmented sentences perform a certain communicative task that arises in the process of communication. The semantic parameters of such sentences are clarified, changed and perceived differently in a communicative situation. The variety of characteristics of non-segmented sentences is more clearly manifested in the process of communication than if they were considered abstractly from the conditions of implementation. As communicative units, syntactically non-segmented sentences are part of the system of simple sentences and correlate with them in a certain way. The correlation of a syntactically non-segmented sentence with a simple sentence is reflected in their common and distinctive characteristics. The following features are common:

1. These are units that perform a specific communicative task: formal-grammatical sentences express a logical judgment about something – the world around us in general or about some realities, a specific situation, a speaker, his/her behavior, etc. To express a statement, formal grammatical compound sentences have an appropriate grammatical structure consisting of a subject and a predicate. Syntactically non-segmented sentences express only the speaker's attitude to someone or something and an emotional reaction to the content of the message, event, behavior of the interlocutor or a third party. They are dynamic structures with specific lexical content and a certain communicative task that fulfill their purpose in specific communicative conditions. Cf.: a formal grammatical sentence: *Туга ночі таємниче шепотіла й зітхала коло них* (В. Винниченко); *S* – *туга ночі*; *P* – *шепотіла, зітхала*; is a syntactically non-segmented sentence that requires a wide context to understand: – *Від тебе потрібна тільки одна дрібничка, – намагається переконати Кена Морган.*

– *Лін навчить Андрія, як це робити, й Андрій усе зробить сам – і все.* – *Я мушу подумати,* – *Кен і далі не хоче ловитися на гачок.* – ***От сухар,*** – роздратовано каже мені [Андрію] Морган у коридорі (І. Йосипів); the impossibility of distinguishing the subject and predicate in this sentence.

It is worth noting that the expression of the speaker's emotional reaction to something in formal-grammatical sentences can be achieved with the help of interjections, emotionally colored words or phrases, intonation; for syntactically unarticulated sentences, the expression of the speaker's attitude or emotional reaction is their essential property, because it is original from the moment these sentences were created. ∴ *Іронічність, яку демонструє нам Олекса Носенко в своїх новелах, якщо можна так висловитися, ситуаційна* (П. Загребельний); *і – А зараз ти мені скажеш правду. Причому без гіпнозу.* – ***Чорта з два,*** – просичав він, *і його права рука склалася в дулю* (Н. Шейко-Медведева).

2. Formal-grammatical and syntactically non-segmented sentences are characterized by meaningful completion, that is, speakers, speech participants, easily understand and perceive a complete grammatically and syntactically unarticulated sentence as complete.

3. Both formal-grammatical and syntactically non-segmented sentences have intonation relative to the finished message. Intonation is an important means of forming an expression. For syntactically unarticulated sentences, it is also one of the important means of expressing the main meaning of such syntactic constructions, as well as their additional meanings. If in the analysis of a formal-grammatical sentence the intonation pattern plays a special role, then in the analysis of syntactically unarticulated sentences the selection of a specific word in the syntactic structure does not change its meaning, because in this case only the character of the intonation is important: conveying joy, satisfaction, surprise, dissatisfaction, etc. For example: – ***Та що ти з ним торгуєшся!*** – *не витримує Сергеев.* – ***Теж мені базар!*** – *Дійсно. Ну то кінчимо торгівлю. Не хочеш підписувати – не треба* (Іван Багряний); “*Та чекай, Шу! Чого ти така пихата? Це я зізнаюся у дурному смакові...*” – ***“Ах ти ж гад!”*** (Л. Денисенко).

Common features of syntactically non-segmented sentences with formal-grammatical sentences express them as a structural type of a simple sentence.

There are much more differences between formal-grammatical and syntactically unarticulated sentences. They differ by the following characteristics:

1. They have different content characteristics. If grammatical sentences express a judgment about someone, something, using the concepts of subject and predicate, then syntactically unarticulated sentences do not express such a judgment, but convey the speaker's attitude to someone, something or an emotional reaction. Proper non-articulated sentences can only relate to a logical judgment – directly or indirectly. The subject and predicate in syntactically unarticulated sentences are presented in an unarticulated form.

2. In a formal-grammatical sentence, the category of predicativeness is represented by three categories: temporality, modality, and personali (Vynogradov 1954, p. 17; Zolotova 1998, p. 104). In syntactically unarticulated sentences, predicativeness has no grammatical expression. Here, regardless of time, an emotional reaction is conveyed, it is not modified in the aspect of reality / unreality, for example *Так; Село як село; От дівчина, так дівчина!* In unarticulated syntactic constructions, the verb components have undergone semantic and grammatical changes: they are de-semanticized, fixed in an unchanged grammatical form in the structural scheme, which makes it impossible to attribute the statement determined time, does not characterize it from the point of view of probability or desirability, for example: *Hy ти даєш!; Hy ти сказав!*

3. A formal-grammatical sentence is syntactically articulated: it is divided into sentence members: the main ones are the subject, the predicate or the main member of a one-syllable sentence, and adverbial and non-adverbial extenders. A syntactically unarticulated sentence cannot be divided into clauses.

4. The founder of the theory of modality Sh. Bally notes that in each statement it is possible to distinguish the main content (dictum) and the modal part (modus), which contains the speaker's intellectual, emotional or volitional judgment regarding the

dictum. In his opinion, modality «is formed mainly as a result of the active activity of the subject who speaks» [Bally 1955, p. 44].

I. Vykhovanets singles out in the category of modality the opposition between real and unreal: «the category of modality indicates the relationship of the content of the sentence to reality, which is connected with the interpretation of what is communicated as real (only stated by the speaker) or as unreal (*possible, desirable, necessary*)» (Vykhovanets 1993, p. 62). Modality is a necessary element of expression, without which any sentence, regardless of its structure, does not exist, an «essential constructive feature» of a sentence (Vynogradov 1975, p. 55). One of the mandatory features of a formal-grammatical sentence is the expression of objective modality, which conveys «the relationship of the communicated to reality in terms of reality (feasibility or feasibility) or unreality (impracticability)» (Lyapon 1998, p. 303).

The opinion of O. Potebnya regarding the subjective content of modality is indicative, since a sentence is «... a living unit of speech communication, in which a segment of objective reality is reflected through the consciousness of the speaker ... The sentence reflects the relationship to the time of action, the process of being, to the probability of what was said and the attitude towards the person» (Potebnya 1958, p. 63).

Syntactically non-segmented sentences are characterized only by subjective modality, respectively – only by a *modus propositionis*: they are focused primarily on the expression of the *modus*, and are its concentrated embodiment.

