

**SEMANTIC-SYNTACTIC ASPECT
OF ANTHROPOCENTRICITY OF UKRAINIAN
LITERATURE OF THE LATE
20TH – EARLY 21ST CENTURIES**

Olha TURKO

**Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatyuk National Pedagogical University
olha.turko@gmail.com**

Tetiana OLENDR

**Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatyuk National Pedagogical University
olendr@tnpu.edu.ua**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52846/aucssflingv.v44i1-2.76>

Introduction

Conceptual positions of the results of theoretical and practical research, which are devoted to the problems of linguo-stylistics, form a holistic system, caused by the tendency to study the means of expression and grammatical types of functioning of the linguistic units, which are components of linguistic creation – “qualitatively new, original in the field of verbal ways of expressing of perceived reality” (Vokalchuk 2008: 6). Since the meaning of language units is often changed in the literary discourse, their emotional and evaluative semantics is enriched, derivational possibilities are modified, the studies dedicated to the description of semantics and grammatical meanings of linguistic units based on the material of the works of literary masters have significantly increased in modern linguistics.

O. Potebnia provided theoretical principles of the description of the language units in linguo-stylistic paradigm in the Ukrainian studies later they were extended in the works of V. Chabanenka, S. Yermolenko, L. Matsko, S. Bybyk, I. Zavalniuk, A. Zahnitka, N. Huivaniuk, I. Kochan, N. Solohub, T. Pankovoi and other researchers.

In the world linguistics, linguo-stylistic problems are considered in the light of theoretical and practical provisions by Sh. Balli, V. Vynohradovym, N. Arutiunovoiu, O. Mukhinym, B. Normanom, P. Adamtsem, Kh-H. Hadamerom, M. Khellideyem, U. Cheifom and other researchers.

Linguistic, philosophical parameters, criteria, indicators, factors, categories, outlined in the works of the above mentioned scientists, help to identify the idiolect features of the texts of a certain time period, to determine priority markers of the development of the society of the depicted period and to find out the actual national problems. It is worth underlining that all these features are determined by means of language.

Ukrainian literature of the late 20th - early 21st centuries is characterized by vivid expressiveness, which is possible to a large extent due to the grammatical essence of separated substantive units, which are qualified as multi-layer language units and possess half-predicateness caused by potential possibilities of predicates in the morphological form of the adverbial participle, participle, adjective, noun; or as a syntactic meaning which explains and specifies, carriers of which are substantive, adjectival, adverbial, verbum-finitive, infinitive constructions (Slynko, Huivaniuk, Kobylanska, 1994). The studied language units will be named as half-predicative appositive units (HAU) in this article.

Methods

The research object consists of half-predicative appositive units, and the purpose of the article is to characterize semantic-grammatical nature of half-predicative appositive units and the identified component that have led to the usage of the descriptive method with the techniques of internal and external modelling. Besides, the method of observing the features of the syntactic nature of the appositive units in the structure of half-predicative appositive units; the method of transformational analysis to study grammatical meanings of half-predicative appositive units and the identified components; the method of statistical calculations have been used. Techniques of comparison and classification of language material have been used as additional.

Results and discussion

HAU possess semantic-syntactic autonomy, which manifests itself in their ability to form a sentence proposition by means of secondary predication. By proposition we mean “semantic invariant common for all members of a sentence paradigm and constructions derived from a sentence (word combinations, constructions, etc). This is a stable semantic core, an objective semantic invariable which reflects the structure of a situation, event. The predicate defines the structure of the proposition (Vykhovanets 1993: 121-122).

HAU are potentially connected with the predicate taking into account the direct connection between the half-predicative appositive unit and the subject; for example: *Татко її, Юрко Магнер, волочиться світами* (*Her father, Yurko Mahner, is wandering all over the world*) (Kozhelianko 1998: 13). We have such propositions: *her father is wandering all over the world* and *Yurko Mahner is wandering all over the world*, as well as *her father is Yurko Mahner*. Thus HAU perform the function of both subject and predicate, but these functions are semantic, not grammatical.

If HAU are correlated with an identified component which is expressed by indirect case, the propositional model will embrace only these two components; in this case HAU will be secondary predicates provided that they express the meaning of the external and internal values of a person, occupation, nationality, family relations, place of living, etc.; the semantic value of the very syntactic unit causes

its syntactic character; for example: *А нам, земним істотам, дано збагнути жінку* (*We, earthly creatures, can comprehend the woman*) (Vynnychuk 2003: 106). There is the following propositional model along with HAU in this example: *we are earthly creatures*; the syntactic demonstration of HAU is a secondary predicate, secondary subject conditioned by its semantic value in relations to an IC.

Thus, HAU are half-predicative units which have the ability to make a propositional sentence model. Taking into consideration the fact that the most important thing for forming a construction is the way the elements are connected - "direct connection" (Zahnitko 2006: 19), but not the number of elements, we can state that the half-predicative appositive unit together with an identified component makes a poly-proposition of sentence structure, additional information and has secondary predication.

The **appositive (Ap)** plays a key semantic-syntactic role in the structure of HAU. The appositive is a substantive core component of a half-predicative appositive unit which finds itself in syntactic relations of half-predicateness with an identified component, thus in relations of potential (secondary) predication as a secondary predicate of this HAU.

