ARTICLE

Categorial Semantic Contours Semi–Phraseologized Sentences

Mariia Lychuk [1*] , *Svitlana Shabat-Savka* [2] , *Lyudmila Marchuk* [3] , *Tatiana Sukalenko* [4] , *Zoreslava Shevchuk* [3]

[1] *Department of International Journalism, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University, Kyiv 04053, Ukraine*

[2] *Department of Modern Ukrainian Language, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Chernivtsi 58012, Ukraine*

[3] *Department of Ukrainian Language, Kamianets–Podilskyi Ivan Ohienko National University, Kamianets–Podilskyi 32301, Ukraine*

[4] *Department of Social Communications, Literature and Culture, State Tax University, Irpin, Kyiv Region 08200, Ukraine*

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the analysis of the categorical meanings of the semi–phraseologized sentences and characterisation of their semantic types. The study is based on the interpretation of semi–phraseologized sentences as colloquial syntactic constructions not only in Ukrainian but also in other languages. The categorical meanings of the semi–phraseological sentences "affirmation", "negation", "asessment" and "expression of will" make it possible to distinguish certain semantic types of semi–phraseologized sentences with corresponding categorical meanings. The classification feature is the phraseosyntactic meaning fixed to a stable structural scheme. The phrase–syntactic meaning forms the content of the phrase scheme components: morphological expression of permanent and variable components. Semi–phraseologized sentences with the categorical meaning of "affirmation" formed three semantic types: 1) with the actual affirmation meaning; 2) with the meaning of categorical affirmation; 3) with the meaning of conditional affirmation. Semi–phraseologized sentences have two manifestations of the categorical meaning of "negation": 1) with actual nega-

tion; 2) with categorical negation. Semi–phraseologized sentences with categorical meaning of the "assessment" formed the two semantic types: with undifferentiated assessment and with negative assessment. Semi–phraseologized sentences with categorical meaning of the "expression of will" do not form semantic types due to the chaotic selection components of the colloquial type of phrase schemes.The proposed algorithm will help to organize specific non–segmented syntactic constructions in the syntax oral speech of speakers of different linguistic cultures.

Keywords: Categorical Meaning; Semi–Phraseologized Sentence; Semantic Type; Affirmation; Negation; Assessment; Expression of Will

1. Introduction

Constructive grammar combines different grammatical constructions [1–3]. One type of grammatical construction is phraseologized sentences.

Phraseologized syntactically non–segmented sentences were discovered two centuries ago. A. Smyrnytskyi and O. Espersen began to study these sentences [4,5]. In phraseologized constructions, the form or meaning of the components do not explain the plan of expression and content [6,7].

In the studies of modern syntax of different languages, especially during the third decade of the twenty–first century, syntactic phraseologized units play an important role, including in the Ukrainian language

Foreign linguists have studied some types and varieties of phraseologized sentences: in Polish and Finnish [8], English [9–15]. However, this was mostly an episodic rather than a comprehensive analysis. The semantics of some types of non–segmented phraseologized sentences have been briefly analysed in scientific studies by both foreign and Ukrainian linguists [11,16,17]. Speakers reproduce phraseologized sentences as ready–made formulas at the right moment of communication. E. Sapir emphasized: "…stereotypes of social behaviour are not necessarily revealed by simple observation... simple use in practice, then we are talking about "unconscious stereotypes of behaviour in society" [18].

L. Tenier pointed out the specificity of a particular type of phraseologized constructions: "Interjections in reality ... are not a type of word, but a type of sentence. [...] Some interjections are capable of expressing states of mind and soul so complex and so subtle that they cannot

be expressed in a single sentence, and long periphrases are needed to convey their semantics"[19].

The syntax of Ukrainian spoken language has changed significantly: new syntactic constructions have emerged. The most important among these syntactic constructions is a new structural type of simple sentences – semi–phraseologized sentences. In linguo–Ukrainian studies, semi–phraseologized non–segmented sentences began to study in the early twenty–first century [16,17,20]. These are units of colloquial syntax, standardised, evaluative and intonationally emphasised. The language standard, on the one hand, eliminates the antinomy of the speaker and the listener, and on the other hand, it shows the poverty and patternedness of thinking and speaking. Therefore, it is especially important to feel and understand the "golden mean" in communication.

The purpose of the article is to determine the specificity of colloquial syntactic constructions, to analyze the categorical meanings of the semi–phraseologized non–segmented sentences – "affirmation", "negation", "asessment" and "expression of will".

2. Methods

Several methods were used to achieve the goal. The main one was the descriptive method help to characterise the semantic types and varieties of semi–phraseologized syntactically non–segmented sentences the peculiarities combinability of the components of structural schemes to characterize the phrase schemes of semi–phraseologized non–segmented sentences and the peculiarities of combining their components to determine the semantic types of semi–phraseologized syntactically non–segmented sen-

tences.

The method of component analysis is especially effective in studying the semantic aspect of the components of semi–phraseological non–segmented sentences: constant and dependent. This method makes it possible to study semi–phraseologized syntactically non–segmented sentences as bilaterial linguistic signs, to characterize modal and pragmatic components in the syntactic structure.

The transformational method is used to represent the mechanisms of construction of semi–phraseologized non–segmented sentences, to find out the reasons for the formation of phraseosyntactic meaning in their sctructure, to actualise the mechanisms of establishing the integrity of the phraseological structure of semi–phraseologized non–segmented sentences.

The modeling method will help to create models of semi–phraseologized syntactically non–segmented constructions.

3. Results and Discussion

Semi–phraseologized sentences are generally endowed with such basic features as syntactic disjointedness, stability, idiomatic meaning, emotional and evaluative informativeness, standardisation, reproducibility and high frequency.

The research material has shown that in the environment of semi–phraseologized sentences, the most active are sentences with the categorical meanings of "affirmation", "negation", "assessment", which can have different manifestations: positive and negative and "expression of will".