5. The presence / absence of autonomously expressed predicativeness determines the sentence's ability to undergo systemic formal changes. The grammatical paradigm of a sentence can be complete or defective (consisting of 6 or fewer forms), but never zero. The morphological nature of the components of syntactically non-segmented sentences – particles, exclamations and modal words – indicates the absence or defectiveness of the paradigm in such syntactic constructions. Syntactically non-segmented sentences have mostly zero grammatical paradigm, e. g. *Поле як поле; Що ж, як ні, то ні; Ну й люди ж!; Нема що дивуватись, Як вирішив, так вирішив; Що буде, то й буде!*

The presence of a null or defective grammatical paradigm in syntactically non-segmented sentences directly depends on their morphological basis, namely, the presence of verbs and personal pronouns in their structure: if the words of such parts of speech are in the structure of syntactically non-segmented sentences, then they have a defective paradigm. The change in temporal characteristics of a verb that is part of an non-segmented sentence is mostly not significant, that is, it does not relate to any moment of speech, it is only formal, e. g. *Ох і хурделить! Світу божого не видно* (М. Стельмах) і *Ох і хурделило!*

6. In terms of communication, syntactically non-segmented sentences are semantically and structurally oriented to specific speech participants and the same speech situation. This indicates the closeness of such syntactic constructions to formal-grammatical sentences, because, according to I. Vykhovanets, a grammatically articulated sentence in terms of its communicative organization is an expression or speech sign, the semantics of which involves addressing the context, a specific situation (Vykhovanets 2004, p. 148). The semantic structure of a formal-grammatical sentence is less dependent on the communication situation or context: *Тополя любила спостерігати за цими уроками і раділа разом з учителькою, коли дитині давався складний пасаж, і нудьгувала разом із нею, коли учні хворіли та не приходили на заняття* (Брати Капранови) і – *А заєць же був! – знову спокушав Микола. – Ех, і заєць!–* (А. Дімаров); – *Тебе мати не сварить? – цікавився я. – Ні, – крутив головою Ванько. – І не б'є? – Ні* (А. Дімаров).

A formal-grammatical sentence can relate to two or more clauses. Its semantics has the meaning of subject, predicate and/or object, often enriched with additional meanings conveyed by secondary members of the sentence.

One syntactically non-segmented sentence can express multiple meanings, and one grammatical sentence cannot convey these meanings.

7. Carrying out of the communicative task in a formally grammatical sentence directly depends on the order of words in it, which has no significance for the expression of the communicative task in syntactically non-segmented sentences, because their structure is stable. The location of each component in the structural

scheme of a non-segmented construction is clearly defined and fixed. Its change is impossible as it leads to a change in the status of the syntactic unit.

8. Formally grammatical and syntactically non-segmented sentences also structurally differ. An elementary simple sentence is formed according to a certain syntactic pattern (structural scheme). Non-segmented sentences are formed on the basis of a stable (connected) structural scheme represented by constant and variable components. A variable structural component can be expressed by nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, etc., the lexical content of which has no restrictions. For example: – *Давайте ближче до діла, товариші. Не будемо пацієнта марно втомлювати. Справа не терпить. Крім того, мене чекає внизу конференція. – Чудово! – сказав професор. – До діла – так до діла* (Ю. Смолич); *Але мені було не до сміху. Зовсім не до сміху* (А. Дімаров). Syntactically non-segmented sentences can be a combination of two parts: stable and free, such as: *І не встигла Тетяна вслухатись в слова його, як Кость несподівано, всім лицем уже, а не одним носом, скривився, підборіддя й губи затінались, очі налили сльозами ...* (В. Винниченко); *Дмитрик не Дмитрик – лише тінь його біла, ніби повісмо, обчухране вітром* (М. Матіос).

9. Syntactically non-segmented sentences mostly cannot play a role of predicative (dependent) part of a complex sentence.

4.2.1.1.7 Semantic and syntactic changes and the specificity of non-segmented constructions

In linguistics, one of the approaches to studying the semantic and syntactic sentence structure is the referential approach. The semantic and syntactic sentence structure was defined as a fixed reflection of the corresponding subject and sign continuum of the world in the syntactic structure, a set of structurally semantic components and relations between them (F. Danesh, N. Shvedova, N. Arvat, O. Moskalska, V. Yurchenko, I. Vykhovanets, K. Shulzhuk, K. Horodenska, A. Zahnitko and others).

The object of research in linguistic Ukrainology is usually the semantic and syntactic structure of mostly elementary simple and complex sentences. The semantic structure of a syntactically non-segmented sentence and its component composition were not the subject of a special research.

The semantic structure of a formally grammatical sentence combines four components: predicative, modal, communicative and pragmatic, but the semantic structure of a syntactically non-segmented sentence – modal, communicative and pragmatic components. Modal and communicative components as components of the formally grammatical meaning of the sentence are related to the components of syntactic semantics – intentional and functional. The modal component also has a subject meaning.

The semantic structure of syntactically non-segmented sentences is specific as its basis is formed by the first two components, and the pragmatic component forms the periphery.

Derivational changes occur in the semantic and syntactic structure of a non-segmented sentence, in particular of the phraseologized type, which is expressed by the categories of modality and communicativeness. These changes are caused by the process of syntactic idiomatization.

In the theory of derivation, the statement of Ye. Kurylovych is important for us: derivation is not only the fact of the formation of some words from others to convey syntactic functions that differ from the syntactic functions of the source words, but also the use of the same word in various secondary syntactic meanings... (Kurylovych 1962, p. 61). This makes it possible to consider the correlation between the syntactic models of formally grammatical sentences and phraseologized ones as one of the types of syntactically non-segmented sentences.

Transformations of formally grammatical sentences into phraseologized ones occur on the basis of derivation relations. According to K. Horodenska, for two syntactic units the derived is one in respect of which «the qualitative set of components of the semantic and syntactic structure was caused before the simplification of its formally grammatical structure» (Horodenska 2004, p. 179). Due to the indissoluble

connection between the formally grammatical and semantical and syntactic sentence structures, the semantical and syntactic derivation determines the formal derivation of the sentence.

A phraseologized sentence as a syntactic construction with an idiomatic meaning is a form with the same lexical content as in the basic sentence, but with a different semantic structure. Derivative combinatorics occurs within the semantic structure of the basic sentence.

The following changes occur in the semantic structure of syntactically non-segmented sentences: *reinterpretation of components, reduction of the modal component, transformation of the communicative component, and transformation of the intensional of the semantic and syntactic structure of the syntactically non-segmented sentence*. The consistent implementation of these changes enables the formation of a phraseologized non-segmented construction. In different types of phraseologized sentences these changes are fully or partially manifested.