The syntactic nature of the appositive semantic-syntactic relations produces correlative semantic and grammatical connections between the identified component and HAU. The key role in this correlative pair belongs to IC, whose grammatical meanings are defined in the background of the main predicateness of a sentence and cause the grammatical expression of HAU in general, and the Ap in particular. The relations between the identified and separated components are not homogeneous, since their semantic, morphological and syntactic expressions are regulated by the type of syntactic and semantic-syntactic relations, which is also a way of combining and functioning of the mentioned syntactic units in the sentence.

Besides the syntactic presentation of the appositive semantic-syntactic relations, IC and HAU are the carriers of certain types of lexical-semantic meanings, which are combined into denotative fields. Thus, the semantic realization of HAU is conditioned by such factors as correlative connection between Ap and IC, the syntactic nature of the sentence half-predicative substantive component (half-predicateness) and denotative meaning.

It should be noted that half-predicative appositive units clarify and reveal the meaning of IC, which is often hidden or they express emotionality, expressiveness and imagery; therefore, finding out the HAU denotative meaning is only possible through IC. Taking into consideration this fact, we will distinguish between the identified component and Ap with valency units in the description of the studied syntactic units.

Taking into account the above mentioned, it is important to identify grammatical types of IC and HAU, their semantic realization, as well as the ways of representing appositive semantic-syntactic relations between these syntactic units. Though HAU is a secondary element in relation to IC, the syntactic position

of the half-predicative part of a sentence structure, as well as stylistic significance, gives it a relevant status.

Half-predicative appositive units that are found in the literature of the late 20th - early 21st centuries are presented in the following grammatical types: one-word, phrasal, coordinating series, and sub-appositive.

Appositive relations between the identified component and **one-word half-predicative** appositive units are caused by lexical-grammatical meanings between these syntactic units, in particular, as follows:

1. One-word IC ⇔ HAU:

a) noun (proper name, animate noun) ⇔ Ap (common name with evaluative semantics, expressed by the grammeme of feminine gender): *Нюська, курвисько, пронюхала про наркотики (Niuska, whore (kurvysko), learned about drugs)* (Ulianenko 2000: 33) → *Нюська – курвисько (Niuska – whore (kurvysko))*,

b) compound noun (common name, animate noun) ⇔ Ap (common name of the identifying concerning IC semantics): *Помер віщун Амфілох. Жінки-плакальниці – ненії – цілий місяць нагадуватимуть олімпійцям про цього зілителя (The fortune teller Amphiloikh died. Women-wailers – mourning songs – will remind Olympic athletes of this healer for the whole month)* (Pavliuk 2002: 47) → *жінки-плакальниці – ненії (women-wailers – mourning songs)*,

c) metaphorical word (concrete name that acquires a metaphorical meaning only being connected with HAU) ⇔ Ap (concrete name, specifying semantics, animate noun): *Вона бачила земну кулю зі сторони – маленьку, висмоктану, мікробів на ній – людей (She saw the globe from the side – small, sucked, germs on it – people)* (Pavliuk 2004: 37) → *мікроби – люди (germs on it – people)*,

d) personal pronominal word (pointing at a person) ⇔ Ap (proper name): – *Гітлер довго дорікав Сталінові, якби вони уклали пакт не лише проти Польщі, а й проти Англії, він, Сталін, тепер не сидів би у Лефортово в тюрмі, а правив би з Кремля своєю половиною світу (Hitler blamed Stalin for a long time if they signed a treaty not only against Poland but also against England, he, Stalin, would no longer sit in Lefortovo in prison, but would rule from the Kremlin his own half of the world)* (Kozheliianko 1998: 35) → *він – Сталін (he – Stalin)*,

e) personal pronominal word (pointing at a person) ⇔ Ap (common name with evaluative semantics, expressed by the grammeme of common gender, which is identified as masculine or feminine gender in the correlative pair): *Подіюють, що він, сука, додає в пиво ще й соди, щоб піни більше було (They say that he, a bitch, also adds soda to the beer, to foam more)* (Volvach 2003: 65) → *він – сука (he – a bitch)*,

f) personal pronominal word (pointing at a person) ⇔ Ap (common name with explanatory-specifying semantics, animate noun): *Вони, українці, свого часу найбільше потерпіли від російського більшовизму (they, Ukrainians, in due time suffered most of all from Russian Bolshevism)* (Kozheliianko 1998: 33) → *вони – українці (they – Ukrainians)*,

g) personal pronominal word (pointing at a person) ⇔ Ap (metaphorical compound word with self-evaluative semantics, expressed by the grammeme of masculine gender, animate noun, concrete name): *Я на хвильку замислився, куди мені спершу передзвонити, і вирішив, що я, мисливець-невдаха, можу вбити відразу двох зайців* (*I thought for a moment, where to phone at first, and decided that [...] I, a hunter-loser, can kill two birds at once*) (Shkliar 1999: 20) → *я – мисливець-невдаха* (*I – a hunter-loser*).

2. Phrasal IC ⇔ HAU. Equality in the ratio between the lexical and grammatical expression of the core component of the identified element and Ap can be observed in this correlative pair, for example, the abstract meaning of IC determines the same meaning of Ap. In addition, IC is represented by indivisible word phrases, which is conditioned by the semantics of HAU.

In the syntactic theory, indivisible word phrases are divided into semantically indivisible and syntactically indivisible. “If in syntactically indivisible word phrases the main component has its own characterizing semantics (quantitative, distributive (selectivity) or nominative), then in semantically indivisible word phrases the main word has a weakened nominativeness because it only names or points to an object the referent of which doesn’t exist in reality” (Maksymiuk 2006: 16).