There is no reason to separately distinguish the type of semi–phraseological sentences with the categorical meaning "emotional reaction", since the expression of an emotional reaction to the content of a message or event or to the behavior of the interlocutor or a third party often accompanies the main phraseological meaning of the structural scheme, cf: Olia. Sirnyky ye? Alina. Obrazhaiesh! (S. Novytska) – categorical meaning of "affirmation" + emotional reaction to the content of the message; – Vizmesh, zvyniai, Denysenkovu zemliu? – nedovirlyvo

podyvyvsia na Horytsvita. – Ta vizmu, shcho zh z toboiu robyty, – zitkhnuv Tymofii, zbyraiuchy zmorshky navkolo ochei. – A meni pansku dasysh? – ishche opasaietsia poviryty polisovshchyk i prypadaie do rukava Tymofiia. – A yaku zh! (M. Stelmakh) – the categorical meaning of "affirmation" + emotional reaction to the content of the message; Dyvys, yaki! Karamzina, Bachysh prochytaly! (T. Shevchenko) – categorical meaning of "expression of will" + emotional reaction to the behavior of third parties.

The categorical meanings of the semi–phraseological sentences "affirmation", "negation" and "asessment" make it possible to distinguish certain semantic types of semi–phraseologized sentences with corresponding categorical meanings. The classification feature is the phraseosyntactic meaning fixed to a stable structural scheme.

3.1. Semi–Phraseologized Sentences with the Categorical Meaning of "Affirmation"

Semi–phraseologized sentences with the categorical meaning of "affirmation" form three semantic types: 1) with the actual affirmation meaning; 2) with the meaning of categorical affirmation; 3) with the meaning of conditional affirmation.

1. The type with an affirmative meaning includes semi–phraseologized sentences based on the phrase schemes Ye shcho (choho, chomu, na shcho, z chym, na chomu, koho, komu, z kym, na komu) + Vf; Ye de (koly, kudy, zvidky) + Vf (see **Table 1**). These are phraseological compounds with case or prepositional–case forms of the relative pronouns shcho, choho and pronoun adverbs de (koly, kudy, zvidky) serves to distinguish two subtypes of such sentences:

1) with a constant component – a relative pronoun. Relative pronouns require an infinitive with the meaning of speech, observation, etc., e.g.: Ye na shcho podyvytys (Ie. Hutsalo); Ye choho posmikhatys. Adzhe vin [Iurko] znav use (V. Kozachenko); Ye z kym pobalakaty (Ie. Pashkovskyi);

2) with a permanent component – an adverb. The invariable accented present tense form of the verb to be combines these two subtypes. The choice of the variable component is to a certain extent determined by the

grammatical nature of the constant component. Pronoun adverbs are accompanied by the infinitive of verbs with the meaning of a specific physical action, e.g.: Ye kudy poikhaty (Braty Kapranovy); Ye de zustritysia (O. Lysheha).

2. The type with the meaning of a categorical affirmative. This semantic type is quite common in spoken language. It combines semi–phraseological sentences based on the following phrase schemes (see **Table 1**).

A. The particle not is desemanticised:

– Chym ya (ty, vin, vona, vono, my, vy, vony) ne + N1 (Subst1). The phraseological indecomposable complex Chym ya (ty, vin, vona, vono, my, vy, vony) ne + N1 (Subst1) is not directed to the plane of the affirmative modality, since it eliminates the negative semantics of the particle ne. The use of structural pronoun components clearly indicates a specific person. The right–hand position is mostly filled by a noun with the meaning of a person or a substantive adjective denoting a person, e.g.: – Chym zhe vin ne kozak, – kazhu ya starym (Marko Vovchok); – Chym vin ne molodyi! (S. Vasylchenko); Shche odni krychat pro pidniattia tsiny na haz? Chym vony ne sluhy narodu? De ye ti, shcho zavzhdy krychaly, shcho za narod! Chomu sohodni zatykhly?! (Ukrainska pravda, 16.02.22);–

– Khto (koho, u koho, komu, z kym, na komu, yakyi, yaka, yake, yaki), yak ne + N1 (Pronom). The grammatical form of variable noun or pronoun components is determined by the accented pronoun component Khto (koho, u koho, komu, z kym, na komu, yakyi, yaka, yake, yaki), yak ne + N1 (Pronom). E.g.: Studenty zapalyly! Vony! Khto, yak ne vony! (V. Vynnychenko).

Some semi–phraseologized sentences of this subtype function as negative ones, but the general affirmative meaning does not change, e.g: Ne khto, yak ne Mykola… (M. Matios);

– Shcho ne + Vf..

The permanent component of the phrase complex is formed by two elements: the pronoun particle that and the negative particle not. In this phrase complex, the negative semantics of the verb component is levelled out, and the phrase scheme has an affirmative meaning. For example: Yaroslav ide sam, khloptsi kolo mashyny lyshaiutsia, bo ditlakhy y parubky skhodiatsia do rozkishnoho popeli-

astoho zi sribliastym vidlyvom avto… Harne! Shcho ne kazhy! (M. Vaino);

– A to my (bud–yakyi zaimennyk, zdebilshoho osobovyi, u formi nazyvnoho vidminka) (tebe chy bud–yakyi zaimennyk, zdebilshoho osobovyi, u formi rodovoho vidminka) ne + Vf. The obligatory constant component of this phrase scheme a to my (any pronoun, mostly personal, in the nominative case). The affirmative nature of the anaphoric analytical phrase if we emphasises the semantics of the semi–phraseologized sentence.

A variable verb component with a negative particle is not formally a negative syntactic construction. Its negative character is completely leveled, and the semi–phraseologized sentence turns into an affirmative one.

The modal meaning of affirmation is layered with an additional shade of mockery, ridicule or dissatisfaction. The pronoun word is desemanticised and turns into a semantically empty component. For example: – Tse zizd osoblyvyi. Tut kozhen musyt svoiu propozytsiiu vyiavyty. – A to my ne rozumiiemo! (M. Vaino).

– A ty zh + Vf! The pronoun ty here does not perform the function of addressing the second person singular due to the loss of grammatical features of the pronoun as a part of speech, so it has become a semantically empty component. The particle a in the anaphoric position and the optional particle g perform an accentuation and specification function.