The reinterpretation of components as a derivative change causes the appearance of a new lexemes meaning or the desemantization of full-meaning lexemes, the lexicalization of the sentence structure, the appearance of hidden semes, the creation of a generalized meaning that is fixed by a stable structural scheme of phraseologized sentences. Analytical and desemanticized components of a stable scheme are combined into an indecomposable complex with the help of specific methods of their connectivity. Polyphraseosyntactic meanings are fixed according to structural stable schemes.

The analytical and desemanticized components of a stable scheme are combined into an indecomposable complex by means of specific ways of their compatibility. Polyphraseosyntactic meanings are fixed according to structural stable schemes. For example: *Заохочений, Обух зітхнув скрушино. – Нічого не вдієш, життя є життя. Дивись, Романе, в обоє, як давньому другові, раджу, бо для комуніста немає більшого горя, ніж те, яке оце мене спіткало... – **То правда.** Для справжнього комуніста більшого горя не вигадаси* (Ю. Збанацький) – the addressee agrees with the interlocutor's opinion + omission, the author's subtext - he puts his meaning into

the construction *«то правда»*; *О шостій мені вже треба лежати на лазаретському ліжку. Нам не до яблук* (Ю. Андрухович) – reluctance + dissatisfaction, unrest; *«Звісно, це все він. Вітовський. От причена! А ти все правильно говориш. Саме так все і є»* (Л. Денисенко) – negative attitude to the person + irritation, dissatisfaction; *Не було й дня, щоб у нашій половині не проклинали Кожушного* (В. Земляк) – the meaning of «limit of the time period» is changed to «extension of the time period, carrying out of the action almost every day» + information reliability or confidence in the reliability of the source of information.

The semantic and syntactic change is particularly evident on the example of semi-phraseologized sentences conveying ironic negation. For example: *...Юркові стає лячно. Довідається, пронюхає той самий Саливон, що брат – член партії, і тоді ... Невже ж не розуміє цього Дмитро? – А як довідаються? – насмілюється він застерегти брата. – Про що там довідаються! – перебиває його мати. – Чотирнадцятий рік, як з села* (В. Козаченко); a separate non-segmented sentence construction conveys a negative meaning, simultaneously transforming from an interrogative into a negative sentence. Live syntactic connections between the components of the phraseological scheme of a non-segmented sentence are weakened. The constructive element *про що* loses its interrogative character; the adverbial word *там* is desemantized, transforms into a modal participle; a hidden sema is formed: the indecomposable combination *про що там* acquires the semantics of «something secondary, unimportant», and in the non-segmented sentence construction changes this semantics once again to the generalized negative semantics of the structural scheme of a semi-phraseologized sentence, e.g.: *А потім я йду нічним містечком, я знову самотній і майже щасливий, якби не припухлість правої руки... Мене чекає солодка винагорода... Чим я не Адам!* (Ю. Андрухович) The phraseologized compound *What I'm not...* (*Чим я не...*) indicates the full correspondence of one person to another – Adam, according to the Bible, the first man on earth; this correspondence is perceived in a figurative sense; the semantics of a stable structural scheme is admiration, a sense of euphoria from the fact that the hero feels that he belongs to the male half of humanity. The desemanticized lexeme is the pronoun *that*, represented by

the grammar of the ablative case; the disassembled structure has a clearly fixed, frozen form what. The disintegrable complex *What I'm not...* demonstrates the restriction on filling with a variable component: it can be a nominal component in the form of the nominative case. The rethinking of the components ends with the emergence of a single, generalized meaning of the phraseologized sentence structure.

According to V. Gak, the result of the rethinking of components is the asymmetry of the separation.

The discrepancy between a syntactically non-segmented sentence and objective reality, a syntactically non-segmented sentence and the structure of thought, which is determined by the reinterpretation of the meanings of the fixed and variable components of phrase schemes, causes a reduction of modality, i.e. a reduction of the speaker's relational role. In a formal grammatical sentence, it is the speaker who, by connecting the elements of the syntactic structure, determines the connection as real – considered on a time scale relative to the moment of speech – or as unreal.

Reduction of the modal component implies a weakening of the speaker's initial attitude to the veracity of what is being said. In the process of syntactic phraseologization of the meanings of the components of an non-segmented syntactic structure, the modal component changes. Phraseologized sentences have a subjective modality, which expresses the subject's view of the denotative situation, the modal evaluation of something, the speaker's emotional attitude to someone's statement, behavior or situation in general, and generalizes the speaker's impression of someone or something.

In phraseologized sentences, the variable component of which is verb forms of the present or past tense of the active voice, the objective real modality is not expressed. In terms of their functional purpose, such non-segmented syntactic constructions do not convey a message about any facts of reality. Phraseologized sentences are intended to express subjective-modal meanings. Напр.: *Коли вже каже, то каже*, – *махнув рукою Сніженко* (М. Стельмах) – Perception of action as usual (сприйняття дії як звичайної); this action is perceived without reference to the present time; *Як наголосив, так наголосив* (розм.) – perception of action as usual; the action is

perceived without reference to the past tense. In both cases, the phraseologized meaning is generalized rather than specific.

In a formal-grammatical sentence, the speaker determines the degree of probability of the reported information, specifies it in the meanings of certainty/doubt, possibility, conviction, desirability, etc., which are also opposed to the meaning of direct statement. Syntactically non-segmented sentences are a syntactic means of expressing subjective-modal meanings, by which the speaker conveys his/her attitude to reality.

It is worthwhile to consider separately the modal component in word-sentences and phraseological sentences. In non-phraseologized, non-segmented sentences, subjective modality is expressed through the syntactic categories of affirmation and negation. The main manifestation of these categories in such non-membered syntactic constructions is grammatical affirmation and grammatical negation. Напр.: – *Я умираю?* – **Так. Абсолютно точно** (О. Довженко); – *До Паскуди кликали?* – *поцікавився дідок.* – **Угу** (Ю. Збанацький); – *Не заблудиш?* – **Ні**; – *До моєї бригади присікаєшся?* – **Ніскілечки** (Із творів М. Стельмаха).

The means of expressing grammatical affirmation and grammatical negation are particles and modal words of affirmative or negative semantics.

For example: *However, subjective modality may not have a verbal expression* – *Жданівський тартак знаєте?* – **Чому не знати?** (М. Стельмах); – *Ти що? Теж віскі?* – **А ти ж думав!** (П. Загребельний); – *Ну, обжилися?* – **Як бачите** (І. Головченко, О. Мусієнко).

We have a small register of phraseologized, sentences that indicate the subject. Semi-phraseological sentences such as *What I am not..., Who else but me..., That's why we are..., That I am..., That we are...*(*Чим я не .., Хто, як не я .., На те ми й .., Що я .., Що ми ...*) directly express the speaker's attitude to the reported information, although their pronoun forms have already been desemanticized and grammatized. Наприклад: **Чим я не мірошник!** (З. Тулуб); **Кому, як не мені, це відомо!** (В. Косенко); **Мартин. Що мені Красовський! Я сам уродзоний шляхтич!** (І. Карпенко-Карий).