There are mostly semantically indivisible phrasal IC in the correlative pair with one-word HAU. In particular, IC and HAU are represented by the following lexical-grammatical and grammatical categories:

the phrase of evaluative semantics (a core noun designates common name, animate noun) ⇔ Ap (proper name, animate noun; conditions a metaphorical meaning with IC), for example: *Ліше померти, як оце й передбачав оцей шалений, демонізований лелека – Ніцше?* (*It’s better die as this crazy, demonized stork predicted – Nietzsche?*) (Pavliuk 2004: 30) → *шалений, демонізований лелека – Ніцше* (*crazy, demonized stork – Nietzsche*).

3. IC ⇔ HAU with functional-morphological components. The structure of the one-word HAU, besides the appositive unit, is composed by the components which serve as a means of connection with IC (subordinating and coordinating conjunctions), give a separated component of the sentence a certain stylistic meaning and enhance the semantic meaning of Ap (functional components expressed by the units of different parts of speech).

In particular, **functional-morphological components** are represented by:

a) prepositional fixed phrases (**з походження, за походженням**), which perform contextually-informative and clarifying functions that are relative to IC, for example: *Зустрівся мені Селім, з походження перс, який мовчки, але незупинно ходив за мною* (*I met Selim, a Persian by origin, who was silent but steadily following me*) (Pokalchuk 1995: 52) → *Селім – з походження перс* (*Selim – a Persian by origin*),

b) particles (**майже**), which enhance the restrictive-accentuated meaning of HAU and express clarifying meaning; IC is represented by a pronominal pronoun

in combination with a particle that transmits conjunctive and clarifying meaning, for example: *Вночі помер ще один, майже підліток* (*At night died another one, almost a teenager*) (Ulianenکو 2000: 88) → *ще один – майже підліток* (*another one – almost a teenager*).

Consequently, the grammatical nature of HAU is produced by the syntactic structure of IC and its lexical and morphological expression. In particular, there is a complete or incomplete agreement between the above mentioned syntactic units (syntactic relations); hyponymic, clarifying, explanatory, evaluative, identifying, identification, metaphorical, periphrastic relations (lexical-semantic relations).

Subordinate phrasal HAU are represented by phrases, whose structure is formed by Ap-noun, which takes a key syntactic position, and its morphological expression causes the valency ability to attach syntaxemes of different grammatical and semantic-syntactic expression. Thus, it is important to define the morphological structure of HAU, and the correspondence between appositive substantive components and IC by the syntactic type of realization of both elements of the sentence.

By the nature of the Ap morphological expression, elementary subordinate phrasal HAU are divided into **noun-based**, for example: *Залишив купець дружину з боргами та єдиною радістю – гарненькою донькою, що тільки-но сягала повноліття* (*A merchant left his wife with debts and the only joy – a pretty daughter who was just reaching the age of majority*) (Sodomora 2004: 306-307) → *єдина радість – гарненька донька* (*the only joy – a pretty daughter*), **adjectival**, for example: *В одному містечку жив чоловік Н-ко, неабиякий дивак* (*A man N-ko lived in one town, a great stranger*) (Kashka 2004: 18) → *чоловік Н-ко – неабиякий дивак* (*A man N-ko – a great stranger*).

Along with the pointed morphological forms of Ap expression, the structure of HAU is made up by **substantive adjective**, for example: *Я раптом збагнув, що я люблю її. Що я, вічний безробітний, міг їй запропонувати?* (*I suddenly realized that I love her. What could I, the eternal unemployed, offer her?*) (Vynnychuk 2003: 167) → *я – вічний безробітний* (*I – the eternal unemployed*).

Since, the mentioned separated substantive units are nouns, attributive relations are typical for them (Vykhovanets, Horodenska & Rusanivskiy 1983: 204).

However, the grammatical expression of the attributive syntaxemes is presented in different ways. In particular, the following models are productive in the literature of the late 20th - early 21st centuries:

1) **Ap + Atr (Adj)**, for example: *На щось вона здалась їм, стара баба* (*They needed her for something, an old woman (broad)*) (Medvid 2002: 66) → *вона – стара баба* (*Her – an old woman (broad)*).

The component structure of this model is made up of attributive units the grammatical expression of which is determined by the prepositional units, namely:

– **from (від) + N2**: indication by the subject - origin, for example: *Наступного дня кур'єр приніс дівчинку – немовлятко від Анни* (*The next day*

the courier brought a girl – a baby from Anna (Prokhasko 2002: 79) → *дівчинка – немовлятко від Анни (a girl – a baby from Anna)*,

– **on (на) + N6**: indication by the place of realization of the abilities of the subject, for example: *Носач, вишибала на танцях, уподобав тискати Нілку по закутках та підвалах* (*Nosach, a bouncer at dances, liked to grope Nilka at the secluded corners and in the cellars*) (Ulianenکو 2002: 36) → *Носач – вишибала на танцях* (*Nosach–bouncer at dances*),

2) **Ap + Atr (Num)**, for example: *приходять до неї гості, два поліцейі* (*guests come to her, two policemen*) (Medvid 2002: 141) → *гості – два поліцейі* (*guests – two policemen*),

3) **Ap + Atr (Pron)**, for example: *Набожна небіжка – дружина його – не дала борошна якійсь змучено-занедбаній жінці. Бо такий забобон – нічого не давати перед Святом* (*Devout dead woman – his wife – did not give any flour to an exhausted-neglected woman. Because there is such a superstition - to give nothing before the holiday*) (Pavliuk 2002: 50) → *небіжка – дружина його* (*dead woman – his wife*).