The permanent analytical component is formed by the pronoun particle shcho in the genitive case and the particle b. The derivational particle in combination with the pronoun personal noun ya, ty, vin, vona, my, vy, vony form a modal indecomposable complex that determines the meaning of the phrase scheme: the interrogative and conditional character is lost and the affirmative meaning is fixed. The optional particle reinforces the categorical character. For example: V Kuchuhurakh maizhe, yak u Kyievi abo Lvovi. – A ty zh dumav!; (P. Zahrebelnyj); – Hasch? Vollen? – pidmorhnuv yomu Pepa i peredav syharetu.).– Nicht schlecht! – A ty dumav! – pidtverdyv Artur (Iu. Andrukhovych);

– Choho b (zhe) ya (ty, vin, vona, my, vy, vony) + Vf. A type with the meaning of a predicted statement. Semi–phraseologized sentences of this semantic type are based

on the phrase schemes ya (ty, vin, vona, my, vy, vony).

The infinitive component is expressed mostly by a perfective verb with the meaning of active action. For example: …Pered vechereiu v nas obiavyvsia tovarysh Nul. – Nul? Tse pravda? – Choho b zhe ya brekhav! Obiavyvsia, znachyt, a my same spivaly (P. Zahrebelnyi).

3. The type with the meaning of a predicted affirmation are based on phrase schemes Nema (nemaie), shchob + Inf; Nema (nemaie) toho, shchob + Inf (see **Table 1**). The verbal lexeme nema (nemaie) is completely desemanticised here. The infinitive component is expressed mostly by a perfective verb with the meaning of active action. For example: Nema toho, shchob posydit (V. Vynnychenko); A nema toho, shchob pity (B. Hrinchenko).

Table 1. Categorical meaning of the "affirmation".

Semantic Types	Phrase Schemes
actual affirmation meaning	Ye shcho (choho, chomu, na shcho, z chym, na chomu, koho, komu, z kym, na komu) + Vf Ye de (koly, kudy, zvidky) + Vf.
meaning of categorical affirmation	Chym ya (ty, vin, vona, vono, my, vy, vony) ne + N1 (Subst1) Khto (koho, u koho, komu, z kym, na komu, yakyi, yaka, yake, yaki), yak ne + N1 (Pronom) Shcho ne + Vf A to my (bud–yakyi zaimennyk, zdebilshoho osobovyi, u formi nazyvnoho vidminka) (tebe chy bud–yakyi zaimennyk, zdebilshoho osobovyi, u formi rodovoho vidminka) ne + Vf A ty zh + Vf!
meaning of predicted affirmation	Nema (nemaie), shchob + Inf Nema (nemaie) toho, shchob + Inf

3.2. Semi–Phraseologized Sentences with the Categorical Meaning of "Negation"

Semi–phraseologized sentences have two manifestations of the categorical meaning of "negation", on the basis of which they are grouped into two semantic types: 1) with the actual negation; 2) with categorical negation. This differentiation is based on the specificity of the negative meaning in these sentences and the function of these sentences in spoken language. The categorical meaning of "negation" is a special type of indirect negation. It is characterised by a wide range of functions. Among the various functions of irony, the polemical and exclusive functions are based on the negating properties of irony [21].

The proper negative meaning is assigned to three types of phrase schemes in semi–phraseologized sentences: 1) Nemaie (nema) koho (komu, z kym, na komu, shcho, choho, chomu, cherez shcho, pro shcho, (z) chym, na chomu) + Inf; Bulo koho (komu, z kym, na komu, shcho, choho, chomu, cherez shcho, pro shcho, (z) chym, na chomu) + Inf; 2) Nemaie (Nema) de (koly, kudy, zvidky) + Inf; 3) Pronom3 (N3) + ne do.

The semantics of negative semi–phraseologized sentences becomes generalised, narrowed down to the categorical seme "impossibility".

The specificity of the semantics of the permanent pronoun and adverbial components of the phrase scheme determines the choice of dependent components. Constant components subordinate only the infinitive. In these sentences the right–hand side variable component can be expressed by transitive verbs with the meaning of a physical or mental action of a person (Nema koho byty. Nema koho liubyty. Nema pro koho dumaty), any active verb of a wide range of meanings, in particular with the meanings of speech and thought action, emotional state, specific physical action, intersubjective action, movement, or non–active verbs expressing local or status value, visitative, comparative or comparative relations (Nema choho spivaty. Nema choho serdytysia. Nema choho viazaty. Nema choho bytysia. Nema choho zghaduvaty. Nema choho radity. Nema choho sumuvaty. Nema choho bazhaty nemozhlyvoho. Nema dlia choho postupatysia. Nema dlia choho vesty. Nema dlia choho namahatysia spodobatysia). Verbs expressing participial relations, the meaning of being, etc. cannot be used as verbal components.

The peculiarity of negative semi–phraseologized sentences based on the phrase scheme nemaie (nema) za shcho is that the infinitive is reproduced based on the traditional speech situation for the dialogue participants. The situation is based on one of the dialogue participants

being grateful to the other. A typical semantic model of negative semi–phraseologized sentences with such a verb component is as follows: Nema za shcho diakuvaty; Nema za shcho hovoryty «spasybi». The verb component can be removed from the phrase scheme, because it is quite clear that the described speech situation requires an unambiguous solution, as it is based on the regularities of everyday communication.

In the phrase scheme Nemaie (nema) the obligatory pronoun component komu in combination nemaie (nema) clearly embeds the subject determination in the structural scheme itself, so the restriction of the verb's semantics is caused only by its correlation with the person. For example: Nemaie komu rozpovidaty. Nemaie komu vidznachytysia nadiinistiu. Nema komu rakhuvaty. Nema komu zaspokoiuvaty. Nema komu nianchyty.