According to V. Yurchenko, the core of modality is the intentional act of linking an object and its features on the axis of real time. Intentionality is the active construction of a subject-significant configuration created by human consciousness that reflects objective reality on the real-time axis. It is caused by three factors: 1) the fact that the world is divided into objects and signs; 2) the fact that the world and man are united by real time; 3) the fact that time is irreversible.

The original construction – a semantically elementary simple or compound sentence – presents the unfolding of the features of objects in terms of real modality. In phraseologized sentences as secondary constructions, we observe a weakening of the speaker's participation in the process of linking the subject and its attributes, напр.: *Пропадать – так пропадать!* (В. Винниченко); *Є чому сміятися* (Розм.).

In most phraseologized sentences, the subject is not expressed, it is excluded from the sphere of modality. Напр.: *Як уже брехати, то брехати* (П. Загребельний); *Думки його, видно, були тільки про перепела. – Самота вона і є самота* (О. Гончар); *Дивився. Думає. – Швидше б та трава!* (Л. Костенко); *Що то були за місяці розлуки й чужини!* (М. Вайно).

Reduction of the modal component gives some non-segmented syntactic constructions a certain expressive color, fixes them in use as a social formula. Напр.: *Нема в що тріски збирати; Нема в що солі зав'язати; Нема що їсти, нема пити, нема й роду, щоб поговорити* (Українські народні прислів'я та приказки); *Нема де працювати; Нема що сказати* (розм.); *На те він і кравець, щоб подертий жупан носити!* (Українські народні прислів'я та приказки); *На те і війна* (розм.); *Тільки й вашого, що веселитися!* (розм.); *Тілький й радості, що діти* (розм.).

Reduction of the modal component in a phraseologized sentence implies weakening of the speaker's participation in the process of linking the subject and its features, and then the speaker's removal from the sphere of modality, while in a formal grammatical sentence the subject's features are unfolded in terms of the objective real modality.

The transformation of the communicative component is caused by the above-mentioned transformations and implies a change in the communicative purpose of the basic sentence. For example, the models *мало що*, *мало чого* convey the meaning of «it doesn't matter». These models are the result of truncation of the variable component in the sentence structure – a verb in the present or past tense, *пор.*: – **Мало чого!** (Розм.); – *Тобто в мене білет є, але не в ваш вагон, а в восьмий. – То в восьмому і їдьте. – Ні, я хочу в вашому. – Мало чого хто захоче! – Але я просив би вас* (П. Загребельний). From the point of view of syntactic semantics, the components of the model *мало що* are not connected idiomatically and the adverbial word and particle do not function according to the current syntactic rules. As a result, the original elements of the semantic structure are removed from the deep structure: predicativity, modality and communicativity. New elements of the semantic structure appear, which are interpreted as pragmatic implications – relations, conclusions that the addressee creates on the basis of the message received.

In the semantic and syntactic structure of the non-segmented construction, the communicative purpose of the original formal grammatical sentence also changes. We can trace the following transformations of the communicative component:

1) the transition of an interrogative formal grammatical sentence into an affirmative non-segmented sentence. The pronoun word *що* loses its interrogative connotation and together with the particle *то* and the preposition *за* forms an indecomposable compound with an evaluative meaning, e.g.: – **Що то за парубок!** – *шепотять дівчата між собою* (Марко Вовчок); 2) the transition of an interrogative formal-grammatical sentence into a negative non-membered sentence. The anaphoric position of the indecomposable compound *яка там, де там*, that consists of a desemanticized pronoun or adverbial word, forms the negative semantics of the corresponding models of phraseologized sentences, e.g.: – *Однаке, – кажу, – видно ти вчився в юридичному. На такій посаді тепер ... Паскуда байдуже махнув рукою, презирливо хмикнув: – Яка там посада. Тимчасово. Мав їхати начальником поліції, але не захотів, бо в чужий район* (Ю. Збанацький); 3) change of the affirmative modal plan to the negative, e.g.: – *Степан знає, чого постить:*

хоче скоріше до раю добратися! – Еге, так його і пустять! (М. Стельмах); 4) the construction changes the conditional modal plan to the affirmative, e. g.: – *Тебе, може, дивує те, що я тебе не так зустрів, як бувало раніше? – А хоч би й це, – нервово кинула Майя* (М. Хвильовий); 5) construction with a formal past tense is translated into the affirmative modal, e. g.: – *...Тут у нас Польський базар, там далі – Турецький ... а ще є наш власний Хуторянський, де можна купити все на світі, навіть овечі смушки. – Овечі смушки? – А ти ж як думав!* (П. Загребельний); 6) the verb loses the grammatical features of a full part of speech, turning into an analytical lexeme. The verb form with interrogative semantics conveys an affirmation. For example: – *А заєць же був! – знову спокушав Микола. – Ех, і заєць! – А нам його даватимеш? – не витримав я. – Питаєш!* (А. Дімаров).

The pragmatic (connotative) components presented in the pre- and post-positive context influence the modal and communicative components of the non-segmented sentence. For example: – *Я мушу подумати, – Кен і далі не хоче ловитися на гачок. – От причена, – роздратовано каже Морган у коридорі* (І. Йосипів); – *Чудії! – не вгавав тим часом житель Сходу. – Просто кажучи – варвари! Що їм наука? А ще сміють вихвалятися* (Ю. Смолич).

The reinterpretation of the components, the reduction of the modal component and the transformation of the communicative component lead to the transformation of the intensifier as a whole, i. e. its qualitative change. Due to such changes non-segmented syntactic structure with specific semantics is formed.

CHAPTER 4.2.2

Communicative units of conversational speech

4.4.2.1 Intra-linguistic factors of syntactically non-segmented sentences

In linguistics there is an ongoing debate about the preconditions for the formation of syntactically non-segmented sentences. Some researchers, in particular N. Shvedova, V. Kodukhov, L. Roizenzon, considering such types of non-segmented sentences as phraseologized ones, qualify them as formerly free and easily segmented syntactic constructions (Shvedova 1960, p. 269; Kodukhov 1965, p. 16; Roizenzon

1961, p. 102), as units characterized in synchronic terms by secondary meaning and secondary form (Kodukhov 1967, p. 127). Others suppose that phraseologized constructions are not connected with formal grammatical sentences, but with phraseological units that at some stage have acquired a certain generalization and abstraction. However, the meaning of such syntactic constructions does not correspond either to the meaning of their syntactic form or to the meaning of the phraseology with which they are connected (Solhanyk 1976, p. 73).