The attributive semantic-syntactic relations between the components of HAU are specified as follows:

a) the basic word denotes gender name, and the dependant one denotes proper name, for example: *Остаточну крапку в закономірному процесі приєднання Малоросії до Російської імперії було поставлено через півстоліття під Полтавою, де ще один невдячний васал – гетьман Іван Мазепа – зробив спробу поміняти сюзерена* (*The final point in the logical process of joining Little Russia to the Russian Empire was put half a century ago near Poltava, where another ungrateful vassal, Hetman Ivan Mazepa, attempted to change the suzerain*) (Kozheliianko 1999: 46) → *невдячний васал – гетьман Іван Мазепа* (*ungrateful vassal– Hetman Ivan Mazepa*),

b) the basic word denotes a person or a group of people, and the dependant one denotes quantitative index, for example: *Й ось вони, все сімейство – лили для початку помалу, по чарчині, „хороша водка, а в том году лучше була”* (*And here they are, the whole family – poured to begin with, gradually, one wineglass by another, “good vodka, and that year was better”*) (Ulianenکو 2002: 24) → *вони – все сімейство* (*they– the whole family*),

c) the basic word denotes a person, a subject, an object by the functional identification, and the dependant one denotes the place of their realization, for example: *Вона, студентка медичного, вступила в нашу організацію і стала відвідувати заняття зі східних двобоїв* (*She, a medical student, joined our organization and began attending lessons in eastern fights*) (Shkliar 1999: 17) → *вона – студентка медичного* (*she – a medical student*).

The grammatical expression of HAU, including the attributive relations of its structure, is regulated by correlative connection between HAU and IC. In particular, such ratio is represented by semantic and grammatical means:

1. One-word IC ⇔ HAU:

a) noun (proper name) ⇔ syntactically indivisible word phrase of evaluative or descriptive semantics, for example: *Ганнуся, чемна дитина, послушно зачерпнула з відра й піднесла їй куклика (Hannusia, a polite child, obediently scooped up from the bucket and gave her a goblin) (Zabuzhko 2003: 81–82) → Ганнуся – чемна дитина (Hannusia – a polite child),*

b) noun (common name) ⇔ syntactically indivisible word phrase which is represented by:

– people's proper and common names of evaluative semantics, for example: *Над припіднятим брезентовим пологом миготів ліхтарем помічник косоокого Нуріма, полукрівка Халям (over the raised canvas canopy, the assistant of cross-eyed Nurim, a half-breed Khaliyam flashed with a torch) (Ulianenko 2002: 84) → помічник косоокого Нуріма – полукрівка Халям (the assistant of cross-eyed Nurim – a half-breed Khaliyam),*

– combination of a cardinal numeral with a noun of a weakened semantics, for example: *Лі Коваленко приймав на своїй віллі за сім кілометрів від Вадуцу своїх колег-науковців – дванадцятьох професорів археології (Lee Kovalenko received at his villa which is seven kilometers from Vaduz his colleagues-scientists – twelve professors of archeology) (Kozheliianko 1998: 43) → колеги-науковці – дванадцять професорів археології (colleagues-scientists – twelve professors of archeology),*

c) noun (common name) ⇔ syntactic word phrase (the core component of which is agreed with IC in gender, number and case) of identification meaning, for example: *У майстерні друга, запійного скульптора, Ігор спросоння згадав власну втечу (In the workshop of his friend, a drunkard sculptor, Ihor half asleep remembered his own escape) (Pashkovskiy 2002: 299) → друг – запійний скульптор (a friend – a drunkard sculptor),*

d) personal pronominal word (pointing at a person) ⇔ syntactically indivisible word phrase which expresses:

– evaluative meaning through the attributive unit, for example: *Я ж його зовсім легенько підранив, тільки так, для постраху, а він, сучий син, придурився заледве не мертвим (I injured him quite lightly, only for fear, and he, the son of a bitch, pretended, hardly alive) (Shkliar 1999: 53) → він – сучий син (he – the son of a bitch),*

– metaphorical meaning, for example: *Ми зустрінемося, вона буде траурна і заплакана, вибач, скаже, за біль, спричинений мною, я тоді ще подумаю, який вирок винести їй, підсудній любові (We will meet, she will be mourning and crying, excuse me, she will say for the pain caused by me, I will then think again what a verdict to give her, defendant's love) (Protsiuk 2001: 22) → вона – підсудна любові (she – defendant's love),*

– identification meaning (the syntactic indivisibility of HAU is caused by the attributive unit, that has lost its attributive features referring to the noun and is qualified as a nominative attribute), for example: *Я, колишній оперативник, це*

маю людей у салафанах та брезентах возити, бо який колхоз тобі дощок настарчить (*I am a former operative, I have to carry people in cellophane and tarpaulins, because what farm (kolkhoz) will provide you with the boards?*) (Medvid 2002: 176) → я – колишній оперативник (*I am – a former operative*).