The right–hand position can be filled by intransitive verbs of broad semantics that name an action or state that relates to the addressee (Nemaie chomu pokloniatysia. Nemaie choho veselytysia. Nema chomu radity, etc.) or a verb of active (physical) action (e.g.: Nema na komu perevezty. Nema chym vykopaty, etc.).

In the negative semi–phraseologized sentences based on the phrase scheme nemaie (nema) de, verb component is semantically limited, as it can only be expressed by action verbs with the meaning of a speech–thought action, e.g: Nemaie de spivaty. Nema de hovoryty. Nema de vystupaty. Nema de zhyty. etc.

The phrase scheme nemaie (nema) koly be subject to truncation of the verb component, which emphasises the specificity of oral dialogue speech, e.g.: Nema koly. Zaraz nema koly. Such semi–phraseologized sentences correlate with the monosyllabic sentence Zaraz meni nikoly (Rozm.) and express the meaning no free time. To understand the semantics of such a phrase scheme, it is necessary to use the prepositional context. According to V. Admoni, "the corresponding form conveys... an expressive projection of the syntactic relation", and it is this projection that makes it possible to understand "direct lexical expression in the sentence" [22].

A negative semi–phraseologized sentence based on the phrase scheme Pronom3 (N3) + ne do +N2 has two dependent positions in relation to the intransitive complex.

The right–hand position is occupied by a noun component in the genitive case, which defines what is denied in the sentence as untimely, impossible, undesirable, irrelevant for a certain person. For example: – Khloptsi, – movliu do nykh. – Budte spokiini. Yoina zhartuie. Ale Yoini ne do zhartiv (I. Franko); Ale meni bulo ne do smikhu. Zovsim ne do smikhu; Koly Yurko vtykhomyryvsia, yoho maty zaproponuvala nam znovu pohratysia. Ta meni vzhe ne do hry (Iz tvoriv A. Dimarova); Meni bulo ne do snu. Ya sydila v svoiemu kabineti tykho, yak mysha, i zhdala, koly potelefonuiut… (I. Josypiv).

The elimination of the left–hand pronoun or noun component is also possible, as a result of which the negation does not refer to an individual but is more generalised. For example: Tazh khaziaika tvoia na bazar zbyralas. – Ne do bazariv sohodni (I. Josypiv); – Mamochko! Ya znaiu, chym tebe rozveselyty. – Ne do zhartiv (M. Vaino); – Ta pomovch, ty, Mykyto, – ozvavsia bryhadyr Zaiets. – Tut ne do zhartiv. Sertse bolyt, koly pohlianesh (Iu. Zbanatskyi).

The indirect negative meaning of semi–phraseological sentences, as opposed to specialised means of expressing this negation, is primarily related to the speaker's pragmatic intentions to influence the interlocutor, make him/her an active participant in communication, and achieve a certain communicative effect.

Researchers emphasise that the negative semantics of semi–phraseological sentences is not explained by the meaning of any of its components [23].

Indirect negation includes categorical negation.

Categorical negation is realised with the help of semi–phraseological sentences – rhetorical questions and atypical grammatical use of the permanent component of such sentences, which makes it possible to distinguish two groups of such sentences.

The first group is formed by semi–phraseological sentences – rhetorical questions, which are highly productive means of expressing negation. S. Balli emphasised that a rhetorical question is "an indirect expressive means that symbolises a more or less defined group of feelings, using the expressiveness of the voice" [24]. Due to the asymmetry of the interrogative form and non–interrogative content, researchers interpret such statements as "the

transposed syntactic structures" [25].

The first group unites two semantic types (see **Table 2**).

1. The first type of semi–phraseologized sentences with the meaning of categorical negation is based on the phrase scheme Yakyi (iaka, yake, yaki) + N1! For example: – Boris, yakshcho tse zhart, to vin nevdalyi. – Ta yaki, v bisa, zharty?! (Braty Kapranovy). The interrogative pronoun Yakyi (iaka, yake, yaki) + N1! has lost its primary function and has been completely grammaticalised.

It is the interrogative phraseologized construction that is the background for the realisation of categorical negation. The weakening of categoricality is observed if the syntactic construction is non–interrogative, cf.: – Vy buly todi shche dytynoiu, Kostia, – zauvazhyv poshtar. – Nu–u, yakoiu dytynoiu! – Na toi chas meni vzhe stuknulo shistnadtsiat rokiv, plius rik dytiachoi kolonii imeni A. S. Makarenka, plius dvi ukhazhorky! (H. Tiutiunnyk).

2. The second type of semi–phraseologized sentences with the meaning of categorical negation is based on the phrase scheme Shcho meni + Nn (Pronomn)! An inde-composable phrase complex is formed by combining the invariable component, that with the personal pronouns ya (ty, vin, vona, my, vy, vony) in the dative singular form. For example: Shcho meni chuzhyntsi?! Choho ya maiu zhaluvaty yikh? (Lesia Ukrainka); – I znaiesh, prodovzhuvav Viktor, – meni zdaietsia, Shepel skazala b: «Khai shumyt. Shcho meni do tsoho!» (O. Donchenko); A shcho yii do toi varty? Shcho vash pervak, hrushevyi kvas! (I. Kotliarevskyi).

In these sentences, the meaning of categorical negation is associated with the unimportance, insignificance of someone or something for someone or the speaker's indifference to the being, object, feature or action in question.

II. The second group is formed by semi–phraseological sentences with atypical grammatical use of structural components, based on the phrase schemes Potribnyi + (Pronom1) + Pronom3 and Ye meni koho (komu, z kym, na komu, shcho, choho, chomu, cherez shcho, pro shcho, (z) chym, na chomu) + N1 (Inf)!; Ye meni de (koly, kudy, zvidky) + Inf! (see **Table 2**)

The peculiarity of the semantic types of the second group is the use of the desemanticised and grammatical-ised lexeme mene or the desemanticised second person singular or plural form of the imperative mood of the verb. The semantically and grammatically empty lexeme mene has become a partitive component. The clearly fixed position of the pronoun particle meni, in particular after the accented element of the permanent component, changes the modal plan of the semi–phraseological sentence from affirmative to negative. For example: – Veremii za tsarem slozu v banochku pustyv. – Potribnyi vin meni, – vidpoviv Straton i shche bilshe vbrav holovu v sutuli plechi… (M. Stelmakh) etc.