Some linguists also do not support the idea of the initial construction as an archetype for a syntactically non-segmented sentence. T. Tulina sees the reason for the formation of syntactically non-segmented sentences not only and not so much in the need to create a form adequate to certain content, but in the advantages of such a form: «the reason for the formation of constructions lies in their high frugality... All such expressions have an increased capacity» (Tulina 1976, p. 49).

The emergence of syntactically non-segmented constructions is determined by a number of specific trends and laws in the language system and beyond. These are, first of all, the overloading of some linguistic units and grammatical forms with meanings, the intensification of the communication process and the speaker's desire to convey as much information as possible using the same formal language resources and the same time period, the dominance of the semantic plan of statements over the formal one in spoken language, the lack of previous consideration of the formal and semantic parameters of a statement in a dialogical communication form, the effect of the principle of linguistic economy, etc.

Syntactically non-segmented sentences are impossible without a connection to the relevant context because this is how their communicative plan is expressed. In a broader context, particularly in a dialogue, in a speech situation, the subject of speech in non-segmented sentences is determined.

Context is an important and indispensable means of fully actualizing the communicative content of syntactically non-segmented sentences in speech. It can include linguistic context (lexical and semantic, morphological, syntactic, functional and communicative), extra-linguistic context (situation – conditions of

communication, subject matter, time and place of communication, communicants, their relations, etc.) and presupposition.

The presence of various factors of both an extra-linguistic and proper-linguistic nature, as well as various presuppositions in conversational speech, especially in oral-dialogical speech, greatly facilitates the production and interpretation of syntactically unarticulated sentences, ensures the maximum efficiency of the communication process in general. Dialogic text, which is a contextual phenomenon, helps to determine the functional specificity of such sentences. For example.: – *Оце так Олесь ! Оце молодчага, так молодчага! Перемогти самого Феодала! – ледь не затанцював од радості Андрій* (І. Головченко, О. Мусієнко); *А принципи відстоювати найважче, бо їх треба дотримуватися й під час бою. Це, звісно, не жіноча філософія, але й фехтування, між нами кажучи, не зовсім жіноча забава. Отже на війні – як на війні* (Брати Капранови); – *Ти б, Васильку, взяв краще букваря та азбуки вчився, тебе он женити пора, а ти раз у раз шмаруєш попід піччю. – Ну, так і женіть, коли пора ! – От такої!* (С. Васильченко); – *Так, правда, я живий, бо чую біль; То сам ти знаєш, що в такі хвилини і лютий ворог міг за брата здатись. – Таки се правда!* (Леся Українка); *Лишіть мене тут при старому огнищі. – От так! От так! Хутірської ідилії захотілося* (Олександр Олесь).

Syntactic constructions, laconic, economical and informatively sufficient, function mostly in conversational speech. The use of syntactic units, laconic in form and capable of conveying substantive content, mainly in oral and dialogic speech, is due to one of the defining features of conversational speech in general. This feature should be interpreted from two points of view: 1) the speaker's desire for brevity, brevity in conveying information; 2) striving for the maximum concentration of this information in the statement, when omitting all that is irrelevant, repetitive, redundant.

The appearance of syntactically non-segmented sentences occurs actively in the conditions of oral speech due to the action of the principles of the organization of oral expression. The results of the implementation of these principles may be different.

1. The principle of economy of speech, the essence of which is that economical syntactic constructions become minimal linguistic means for expressing a certain amount of information, sometimes quite large. It is defined as the main one in the organization of conversational speech. Constructions that are different in scope – free, phraseological, etc. – are transformed into minimal in scope formulas that express their categorical meaning [Pankova 2007].

The theory of the economy of linguistic phenomena was developed by many linguists, but it was most convincingly substantiated by A. Martine. He equated the principle of economy with the driving forces of language development: «The principle of economy in language is manifested in the constant desire to achieve a balance between conflicting needs that must be satisfied – the needs of communication, on the one hand, and the inertia of memory and the inertia of speech organs – on the other» (Martine 1963, p. 534).

The principle of linguistic economy, as interpreted by A. Martine, was criticized for its universality by some Russian linguists. R. Budagov, refuting excessive expansion of the concept of economy, noted that numerous facts from the history of various languages contradict the principle of economy, and that the development of language «economy cannot be equated with economy, no matter how broadly it is understood» (Budagov 1972, p. 27). However, he noted that the principle of economy may be relevant for some structural components of language and may be fixed differently at each individual stage of its development.

Our observations of the syntax of dialogical and monological speech, in particular on the material of literary works, provide grounds to believe that the tendency towards economy in the Ukrainian language is traced at all levels. For example, in the sphere of syntax, the principle of economy in speech processes is manifested in the shortening of the verbal structure of the sentence, the use of single-clause sentences, various incomplete sentences, and syntactically non-segmented constructions.

The principle of economy eliminates the danger of information overload in speech and thus creates conditions for fulfilling an important rule of spoken language – the pursuit of phraseologized and concise expressions.

Significant factors beyond the realm of language influence the functioning of the principle of economy. Firstly, the features of the speaker themselves play a role in their pursuit of maximum efficiency in communication. Their speech is characterized not only by accuracy, but also by reproducibility, which is possible through maximum speed or encoding of articulated expressions into more economical, non-segmented units. Secondly, a significant portion of information related to the content of a specific speech act is already explained in the situation, which allows for its avoidance in verbalization, enabling the economy of time and linguistic effort of communication participants. Thirdly, another part of information is implicit in the context of the speech act in the form of various presuppositions, which contributes to a significant reduction in the use of language means in the communication process and the time required for their representation.

It is precisely the contradiction between a person's need for efficient means of communication and their limited, inadequate possibilities in the linguistic sphere that stimulates the emergence of more economical means and units of expression of human thought, including syntactically non-segmented sentences. Typically, such contradictions are the main reason for linguistic development. The way to eliminate these contradictions is determined by the nature of the language system itself, which enables such transformations to take place.

2. *The principle of the automatism of speech* explains the appearance of sentence structures in the speech flow in conditions of high-frequency repeated situations.

3. *The linear-dynamic principle*, the essence of which is that the informative centers of an expression are conveyed to the listener separately, in certain parts, in a temporal sequence, and the most important, informative significant center of an expression attempts to occupy the initial position. In the sphere of specific constructions of spoken syntax, this principle influences both word order and structural-grammatical organization, which leads to the emergence of specific syntactically unarticulated constructions.

4. *The application of the principle of absence of prior planning* demonstrates diametrically opposite results at the syntactic level. This leads to the production of

constructions in speech that have unmotivated, unclear syntactic organization, or of stable, automatically reproducible constructions in speech, which include non-segmented sentences.