2. Phrasal IC ⇔ HAU: both syntactic components are represented by syntactically indivisible word phrases and express the following lexical-grammatical meanings:

– people's proper + common names ⇔ metaphor, expressing different semantic meanings, namely: identification, clarifying, characterizing, for example: *Ще є генерал Судоплатов – караюча десниця партії!* (*There is also General Sudoplatov – the party's punishing hand!*) (Kozheliianko 1998: 35) → *генерал Судоплатов – караюча десниця партії* (*General Sudoplatov – the party's punishing hand*),

– common nominative animate noun ⇔ evaluative meaning, for example: *Дійшло до нас від давніх греків, шанувальників вина, порівняння: „Пиймо! Бо добре вино – мов кінь у далекій дорозі”* (*came to us from ancient Greeks, admirers of wine, a comparison: "Let's drink! For good wine is like a horse in a distant road"*) (Sodomora 2004: 17) → *давні греки – шанувальники вина* (*ancient Greeks – admirers of wine*).

3. IC ⇔ HAU with functional-morphological and linking (syntactic) components.

In particular, the **functional-morphological components** are represented by:

a) demonstrative pronoun adjectives (**такий (така), той (той), цей (ця, ці)**), which enhance HAU's semantic meaning of evaluation, identification and clarification, add irony to the meanings, for example: *І ось одного разу Назарій, ця шляхетна душа, не витримав, він узяв ланцюг і так відлупцював двох бахурів, які прийшли до його так званої жінки, що вони ледь не поздохали* (*And so, Nazarii, this noble soul, could not stand it, he took the chain and beat up really bad the two gallants who had come to his so-called wife that they almost died*) (Kozheliianko 2001: 106) → *Назарій – ця шляхетна душа* (*Nazarii – this noble soul*),

b) adverb (**дуже**), unchangeable word combinations (**усе ж таки, між іншим**), which clarify the content of HAU regarding IC, for example: *Потяг різко сіпається, тягнучи за собою, окрім всього, і ні в чому не повинного Васю Комуніста, мого приятеля між іншим* (*The train sharply jerks, dragging along, besides everything, also innocent Vasia Communist, my friend by the way*) (Zhadan 2004: 54) → *Вася Комуніст – мій приятель між іншим* (*Vasia Communist – my friend by the way*).

Linking (syntactic) components are presented by subordinate conjunctions **мовби, яко**, expressive means of comparative relations between HAU in the role of the comparative phrase and IC, for example: *Михайлові, мовби голові сімейства, нічого не лишалось, як і далі набирати респектабельного вигляду* (*There was nothing left for Mikhail, as if the head of the family, but to continue to*

gain a respectable look) (Ulianenko 2000: 24) → *Михайло – мовби голова сімейства* (Mikhail – as if the head of the family).

Consequently, the elementary subordinate phrasal HAU are related to IC having the same lexical-grammatical meanings as one-word substantive half-predicative appositive units. However, their phrasal structure is presented by a far smaller, in comparison with one-word HAU, spectrum of semantic meanings with respect to IC, namely: evaluative, descriptive, identifying, identification, clarifying, metaphorical semantics. IC, expressed by a syntactically indivisible phrase, is related to HAU, which is also presented by an indivisible phrase as proper, concrete name and its specifier as to evaluation and characteristics; as identical components, that is, syntactic equation which is driven by lexical and grammatical meanings. There is also regularity in determining the identified element in the sentence as an indivisible phrase in the context thanks to the separated substantive component. In addition, the functional-morphological and linking (syntactic) components are carriers of stylistic meanings between IC and HAU.

The semantic-syntactic relations between the core substantive units by the nature of the coordinating conjunctions which combine them are determining for **coordinating series of HAU**. In particular, the indicated syntactic type of HAU is presented by the following models:

1. Disjunctive conjunction (**то...**, **чи...**) + **Ар** + disjunctive conjunction (**...то**, **...чи**) + **Ар**, for example: *Вона – дружина високопоставленого чиновника, чи то дипломата, чи молодого міністра* (She is the wife of a high-ranking official, either a diplomat, or a young minister) (Protsiuk 2001: 26) → *чиновник – чи то дипломат, чи молодий міністр* (a high-ranking official – either a diplomat, or a young minister),

2. **Ар** + copulative conjunction (**і**, **та**) secondary component of HAU + **Ар**, for example: *Як істинні заходофіли і демократи, вони з Теофілом випили пляшку доброго скотчу „Балантайн”* (As true Zahodophiles and Democrats, they together with Theophilus drank a bottle of good Scotch “Ballantine’s”) (Kozheliianko 2001: 9) → *вони з Теофілом – як істинні заходофіли і демократи* (they together with Theophilus – as true Zahodophiles and Democrats),

3. **Ар** + copulative conjunction (**і**) + **Ар**, **Ар** + copulative conjunction (**і**) + **Ар**, for example: *Ми – депресанти і туберкульозники, параноїки і паралітики, віродимося до могутнього державного життя* (we – depressants and tubercular patients, paranoids and paralytics, will reborn to a mighty of state life) (Protsiuk 2003: 72) → *ми – депресанти і туберкульозники, параноїки і паралітики* (we – depressants and tubercular patients, paranoids and paralytics),

4. **Ар** + adversative conjunction, conjunctive adverbial compounds (**а**, **а тепер**) + **Ар** + copulative conjunction (**і**) + **Ар**, for example: *Мій брат, колишній лягавий, а тепер лісник і мисливець, любить казати, що доля посилає чоловікові всього в однині: товариша, собаку, коня і жінку* (My brother, a former cop, is now a forester and a hunter, likes to say that fate sends a man everything in the singular: a friend, a dog, a horse and a woman) (Kashka

2004: 19) → *мій брат – колишній лядавий, а тепер лісник і мисливець (my brother – a former cop, is now a forester and a hunter).*

Consequently, the use of coordinating conjunctions and conjunctive adverbial compounds, as well as semantic-syntactic relations, is determined not only by a syntactic purpose, but also by a stylistic one. In particular, the first model is the identification of two (contextualized) comprehensible and exhaustive notions concerning the identified component; the second model is the meaning of the choice between the mentioned notions, uncertainty, the possibility of continuation of coordinating series; the third model is the marking of the secondary component; the fourth model is the combination of the components of HAU in pairs of open structure, which makes it possible to conjecture the series; the fifth model is the semantic determinability of a part of HAU, which is located in front of the opposing conjunction, that is, in the opposing part.