The analysed semantic type of negative semi–phraseologized sentences is an extreme periphery in spoken language.

The inclusion of the partially grammaticalised pronoun particle me in the affirmative sentences of the form Ye meni koho (komu, z kym, na komu, shcho, choho, chomu, cherez shcho, pro shcho, (z) chym, na chomu) + N1 (Inf)! and Ye meni de (koly, kudy, zvidky) + Inf! creates a negative modal plan of the entire phraseological structure. For example: A ya zovsim ne zbyraiusia za toboiu bihaty. Ye meni na tse chas! (O. Honchar); Ye meni koho slukhaty! (rozm.); O. Shuliak (hrubo). Na yakyi tam benket. Ye meni koly po benketakh yizdyty! Idu v Malyshky spovidaty khvoru (S. Vasylchenko).

Occasionally, categorical negation is expressed by semi–phraseological sentences formed according to the phrase scheme Shcho + Vf, e.g.: – Shche shcho vyhadai! Shchyrishoi od mene liudyny y na sviti ne znaidesh (O. Lysheha).

The variable verb component is expressed by the second person singular or plural form of the imperative mood.

Table 2. Categorical meaning of the "negation".

Semantic Types	Phrase Schemes
actual negation	Nemaie (nema) koho (komu, z kym, na komu, shcho, choho, chomu, cherez shcho, pro shcho, (z) chym, na chomu) + Inf
	Bulo koho (komu, z kym, na komu, shcho, choho, chomu, cherez shcho, pro shcho, (z) chym, na chomu) + Inf
	Nemaie (Nema) de (koly, kudy, zvidky) + Inf
	Pronom3 (N3) + ne do

categorical negation	Yakyi (iaka, yake, yaki) + N1! Shcho meni + Nn (Pronomn)! Potribnyi + (Pronom1) + Pronom3 Ye meni koho (komu, z kym, na komu, shcho, choho, chomu, cherez shcho, pro shcho, (z) chym, na chomu) + N1 (Inf)! Ye meni de (koly, kudy, zvidky) + Inf!

3.3. Semi–Phraseologized Sentences with the Categorical Meaning of "Assessment"

Semi–phraseologized sentences with the categorical value of assessment are heterogeneous due to the heterogeneity of this value. The author distinguishes between un-differentiated evaluation, positive evaluation and negative assessment, on the basis of which three groups of semi–phraseological sentences are distinguished.

1. Semi–phraseologized sentences with the meaning of undifferentiated assessment are of two types (see **Table 3**):

1) Ot (oto, otse) i (y) + N1 (Adj, Adv, Vf)!; Ot (oto, otse) yakyi (yaka, yake, yaki) + N1 (Adj, Adv, Vf)!; Ot (oto, otse) tak + N1 (Adj, Adv, Vf)!; Ot + N1 (Adj, Adv, Vf), tak + N1 (Adj, Adv, Vf)!; Os vam (i) +N1. The modal particle ot (oto, otse) in these phrase schemes has lost its indicative function and is used to emphasise the importance of an object, phenomenon, quality, etc., creating the basis for a positive or negative assessment of the same object, phenomenon, quality by the speaker. F. e.: Khoma. U yakykh–nebud Cherkasakh, a mozhe, u samomu Chyhyryni huliai sobi z polkovnychoiu bulavoiu! I slava, i pochot, i chervintsi do sebe harbai – vse tvoie. A pushche vsoho chervintsi. Yikh liudy po dukhu chuiut; khoch ne pokazui, vse klaniatymutsia… Kha–kha–kha! Ot i sotnyk! (T. Shevchenko); Ot buv narod! Shcho rymliany, shcho hreky. Na vsi viky nashchadkam zapasly (L. Kostenko); – Khto tse napysav taku harnu pisniu?! – pytav zvorushenyi Sanko v Andriia. – Ot, brat, pisnia, tak pisnia! (Ivan Bahrianyi); – Ot uskochyly, tak uskochyly! – zachukhav potylytsiu Tymko (H. Tiutiunnyk).

The affirmative particle thus lost its primary semantics and acquired the secondary function of conclusion, completing the semantic frame of an indecomposable complex. F. e.: Zvidusil myttievo naletilo, pryhrymilo, prytupotilo… zahalasuvalo, zavereshchalo, zatelesuvalosia: – Halia! Halia! Ha–ha–ha! Halia, Halyna po–hretsky

oznachalo «tysha». Otse tak tysha! (P. Zahrebelnyi); I koly khytryi utikach uraz kynuvsia cherez dorohu, na mii bik, ya azh zareviv iz radoshchiv, shcho zaraz nasypliu yomu pertsiu za komir, ta myt – i znovu yoho nemaie. – Ot tak padliuka, – spliunuv spereserdia Dzhmil… (S. Soloviov).

In the phraseological complex Os vam (i) + N1, the dependent noun component mostly has the meaning of a concrete object and rarely an abstract meaning. A semi–phraseologized sentence based on this phrase complex is rarely used in spoken language and mostly expresses the meaning of positive assessment. F. e.: Maksym vytiahnuv z bahazhnyka dovhu kryvu ruchku, khyzuiuchys sports-menskymy miazamy, krutnuv tak, shcho avtomashyna zatremtila, mov u propasnytsi. Z pereliaku vona zavelasia, motor zadzyzhchav, v odnu myt dibrova vypovnylas nepryiemnym benzynovym pereharom. – Os vam i akumuliator! – torzhestvuvav Maksym. – Yak hodynnyk, pratsiuie mashyna (Iu. Zbanatskyi);

2) Shcho to (tam) za + N1 (Subst, Adj)! Shcho tsikavoho? Shcho za spravy? Such semi–phraseologized sentences are a modification of interrogative sentences with the pronoun that or the interrogative particle what for in the initial position, f. e.: Osoblyvo hospodar, vid kotroho Ivan donedavna ne chuv dobroho slova, teper trubyv o nim na vsi boky, mov naniatyi. – Shcho tam za syla! Shcho za provirnist! (I. Franko); Natalka tilky ochyma merekhkotila, zadovolena. Shcho to za zhinka! (Ivan Bahrianyi); Skilky b yomu ne kazav, ne poslukhaie. Shcho za duren takyi! (V. Medvid); Shcho to buly za misiatsi rozluky y chuzhyny! (M. Vaino).