The mentioned principles of organizing oral expressions create prerequisites for the use of syntactically non-segmented sentence structures in oral speech.

The emergence of non-segmented sentences is also directly caused by the law of asymmetry of the linguistic sign. The action of this law consists in the fact that the form of the syntactic construction undergoes a change – a reduction or compression of the structure, the form does not correspond to the content of the syntactic construction, for which, ultimately, an expansion of the expression capacity is possible. The expression plan of the linguistic unit becomes more complex due to the implicit part of the content of the syntactic structure. The new syntactic unit becomes more informative, which gives it specificity and enables it to acquire new properties due to the asymmetry of form and content.

Linguists identify *general reasons* for the appearance of syntactically non-segmented sentences, including:

1. Redistribution of meanings, which makes it possible to reduce semantic overload of some grammatical forms. In this regard, researchers have noted: «...some grammatical forms turned out to be overloaded with meanings. It is natural that methods of relieving them from excessive polysemanticism were used in the language... It turned out to be possible to redistribute meanings, distinguish meanings according to different grammatical forms, which reduces the semantic load of some forms...» (Panov 1968, p. 15).

2. The desire to convey the maximum amount of information using minimal linguistic resources. Scientists note that language development occurs through an increase in the amount of information transmitted per unit of time.

In addition to the general reasons that determine the appearance of various types of syntactically non-segmented sentences, specific factors should be named, such as the form of thought they express – holistic, not separated into individual concepts, but implying these concepts. Another factor is the specificity of the semantics of unattached constructions, which represent a modal proposition. It is recognized that

modal units undergo reduction, and in any language at a certain period of its development, there are «... standard formulas for mode expression, which are at different degrees of reduction стандартні формули вираження модусу, що перебувають на різних ступенях редукції» (Cheremisina 1987, p. 35).

Representatives of psycholinguistics believe that our thinking operates in at least two forms: 1) concrete, clearly structured, with defined boundaries and scope of content; 2) generalized, structurally unattached, with expanded boundaries and an undefined scope. There are corresponding means in the language for expressing the first type of thought – formal-grammatical sentences. It has been quite regular for communicators to seek to find language units that would express the unattached thought since «... speech should be clearly optimal, that is, adequate to the content of the thought» (Savchenko 1986, p. 64). There are two reasons for the emergence of unattached thought: economy, that is, reducing the time for mental operations as well as intellectual efforts, and misunderstanding – superficial penetration into the subject of thought either due to a lack of necessary information or due to a time limit. Therefore, if the unattached thought is based on a dissected one, it is logical that non-segmented sentences can also be compared with formal-grammatical sentences. Units that are adequate to the unattached thought are syntactically non-segmented sentences. Such sentence structures have a particular significance for the grammar of the Ukrainian language and its speakers because, as A. Vezhbitska pointed out, Ukrainian and Russian languages share the characteristic of «irrationality – non-irrationality», the manifestation of the limitations of logical thinking, human knowledge and understanding, and the unpredictability of life (Vezhbitska 1996, p. 34).

4.2.2.2 Criteria for identifying syntactically non-segmented sentences

The study of any linguistic phenomenon begins with defining its boundaries. However, it becomes particularly complicated when the linguistic phenomenon is quite diverse in structural and functional-semantic manifestations and lacks clearly established criteria for identification.

In linguistics, the terminological diversity in designating such a linguistic phenomenon as syntactically non-segmented sentences reflects not only the ambiguity of their status and the different views of researchers but also the diffuse nature of units of a certain class.

A broad interpretation of syntactically non-segmented sentences makes the boundaries of their class more blurred and indefinite, so establishing criteria for their selection becomes quite problematic.

Our study is based on a narrow interpretation of non-segmented sentences as non-predicative syntactic units that perform a communicative function. The class of syntactically non-segmented sentences is represented by two types: non-phraseological self-non-segmented sentences and phraseologized non-segmented sentences. We distinguish them according to two criteria: *syntactic* and *functional*.

The main one is the syntactic criterion, outlined on the basis of such syntactic features as the impossibility of distinguishing the main and secondary members of the sentence, the impossibility of establishing syntactic links between the components of a stable structural scheme. The syntactic criterion serves as the basis for extracting syntactically non-segmented sentences from two-syllable and monosyllabic sentences.

Syntactically non-segmented sentences implement communicative, emotive and expressive functions that form the basis for a functional criterion. The essence of the emotive function is the expression of an emotional reaction to the content of a message, an event, the behavior of an interlocutor or a third person. The emotive component basically complements the speaker's attitude to the facts and phenomena of objective reality, the speaker as a participant in communication, his behavior, which together determine the communicative direction of syntactically non-segmented sentences as a whole. The emotive function enhances the intentional movement of non-segmented syntactic constructions. It is closely related to the expressive function.

Outlining the boundaries of syntactically non-segmented sentences, we do not include such non-speech and proposed constructions as pause fillers, contact stimuli, dialogic repetitions, etiquette formulas, invocation-sentence and unfinished (interrupted) sentences.

Pause fillers and **contact stimuli** are considered among the equivalent sentences because of their complete inconsistency with the formal grammatical sentence. Noting the obligatory nature of pause fillers – hesitatives – for any type of communication, some researchers focus on their thought-regulating function. The research points out that hesitatives allow «to gather one's thoughts, to make up for a pause of confusion or lack of concentration» (Devkin 1979, p. 62). Ostman Y. singled out the specific role of pause fillers – to soften the expression (Ostman 1981, p. 9). According to his observations, such speech units contribute to the conversation in calm tones.

In our opinion, pause fillers and contact stimuli are not oriented directly to the expression of communicative reactions. Given that these are units of the communicative-organizational level, in particular, they are used to establish, continue, complete contact, etc., they are only communication regulators, for example: pause fillers – *А чим ти цікавишся? – Ну-у-у ... Та всім цікавлюсь, а ти? – Іринка склала губи бантиком* (Л. Дереш); – *Як пройшла перевірка? – А-а... Комісія продовжить роботу і завтра* (Розм.); контактні стимули – *Зустрінемося сьогодні? Добре?* (розм.); – *Я ж тепер у твоєму сні. Що, слабо?* (Л. Дереш).

Dialogic repetition is the speech reaction of one speaker to the expression of another. Arutyunova N. instead uses the term spring cue, indicating the function of organizing dialogic unity and the role of a constructive element in the dialogue (Arutyunova 1970, p. 54). From a formal point of view, repetition relies on the lexical and grammatical composition of the stimulus replica, which determines its formal synsemanticity. The components of dialogical repetition are incomplete and full-fledged vocabulary, reflected in the transfer of *modus* and *dictum* meanings. Such characteristics serve to refer dialogic repetitions to the class of equivalent sentences, and not to syntactically non-segmented sentences, for example: – *Можеш піти містом і заблудитися. Блуд дуже чіпляється. Але то вже як наслідок... – Чого? – Чого? Таке краще не питати* (Л. Дереш); – *Ви з голодного села? – суворо спитав сторож. – З голодного, – знехотя відповів передній* (В. Винниченко).