Among the complicated phrasal HAU that can be found in the literature of the late 20th - early 21st centuries there is a certain type, which is inherent in performing the syntactic function of the identified component and the half-predicative appositive unit simultaneously. There are two reasons for this dual role: grammatical and semantic. The grammatical nature of HAU of this type is driven by the position of the last one in coordinating series of the appositive unit and its valency components as an attributive element opposing to the appositive unit located in front of it (including its valency components) as well as to IC. However, the last component of HAU is often identified only relatively to the previous one. In addition, the reason for such a dual role of HAU is their coordinating arrangement. The semantic reason is that the last component of HAU subjects lexically only to the previous one, and does not constitute with it a coordinating (by semantics) series. According to the above mentioned, we suggest to define this type of HAU as **sub-appositive** ones, those that are combined by asyndetic and conjunctive (coordinating) connection, in which there are attributive and identified components by grammatical and semantic nature.

In particular, there are the following sub-appositive HAU models:

1. IC ↔ Ap

↓↑

Ap, for example: *Знає політично підкований Пашок і про теорію злиття націй. Основним її ідеологом є Сулов, права рука Брежнєва, бровастого секретаря партії (Politically proficient Pashok also knows about the theory of the unification of nations. Its main ideologist is Suslov, the right hand of Brezhnev, the secretary of the party with thick eyebrows) (Volvach 2003: 38) → 1) Сулов – права рука Брежнєва (Suslov – the right hand of Brezhnev), 2) Брежнєв – бровастий секретар партії (Brezhnev – the secretary of the party with thick eyebrows).*

The first part of HAU serves as IC for its second part, since the second part of the separated half-predicative unit correlates semantically only with it, but not with the identified element of HAU. This correlation is due to the semantic valency

of the appositive units, which are conditioned by the semantic insufficiency of other structural elements of HAU.

In addition, the following conditions for the operation of a given model of sub-appositive half-predicative units can be traced:

– IC appositive units expressed by proper names, for example: *На Паука ще й тепер запитально дивиться їхній вчитель рисунку й живопису з художньої школи, Віталій Тарасович – довгий прямокутний мужчина* (*Their teacher of drawing and painting from the art school, Vitalii Tarasovych – a long rectangular man is still looking at Pasha enquiringly*) (Protsiuk 2002: 52) → 1) *вчитель рисунку й живопису з художньої школи – Віталій Тарасович* (*teacher of drawing and painting from the art school – Vitalii Tarasovych*), 2) *Віталій Тарасович – довгий прямокутний мужчина* (*Vitalii Tarasovych – a long rectangular man*),

– parts of NAO are attached to the IC appositive unit by coordinating and subordinating conjunctions of the explanatory-identifying meaning (**або**), for example: *В Ліон дорожньою каретою в'їхав іноземець у шляхетському вбранні, на ім'я шевальє Жан Журавльовф, або просто Івашко Журавльов з посольства московського царя* (*A foreigner in a costume belonging to Szlachta (Poland's nobility), named after a Chevalier Jean Zhuravloff or simply Ivashko Zhuravlov from the Moscow tsar's Embassy came into Lyon in a road carriage*) (Kozheliianko 2001: 41) →

1) *іноземець – на ім'я шевальє Жан Журавльовф* (*a foreigner – named after a Chevalier Jean Zhuravloff*),

2) *шевальє Жан Журавльовф – або просто Івашко Журавльов з посольства московського царя* (*Chevalier Jean Zhuravloff – or simply Ivashko Zhuravlov from the Moscow tsar's Embassy*).

It is worth noting that the number of sub-appositive HAU in the literature of the late 20th - early 21st centuries is the smallest comparing to other types of separated substantive half-predicative appositive units, however, all of them, except for several linguistic samples, are a part of the “man” denotative field. In our opinion, their dual structure allows masters of the word to model artistic reality more prominently, to use, along with the actual syntactic function of separated parts of the sentence – explanation, specification and strengthening of the IC content, stylistic functions, in particular artistic – figurative and evaluative, which require the greatest amount of expressive means, for example: – *Зібрались два душогуби на велику дорогу – Адольф Алоїзович і Митро Теофілович – два чоботи пара* (*Two murderers gathered to a great road – Adolf Aloisovych and Mytro Theofilovych – two of a kind*) (Kozheliianko 1998: 16) →

1) *два душогуби – Адольф Алоїзович і Митро Теофілович* (*two murderers – Adolf Aloisovych and Mytro Theofilovych*),

2) *Адольф Алоїзович і Митро Теофілович – два чоботи пара* (*Adolf Aloisovych and Mytro Theofilovych – two of a kind*) (evaluative name, expressed by a phraseme).