The phrase complex is formed from the primary interjections okh, ekh, ukh, nu and the conjunctive particles i and y. The anaphoric accented indecomposable unity performs two main functions: it creates a plan for the assessment, modality and performs a reinforcing and stating function. Removal of the phraseological exclamatory–participatory complex causes neutralisation of the meaning of the semi–phraseologized sentence, empties the semantics of the phrase scheme. The right–side variable component is mostly the name of a person (creature) or a lexeme with an evaluative meaning (– A ya, duren, ne viryv, shcho Did Moroz i spravdi isnuie… Okh i pustomelia! Stoit u kazkovii shubi, vsiianii blyskitkamy, nachepyv shapku y ruka-

vytsi, a patiakaie kazna–shcho (S. Soloviov); – Khocha ta sama istoriia svidchyt, shcho vsi bahati zavzhdy buly nehidnykamy. – Okh, teoretyk! Vnochi, zdaietsia, v tobi perevazhav praktyk (P. Zahrebelnyi); Tak ty shcho, sam dumaiesh do tyshchi doshchok vykydaty? Tse zh tyshchu raziv paltsem kyvnut, i toi onimiie, a to – doshky verhat. Ekh, molodist nasha! (Hr. Tiutiunnyk); Ne khvatalo nam ishche do Kima y tebe! – Ya vse odno yii vikno vysadzhu! – azh skhlypuie Myshko. – Nu, y duren! – Khai i duren! (A. Dimarov); or expressed by a verbal lexeme, which gives the phrase scheme the meaning of a high degree of action (f.e.: Okh i zliakalasia! (A. Khyzhniak); Nu y spivaie! (M. Starytskyi).

3. Semi–phraseologized sentences with the meaning of negative assessment of the speaker are divided into two types, formed on the basis of the following phrase schemes (see **Table 3**):

1) Ty + N1 (N5)!; Ekh ty (vy) + N1 (N5)! The semi–phraseologized sentences formed according to these phrase schemes are based on semantically and intonationally indecomposable interjection–pronoun complexes akh ty (vy) and ekh ty (vy). The right–hand component expresses the speaker's negative attitude to what is said or to the interlocutors, as it is expressed by nouns or substantive adjectives to denote persons with a vivid negative evaluative value or even stylistically reduced lexemes, in particular swear words. F. e.: Akh ty zh vyrodku! – zi zlosti zirvavsia z mistsia staryi (P. Kulish); Akh ty zh kham! Hnyi, propadai, shchob i slid tvii zahynuv, tak nache nikoly tebe ne bulo… (M. Kotsiubynskyi). The indecomposable complex akh ty gives the semi–phraseological sentence modal connotations of condemnation or disdain, and ekh ty – of reproach: Akh ty zh hadyno! (S. Vasylchenko); Ekh ty,

zhyttia prokliate! (M. Khvylovyi).

The means of the subjective modality serve as modifiers of the objective modality, transforming it into an emotionally expressive modality expressed in a figurative and sensual rather than logical form. The degree of expression of emotionality and evaluation by indecomposable complexes also depends on other specialised means, including exclamatory intonation. F. e.: «Ta chekai, Shu! Choho ty taka pykhata? Tse ya ziznaiusia u durnomu smakovi…» – «Akh ty zh had!» (L. Denysenko); «Akh ty zh, hadyno solona! Skilkom liudiam ty zhyttia polamav, zruinuvav, spustoshyv shchastia, otruiv radist…» (M. Stelmakh);

2) Okh (vzhe) tsei meni + N1!; Akh tsei (vzhe) meni + N1! The exclamatory components okh, akh of this phrase scheme differentiate two types of evaluative semi–phraseologized sentences.

The permanent component of the phrase scheme combines three elements: an accented exclamation okh or akh, the pronoun adjective tsei (tsia, tse, tsi), which agrees with the following noun component in gender, number, case and the pronoun particle ya in the form of the dative singular. The pronoun form me is completely desemanticised and grammaticalised. Sometimes the structure of a phrase scheme includes the optional adverbial particle already. The right–hand position is filled by a variable noun component with the meaning of a person – a proper or common name, less often – with subject, process and other meanings. F.e.: Okh vzhe tsi meni vykhovateli! (L. Ponomarenko); Akh tsei vzhe meni obid! Ya prokliav sebe, restoran i vyno, shcho z takym smakom pyv. Vid rizkoi zminy perspektyvy shlunok z novoiu syloiu atakuvav horlo… (Braty Kapranovy).

Table 3. Categorical meaning of the "assessment".

Semantic Types	Phrase Schemes
undifferentiated assessment	Ot (oto, otse) i (y) + N1 (Adj, Adv, Vf)! Ot (oto, otse) yakyi (yaka, yake, yaki) + N1 (Adj, Adv, Vf)! Ot (oto, otse) tak + N1 (Adj, Adv, Vf)! Ot + N1 (Adj, Adv, Vf), tak + N1 (Adj, Adv, Vf)! Os vam (i) +N1 Shcho to (tam) za + N1 (Subst, Adj)! Shcho tsikavoho? Shcho za spravy?
negative assessment	Ty + N1 (N5)! Ekh ty (vy) + N1 (N5)! Okh (vzhe) tsei meni + N1! Akh tsei (vzhe) meni + N1!