Speech etiquette is a special communicative unit that has been sufficiently studied. Speech formulas were actively studied at the end of the 20th century – at the

beginning of the XXI century (Bohdan S., Radevich-Vynnytskyi Y., Matsko L., Huyvanyuk N., Melnychuk A., etc.). Politeness formulas are qualified in different ways, namely as formulas or constructions of speech etiquette (Pliushch N., Radevich-Vynnytskyi Y., Huyvanyuk N., Melnychuk O.), etiquette formulas (Bohdan S.), interactive units of language etiquette (Matsko L.) and others (Bohdan 1998; Kuz 2000; Radevich-Vynnytskyi 2001.; Huyvanyuk 1995; Dudyk 1973, p. 290; Matsko 2003, p. 382; Mironiuk 2006; Pliushch 1991).

In linguistics, by tradition, speech formulas were considered as incomplete sentences (Peshkovsky 1956, p. 362; Shakhmatov 1941, p. 128), one-word sentences (Grammar 1954, p. 88], exclamations (Gvozdev 1958, p. 160), encouraging and wishful thinking (Babaitseva 1968, p. 132–133). O. Gvozdev classified speech formulas for greeting as a special type of exclamatory sentences (Gvozdev 1958, p. 189). Expressions with the meaning of wishes and threats were mostly considered non-articulated sentences with a contact-establishing function (Skoblykova 1979, p. 149) or emotional and evaluative sentences.

Ukrainian linguists considered them among the words-sentences. Although P. Dudyk emphasized that language etiquette constructions «are classified as words-sentences ... conditionally: they do not affirm or deny anything, do not contain an expressive-modal evaluation of someone's statement... The basis for including such formations as words-sentences is , on the one hand, their ability to express an attitude towards a person, and on the other hand, the incommensurability of the syntactic structure, the absence of sentence members in it» (Suchasna 1972, p. 302). The authors of «The Syntax of the Modern Ukrainian Language: Problematic Issues» interpreted language formulas as «communications of linguistic etiquette» (Syntax 1994, p. 204), which reflects only their communicative purpose, but by no means delineates the correlation or non-correlation with other indivisible formations. Example: – **Боже помагай!** – *тієї ж миті привітався Варварчук із Кейваном і ступив у скошену траву під горіхом* (М. Матіос); – **Добраніч!** – *відповів скоро, і в тім його голосі причулося мені виразно душевне зворушення і якась ураза* (О. Кобилянська).

The main formal and grammatical features of speech etiquette are predicativeness and modality; these are communicative units built according to the scheme of noun and verb sentences, two-syllable and one-syllable; they have verbal or nominal predicates. Given these characteristics, speech etiquette formulas are not included in syntactically unarticulated sentences.

The problems of including sentences-addresses in the class of grammatical or syntactically non-segmented sentences were actively discussed in linguistics in the 60s and 70s of the 20th century. In particular, O. Popov believed that «vocative sentences should be classified as sentences that do not show semantic-grammatical fragmentation. The main member of such sentences does not converge with either the subject or the predicate» (Popov 1958, p. 37). E. Galkina-Fedoruk emphasized that vocative sentences are grammatical sentences, because they have two main features: they have intonation of the message and predicativeness... (Galkina-Fedoruk 1965, p. 63).

I. Kucherenko stood on the position of recognizing the syntactic completeness (sentence) of autonomous vocatives (Kucherenko 1963, pp. 70–71).

P. Dudyk initially considered the inflectional sentences as a kind of equivalents (substitutes) for sentences, because they «do not show either content or syntactic fragmentation, do not have the logical and grammatical basis of a two-syllabic or one-syllabic sentence» (Suchasna 1972, p. 309; Dudyk 1973, p. 43). However, later he qualified the address-sentence as a separate communicative unit that «is peculiarly used as a sentence» (Dudyk 2000, p. 41).

K. Shulzhuk shared the opinion of P. Dudyk: he considered vocative sentences as the equivalents (substitutes) of the sentence as a broader class of non-segmented sentences (Shulzhuk 2004, p. 46–149).

The rest of Ukrainian linguists, namely I. Vykhovanets, M. Karanska, M. Skab, considered the vocative sentences in the system of formal-grammatical sentences. I. Vykhovanets categorically rejected the thesis about the non-segmentation of vocative sentences; in the formal-syntactic aspect, these are «segmented one-piece sentences, the main member of which, undifferentiated to subject and predicate, is

expressed by the vocative case and can be extended by attributive components»; from the semantic-and-syntactic point of view, such sentences are «divided into two constitutive syntaxemes» (Vykhovanets 1992, p. 61–62). However, he emphasized the possibility of transition under the influence of the emotional microcontext of some segmented vocative sentences into non-segmented exclamatory ones, that is, he considered such exclamatory sentences as non-segmented sentences (Vykhovanets 2006, p. 25). Only one functional type of vocative sentences can undergo such transformations – those that express an emotional reaction to the words and actions of the interlocutor; they appear as a corresponding emotional-evaluative reaction.

On the grounds of the mentioned considerations of I. Kucherenko, I. Vykhovanets, M. Skab, we qualify vocative sentences, namely evaluative-emotional ones, as one-piece, segmented sentences, motivated by communicative and situational tasks. For example: *О розп'ятий! глянь на мене! О не дай мені пропасти У безодні мук, розлуки, у зневір'я глибині* (І. Франко); *Василь. Панове громадо! Радив би вам вибрати Трохима на війта!* (М. Кропивницький).

The status of unfinished (interrupted, broken) sentences is still the subject of linguistic discussions. Mostly, researchers considered them as incomplete. P. Dudyk and K. Shulzhuk included unfinished sentences among peculiar sentence substitutes, its equivalents (Dudyk 1973, p. 297; Shulzhuk 2004, p. 144–146). P. Dudyk singled out the main feature of unfinished sentences – their incompleteness; in addition, he distinguished between structural, content and intonation incompleteness (Dudyk 1972, p. 303). In his opinion, the «fragility» of unfinished (interrupted, broken) sentences is an obstacle to their adequate description, since it is difficult to clearly distinguish between typical and less typical, less traceable and episodic phenomena" among various phrases (Dudyk 1972, p. 303).