Вона посміхається зустрічним перехожим у вічі – і вони думають, що ось він, смисл життя, оця щаслива усміхнена жінка (She smiles at everyone she meets to their faces – and they think that here it is, the sense of life, this happy smiling woman) (Matios 2001: 167–168) →

1) *ось він – смисл життя (here it is – the sense of life),*

2) *смысл життя – оця щаслива усміхнена жінка (the sense of life – this happy smiling woman) (IC appositive unit together with a correlative pair predetermine a metaphorical meaning).*

Conclusions

The analysis of the one-word, phrasal and coordinating series of HAU that are found in the literature of the late 20th - early 21st centuries led to the following conclusions about their functioning:

– the grammatical nature of HAU is conditioned by the grammatical expression of IC;

– stylistically neutral meanings of IC and HAU in the correlative pair are changed into literary marked because one of the components stylistically intensifies another;

– grammatical models of elementary phrasal and coordinating HAU are realized thanks to smaller amount of models in comparison with the complicated phrasal and coordinating series. Instead, the lexical-grammatical expression of the correlative pairs of elementary phrasal and coordinating HAU is characterized by a significant quantitative indicator of meanings and forms of representation, in comparison with complicated phrasal and coordinating series of separated substantive half-predicative units;

– complicated phrasal and coordinating HAU are represented by a wide range of syntactic models, which are caused by the valency ability of Ap to be combined with attributive syntaxemes expressed by nouns, pronouns, numerals and adverbs. In addition, noun attributive units, thanks to prepositions, are carriers of objective, subjective, locative, addressing, instrumental, temporal semantic-syntactic relations within HAU. On the other hand, lexical-grammatical expression of appositive meaning relations between IC and HAU succumbs considerably in its demonstrations to the elementary phrasal and coordinating separated substantive half-predicative units;

– in addition to subordinating and coordinating types complicated HAU are also represented by sub-appositive separated units that perform dual syntactic function of an identified element and a separated one;

– coordinating series, representing IC and HAU in the correlative pair form semantically indivisible phrase caused by the semantic potential of the context;

– in general HAU represent the following denotative fields: “man”, “society”, “nature” and “abstract names”. Lexical-semantic groups of the first and second denotative fields are most commonly used, that is, the literature of the late 20th - early 21st centuries is marked by a special interest to anthropocentric problems and issues, as well as direct life activities of a human being – a society.

REFERENCES

- Adamets, P., *Obrazovanie predlozheniy iz propozitsiy v sovremennom russkom yazyke*, Prague, Univ. Karlova, 1978. (Adamets 1978)
- Arutiunova, N. D., *Predlozhenie i ego smysl*, Moscow, Nauka, 1976. (Arutiunova 1976)
- Balli, Sh., *Obschaia lingvistika i voprosy frantsuzskogo yazyka*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1955. (Balli 1955)
- Bybyk, S., *Opovidnist v ukrainskii khudozhnii prozi*, Luhansk, SI “Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University”, 2010. (Bybyk 2010)
- Chabanenko, V., *Vybrani pratsi z movoznavstva*, Zaporizhzhia, Dnipropetrovskiy metalurh, 2007. (Chabanenko 2007)
- Chafe, Wallace L., *Znachenie i struktura yazyka*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1975. (Chafe 1975)
- Gadamer, H.-G., *Istina i metod: Osnovy filosofskoi germeneytiki*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1988. (Gadamer 1988)
- Halliday, M. A., *The place of “functional sentence perspective” (FSP) in the system of linguistic description*. *Novoe v zarubezhnoi lingvistike*, issue VIII, 1978. *Lingvistika teksta*, pp. 138-148. (Halliday 1978)
- Huivaniuk, N. V., *Slovo – Rechennia – Tekst*, Chernivtsi, Chernivtsi National University, 2009. (Huivaniuk 2009)
- Kashka, V. Zhytlo, *Roman-robotnia*, *Kurier Kryvbasu*, 2004, No. 170, pp. 18-71; No. 171, pp. 3-59; No. 172, pp. 3-61. (Kashka 2004)
- Kochan, I. M., “Interpretation of the text model and structure”, in *Grammar language space: scientific works on the 60th anniversary of the corresponding member of NASU Anatoliia Zahnitka*, Donetsk, DonNU, 2014, pp. 285-290. (Kochan 2014)
- Kozheliianko, V., *Defiliada v Moskvi*, *Suchasnist*, 1998, No. 11, pp. 9-56; No. 12, pp. 6-38. (Kozheliianko 1998)
- Kozheliianko, V., *Konotop*, *Suchasnist*, 1999, No. 11, pp. 10-71. (Kozheliianko 1999)
- Kozheliianko, V., *Liudynets*, Lviv, Calvaria, 2001. (Kozheliianko 2001)
- Kozheliianko, V., *Lzhe Nostradamus*, Lviv, Calvaria. (Kozheliianko 2001)
- Maksymiuk, O. V., *Koreferentnist nerozkladnykh komponentiv u strukturi rechennia*. Unpublished candidate dissertation, Chernivtsi, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, 2006. (Maksymiuk 2006)
- Matios, M., *Zhyttia korotke*, Lviv, Calvaria, 2001. (Matios 2001)
- Matsko, L., “Discourse analysis of a text”, in *Ukrainska literarura v zahalnoosvitnii shkoli*, 2008, No. 9, pp. 9-14. (Matsko 2008)
- Medvid, V. *Krov po solomi*, Lviv, Calvaria, 2002. (Medvid 2002)
- Mukhin, A. M., *Lingvisticheskii analiz: Teoreticheskie i metodologicheskie problemy*, Leningrad, Nauka, 1976. (Mukhin 1976)
- Norman, B. Yu., “Factors determining speakers’ choice of a syntactic construction”, in *Modern Russian syntax: phrase and sentence: interuniversity collection of scientific papers*, Vladimir, VGPI Publishing house, 1986, pp. 3-10. (Norman 1986)