3.4. Semi–Phraseologized Sentences with the Categorical Meaning of "Expression of Will"

The "expression of will" covers such meanings as wish, permission, prohibition, order, threat, and advice, which made it possible to distinguish seven semantic types of semi–phraseological sentences. Semi–phraseological sentences with the categorical meaning of "expression of will" are formed according to phrase schemes of the prepositional type, the peculiarity of which is that they cannot be used to organize sentences, since they appear spontaneously, with a component structure that is not specifically fixed.

Such non–segmented clauses mostly have a verb in their structure, the grammatical form of which varies depending on the meaning of "expression of will". In particular, the meaning of an order is expressed by the second person singular or plural forms of the verb, which are typical for expressing the imperative mood of verbs in modern Ukrainian. Different grammatical forms of verbs express the meaning of threat: the second person singular imperative mood, the first or second person singular future tense, and the past tense of verbs. However, such verb lexemes are desemanticized and grammaticalized, so they do not express an action or state in a certain time period.

The general meaning of the phrase schemes of semi–phraseologized sentences with the categorical meaning of "expression of will" is to induce the interlocutor to perform or not to perform some action.

The generalized meaning of "expression of will" includes the following specific meanings (see **Table 4**):

– wishes, f. e: Chy zhinoche dukhove zhyttia mensh tsikave, yak yii orhanizm?.. Spravdi nichym ne tsikave? – Ta ba! Choho zakhotilos! (O. Kobylianska); Khocha b yoho, chortiaku, khoch by vyshenkoiu tobi zachepylo! (V. Nestaiko);

– permission, f. e.: – Chy mozhu ya pity? – zapytala vona. – Zroby lasku! – pochula veselyi holos (V. Nazarenko);

– prohibition, f. e.: – Ya proshu sobi Danelevshchynu, – skazav odyn z nashchadkiv Horonetskykh, znimaiuchy okuliary i zasovuiuchy yikh v kysheniu. – Malo choho khto zakhoche! Ni, ya beru Danelevshchynu, a

tobi nalezhyt bairak, ty starshyi! – vyhuknuv druhyi, ne znimaiuchy okuliariv i tezh vystupaiuchy napered ta vidtyskuiuchy brata nazad (H. Tiutiunnyk); – Vona meni ne probachyt tsoho nikoly! – Ne roby tsoho! (A. Dimarov); Bozhe zbav! (Rozm.);

– order, f. e.: – Tak trymaty! – kapitan peredav sterno do moikh ruk, a sam pochav porpatys u lynvakh bilia shchohly, balansuiuchy na maliusinkii palubi (Braty Kapranovy); – Nu zh bo, vernys! Ne bud tvariukoiu bezrohoiu! (P. Zahrebelnyi) – in this sentence, the order is not presented in a "pure" form, but in combination with the meaning of a request; – Zakryite rot! (Rozm.);

– threat, f. e.: – Ot pobachysh! – serdyto vykryknula zhinka (V. Stefanyk); – Tilky pidiidy!.. (V. Stefanyk); – Nu, ya zh yim dam! – vidkhekuiuchys kazav Borys. – Ya yim dam, tsym fashystiuram! Ya yim shche pokazhu! Shche viddiachu! (P. Zahrebelnyi); Holos.Chuiesh, ty? Koly ne budesh movchat, tak het sobi. Druhoi. A to vyzhenem! Stekha. A khto b posmiv! Sotnyk vas usikh perevishaie (T. Shevchenko);

– advice, f. e.: – A ty zvidky znaiesh, yak mene zvaty? I titkoiu choho ne zvesh? Ya zh starsha vid tebe nabahato! – Zakryi svii rot. Ne titkoiu, a podruhoiu mene klych (K. Motrych).

The meaning of the phrase schemes of semi–phraseologized sentences with the categorical meaning of "expression of will" is based on the context, especially the prepositional one, which makes it possible for such sentences to function as different semantic types, f. e.: – Dozvolysh zaity? – Zroby lasku! (Rozm.) – a semi–phraseologized sentence expresses permission; – Prynesy meni stakan vody. Zroby lasku! (Rozm.) – a semi–phraseologized sentence expressing a request.

Sometimes the exclamatory intonation differentiates semantic types of semi–phraseologized sentences, f. e.: Zakryi svii rot! (Rozm.) – a semi–phraseologized sentence expressing a categorical order; Zakryi svii rot (Rozm.) – a semi–phraseologized sentence expressing a request.

The most distinctive features of semi–phraseologized sentences with the categorical meaning of "expression of will" are semantic stability, which makes it impossible to replace the right–hand component with another verb, or less often with a noun, adjective or pronoun, while main-

taining the grammatical form of its expression, and syntactic stability as the invariability of a stable scheme. In some semi–phraseologized sentences, it is possible to replace the right–hand verb component, but with a very limited list of verbs, cf: Tilky pidiidy! – Tilky skazhy! – Tilky zroby! – Tilky dai! ta in.; Ya yim shche pokazhu! – Ya yim shche dam! – Ya yim shche skazhu! – Ya yim shche zrobliu! and other.

Syntactically non–segmented semi–phraseologized sentences with the categorical meaning of "expression of will" do not form semantic types. The partial meanings of the generalized categorical meaning of "expression of will" are diversified by various additional semantic shades. Because the components of the phrase schemes of these sentences form models spontaneously based on spoken lexical items.

Table 4. Categorical meaning of the "expression of will".

Most Typical Models with Meanings	For Example
wishes	Choho +Vf (past tense)
permission	Vf (imperative mode)
order	Vf (imperative mode)
prohibition	Malo choho + Vf!
threat	Vf!
advice	Zakryi svii rot!

5. Conclusion

Semi–phraseologized non–segmented sentences have their own functional and communicative purpose in language and speech. The semantic types of semi–phraseologized sentences are based on the types of categorical meanings.

The categorical meaning of semi–phraseologized sentences determines the phrase–syntactic meaning of phrase schemes. The phrase–syntactic meaning forms the content of the phrase scheme components: morphological expression of permanent and variable components. The phrase–syntactic meaning is generalised, so it emphasises the semantic specificity of semi–phraseologized sentences.