V. Pitel qualified unfinished constructions as formal-grammatical sentences that have most of their features (Pitel 2000, p. 5). Intonational incompleteness of an unfinished sentence does not mean incompleteness of the thought in terms of communication, because what the speaker wanted to say, thanks to the speech situation and context, becomes transparent and does not need clarification. It is worth noting that

unfinished sentences are mostly represented by full-valued components, and this formal-grammatical feature gives reason to talk about their two or one-piece syntactic construction, that is, they were considered as real segmented sentences.

The integral features unifying different types of syntactically non-segmented sentences into one class are formal-grammatical, semantic, and functional characteristics. Their formal-grammatical characteristics include: expressed sentence character, absence of an abstract scheme, situational predicativeness or its absence, impossibility to form modal, temporal and personal paradigm forms. From a semantic point of view, syntactically non-segmented sentences are characterized by a high degree of implicitness, a decrease in the autosemanticity of the components of a stable structural scheme, and a predominance of modal values.

4.2.2.3 Categorical and differential features of syntactically non-segmented units

Syntactically non-segmented units, heterogeneous in terms of the degree of segmentation, are characterized by categorical and differential features.

The categorical features of syntactically non-segmented sentences are syntactic non-segmented, stability, and structural-semantic integrity.

Syntactic non-segmented is a multifaceted feature and therefore manifests differently in syntactically non-segmented sentences. Syntactic detachment integrates formal and semantic-syntactic detachment. Formal-syntactic non-segmented is the inability to distinguish sentence members and the absence of syntactic relationships in sentence structure. Semantic-syntactic non-segmented means the inability to distinguish differentially expressed subjects, objects of action, various attributes, etc. in the semantic structure of the sentence and semantic-syntactic relationships between them. Syntactic non-segmented as a feature of an unattached phrase implies its function as one sentence member.

Following V. Arkhangelsky, we consider stability as a feature of the structural organization of a sentence (Arkhangelsky 1964, p. 110) and identify the following indicators: 1) structural stability – the presence of mandatory components,

variable and invariant, and optional ones; irreversible order of positioning of model components; the impossibility of lexical-grammatical variation of the invariant component; this indicator characterizes phrasal, semi-phrasal, and partially phrasal sentences; 2) morphological stability – the preservation of the invariance of grammatical forms for reference and variable components, the constancy of using the unrepeatable component; this indicator characterizes phrasal and semi-phrasal sentences; 3) syntactic stability – the invariability of the model; this is a feature of proper unattached sentences and sentences with phrasal structure. Syntactic stability implies the presence of such a type of internal dependence as syntactic connection; this is characteristic of all types of phrasal sentences; 4) functional stability – the traditionality of using different types and kinds of syntactically unattached sentences.

The stability of syntactically non-segmented sentences is determined by their structural organization. In such phrases, the grammatically subordinate word has a fixed, clearly defined position relative to the grammatical core word. Morphological stability as one of the indicators of stability in general for syntactically non-segmented phrases involves the use of established grammatical forms of dependent constituents, often limited by their morphological expression. Depending on the type of non-segmented combination, the grammatical core word is limited in terms of morphological expression and lexical-grammatical variation. There is a syntactic relationship between the constituents of non-segmented phrases, which is the basis of grammatical coherence and leads to the invariant sequence of the constituents in the model.

A stable structural scheme of idiomatic, semi-idiomatic, and partially idiomatic sentences is characterized by a structural-semantic integrity that is associated with limited possibilities of transforming the structural scheme without changing the meaning of the sentence. The meaning of such types of syntactically non-segmented sentences is idiomatic, not derived from the meanings of individual components; it is generalized. The meaning of properly non-segmented sentences is typical, generalized, produced in the plane of affirmation or negation, positive or negative assessment, etc. Unlike idiomatic sentences, their meaning is largely related to the semantics of their

components. Transformations of such sentences without changing their meaning are impossible.

The overall meaning of a syntactically non-segmented combination is fixed by a stable structural scheme and is not derived from the sum of the meanings of its constituents. The core and dependent constituents of a non-segmented combination retain their lexical meaning. In the structure of a syntactically non-segmented combination, the core constituent is grammatically important but requires informative complementation. The dependent constituent has a more specific lexical meaning and provides the core constituent with necessary meaning complementation. The main and dependent words together form an informationally sufficient complex (Zahnitko 1996, p. 124). The linguists notes that the constituents of such a cohesive compound «do not have the properties of separability in terms of content in this phraseological unit», meaning that two constituents together ensure the informativeness of an indivisible compound.

It is worth noting that a significant number of syntactically non-segmented phrases can combine several meanings at the same time. Due to the syncretism of semantic-syntactic relations, syntactically non-segmented phrases are formed with completive-attributive, completive-objective, and completive-attributive-objective relationships. For example: *Еней був **парубок моторний*** (І. Котляревський); *Хто-хто, а син знає, що добра **половина** цих **обладунків** у звичайний час залишилася б лежати вдома ...* (О. Гончар); *У неї [Марії] чоло, а за ним хорониться **брунька розуму**, яка от-от розів'ється, розцвіте й пізнає добро і зло* (У. Самчук).

The qualifying characteristics of syntactically non-segmented sentences are idiomaticity and reproducibility. These features are characteristic only of phraseologized sentences. The semantics of phraseologized sentences, as an individual semantics of each type and kind, has an idiomatic character since it is not determined by the lexical content of the components: their specific meaning is either lost or neutralized and overlaid by the general meaning of the non-segmented structure. The semantics of phraseologized sentences is created precisely by the combination of specific components that acquire a complete semantic and intonational expression only

in combination with each other. Outside of the non-segmented structure, the stable structural scheme does not have the same semantics as revealed in it.

Reproducibility as a characteristic of phraseologized sentences enables their use in their ready-made form in oral-dialogue speech, which directly indicates their conventional nature.

Expressiveness is a characteristic of syntactically non-segmented sentences. Since the only component of non-segmented sentences conveys the overall sentence semantics that is in the sphere of subjective-modal and emotional expressions of the speaker, such expressive means as particles and interjections perform their functions of emphasis, reinforcement, and providing communicative power to the statement.

Both non-segmented and phraseologized sentences are communicative units that are means of conveying a certain national color and individuality of speech. non-segmented sentences function in texts with reliance on context.

The differential feature of syntactically non-segmented phrases is semantic: each of their constituents retains its lexical meaning.

Generally, such phrases serve as direct names for facts and phenomena of the surrounding reality, and their meaning is directly focused on reality, except for metaphorical and periphrastic phrases. The components of syntactically non-segmented phrases are words of relative semantics, grammatically main, requiring informative complementation by another component, grammatically dependent, i.e., the semantics of the components has a gradational manifestation.

Depending on the communicative needs and intentions of the speaker, as well as the peculiarities of communication, some types of syntactically non-segmented phrases are created and produced in their original form. They are characterized by full or partial reproducibility.