Categorical meaning of "affirmation" formed the following types: with actual affirmation meaning, with meaning of categorical affirmation and with meaning of predicted affirmation. Categorical meaning of the "negation" made it possible to identify the following types: actual

negation and categorical negation. Categorical meaning of the "assessment" formed the two semantic types: with undifferentiated assessment and with negative assessment.

Other languages have semi–phraseologized non–segmented sentences. The proposed study will make it possible to identify and analyse their semantic types.

Syntactically non–segmented semi–phraseologized sentences with the categorical meaning of "expression of will" do not form semantic types. The models of these sentences are not built according to a clear pattern. The components of the phrase schemes, expressed by colloquial lexemes, are selected spontaneously and randomly. Most of the components are morphologically modifiable verbs in different mood and tense forms.

Communicative intentions to use syntactically non–segmented semi–phraseologized sentences of different semantic types are peculiar to the speakers of their own culture and cannot be understood by speakers of a foreign language culture. Therefore, the proposed study makes it possible to organize an algorithm for the systematic study of phraseologized sentences in general and semi–phraseologized ones in particular.

We see the prospect of the research in the study of semi–phraseologized sentences in the cognitive base of communicators.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, M.L. and S.S.–S.; methodology, S.S.–S. and L.M.; software, L.M.; validation, L.M., S.S.–S. and T.S.; formal analysis, L.M.; investigation, L.M.; resources, L.M.; data curation, L.M.; writing—original draft preparation, T.S. and Z.S.; writing—review and editing, L.M.; visualization, L.M.; supervision, L.M.; project administration, L.M.; funding acquisition, S.S.–S. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Zhukovska, V., 2021. Current Schools of Construction Grammar: Theoretical and Methodological Architecture. Modern philological science: topical issues and vectors of development: collective monograph. Liga–Press: Lviv–Torun. 1–86. DOI: 10.36059/978–966–397–242–8–3.

[2] Findlay, J., 2023. Lexical Functional Grammar as a Construction Grammar. Special Issue on Constructional Approaches in Formal Grammar. 11 (2), 20–25.

[3] Hoffmann, Th., Trousdale, G., 2022. Construction Grammar. The structure of English. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, USA. pp. 111–137. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139004213

[4] Smirnytskyi, A., 1957. Syntax of the English language. Publishing House of Foreign Language Literature: Moscow. Russia. 228–230.

[5] Espersen, O., 1958. Philosophy of Grammar. Publishing House of Foreign Literature: Moscow. Russia. pp. 6–23.

[6] Kolkmann, J., H. De Vaere, Belligh, Th., 2020. Allostruction revisited. Journal of Pragmatics. 170, 96–111.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.08.016

[7] Constructions in Contact 2, 2021. In:: Boas, H., Höder, S. (Eds.). Constructional Approaches to Language. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam / Philadelphia, Netherlands–USA. pp. 107–111.

[8] Kopotev, M., Feinweitz, A., 2007. To study is to study: synchrony and diachrony. Scientific and technical information. Ser. 2. Information processes and systems. 9, 29–37.

[9] Flach, S., 2020. Beyond modal idioms and modal harmony: a corpus–based analysis of gradient idiomaticity in mod + adv collocations. English Language and Linguistics. 25 (4), 1–23. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s1360674320000301.

[10] Roberts, J. 2023. Beginning Syntax. An Introduction to Syntactic Analysis. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, USA. pp. 12–28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009023849

[11] Fillmore, Ch., Kay, P., 1999. Grammatical constructions and linguistic generalisations: the Wha's X Doing Y? construction. Language. 75, 1–33. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1999.0033.

[12] Barlow, M., Kemmer, S., 2000. Introduction: A Usage–Based Conception of Language. In: Barlow, M., Kemmer, S. Usage–Based Models of Language. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Grait Britain. pp. 7–28.

[13] Sommerer, L., Baumann, A., 2021. "Of absent mothers, strong sisters and peculiar daughters": The constructional network of English NPN constructions. Cognitive Linguistics. 32 (1), 97–131. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/cog–2020–0013.

[14] Stefanowitsch, A., 2020. Corpus linguistics: A guide to the methodology. Language Science Press: Berlin, Germany. pp. 217–223.

[15] Zhukovska, V., 2019. Semantics of grammatical construction: corpus and quantitative aspect. Studia Philologica. 2, 28–35. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.28925/2311–2425.2019.13.4.

[16] Sitar, G., 2012. Phraseologized sentences built on the model Yakyi N1 Cop in the Ukrainian language. Linguistic studies. 25, 64–70.

[17] Lychuk, M., 2014. Implicit models of affirmative and negative modality of semi–phraseologized sentences. Bulletin of Cherkasy University. Series. Philological sciences. 7 (300), 113–117.

[18] Sapir, E., 1993. Selected Works on Linguistics and Culturology. Progress: Moscow, Russia. p. 598.

[19] Tenier, L., 1988. Fundamentals of structural syntax. Progress: Moscow, Russia. p. 110.

[20] Sitar, G., 2015. Constructive grammar as a theoretical basis for the study of phraseologized sentences. Scientific journal. 2 (4), 192–205.

[21] Bahan, M., 2012. The category of negation in the Ukrainian language: functional–semantic and ethnolinguistic manifestations: a monograph. Dmytro Burago Publishing House: Kyiv, Ukraine. p. 167.

[22] Admoni, V., 1958. Completeness of Construction as a Phenomenon of Syntactic Form. Questions of linguistic knowledge. 1, 111–114.

[23] Melchuk, I., 1995. Phrases in Language and Phraseology in Linguistics. In: Everaert, M., E.–J., van der Linden, Schenk, A., Schreuder, R. (Eds). Idioms: Structural and Psychological Perspectives. Psychology Press, Taylor and Francis Group: New York and London, USA and Great Britain. p. 215.

[24] Arnold, I., 2016. Stylistics of Modern English Language. Enlightment Publisher: Moscow, Russia. p. 205.

[25] Balli, S., 1955. General linguistics and questions of the French language. Publishinghouse of foreign countries literature: Moscow, Russia. p. 38.