- Pan'kova, T., "Polypredicative hypotactic constructions: the linguo-synergetic aspect", in *Annals of the the University of Craiova. Philology. Linguistics*, 2016, XXXVIII (No. 1-2), pp. 273-284. (Pan'kova 2016)
- Pavliuk, I., "Biohrafii dereva plemeni poetiv", in *Kurier Kryvbasu*, 2002, No. 151, pp. 39-88. (Pavliuk 2002)
- Pavliuk, I., "Vertepni dushi", in *Dzvin*, 2004, No. 8, pp. 29-81. (Pavliuk 2004)
- Pavliuk, I., "Vyroshchuvannia almaziv", in *Kurier Kryvbasu*, 2004, No. 177, pp. 3-52; No. 178, pp. 68-111. (Pavliuk 2004)
- Pashkovskiy, Ye., "Zakryta palata", in *Private collection: Selected Ukrainian prose and essays of the late XXth century / uporiad., vstupne slovo, bibliohraf. vidomosti ta prymit. V. Gabora*, Lviv, LA "Piramida", 2002, pp. 503-512. (Pashkovskiy 2002)
- Pokalchuk, Yu., "Posmishka meduzy", in *Suchasnist*, 1995, No. 2, pp. 40-55. (Pokalchuk 1995)
- Potebnia, O., *Teoreticheskaia poetika*, Moscow, Academy, 2003. (Potebnia 2003)
- Prokhasko, T., *Neprosti*, Ivano-Frankivsk, Lileya-Nv., 2002. (Prokhasko 2002)
- Protsiuk, S., "Zhertvoprynesennia", in *Kurier Kryvbasu*, 2003, No. 160, pp. 5-72; No. 161, pp. 23-102. (Protsiuk 2003)
- Protsiuk, S., *Infektsiia*, Lviv, LA "Piramida", 2002. (Protsiuk 2002)
- Protsiuk, S., *Shybenytsia dlia nizhnosti*, Ternopil, Dzhura, 2001. (Protsiuk 2001)
- Shkliar, V., "Kliuch", in *Suchasnist*, 1999, No. 5, pp. 6-59; No. 6, pp. 9-59. (Shkliar 1999)
- Slynko, I. I., Huivaniuk N. V. & Kobylanska M. F., *Syntaksys suchanoi ukrainskoi movy: Problemni pytannia*, Kyiv, Vyscha shkola, 1994. (Slynko, Huivaniuk & Kobylanska 1994)
- Sodomora, A., *Naodyntsi zi slovom*, Lviv, Ukraine, 2004. (Sodomora 2004)
- Solohub, N. M., "Concept "individual style of the writer" in the context of modern linguistics", in *Naukovyi visnyk Chernivetskoho universytetu. Slovianska filolohiia*, 2011, issue 117-118, pp. 34-39. (Solohub 2011)
- Uliananko, O., *Stalinka*, Lviv, Calvaria, 2000. (Uliananko 2000)
- Uliananko, O., "Uhoda", in *Private collection: Selected Ukrainian prose and essays of the late XXth century / uporiad., vstupne slovo, bibliohraf. vidomosti ta prymit. V. Gabora*, Lviv, LA "Piramida", 2002, pp. 588-593. (Uliananko 2002)
- Vinogradov, V. V., *O teorii khudozhestvennoi rechi*, Moscow, Vysshiaia Shkola, 1971. (Vinogradov 1971)
- Vokalchuk, H., *Slovotvorchist ukrainskykh poetiv XX stolittia*, Ostroh, National University "Ostroh Academy", 2008. (Vokalchuk 2008)
- Volvach, P., "Kliasa", in *Kurier Kryvbasu*, 2003, No. 162, pp. 47-109; No. 163, pp. 3-71; No. 164, pp.14-87. (Volvach 2003)
- Vykhovanets, I., *Hramatyka ukrainskoi movy. Syntaksys*, Kyiv, "Lybid", 1993. (Vykhovanets 1993)
- Vykhovanets, I., Horodenska K. & Rusanivskiy V., *Semantyko-syntaksychna struktura rechennia*, Kyiv, "Naukova dumka", 1983. (Vykhovanets, Horodenska & Rusanivskiy 1983)
- Vynnychuk, Yu., *Divy nochi*, Lviv, LA "Piramida", 2003. (Vynnychuk 2003)

- Vynnychuk, Yu., *Malva Landa*, Lviv, LA “Piramida”, 2003. (Vynnychuk 2003)
- Yermolenko, S., *Narysy z ukrainskoi slovesnosti: Stylistyka ta kultura movy*, Kyiv, Dovira, 1999. (Yermolenko 1999)
- Zabuzhko, O., “Kazka pro kalynovu sopilku”, in *Zabuzhko Oksana Sestra, sestro*, Kyiv, Fact, 2003, pp. 71-122. (Zabuzhko 2003)
- Zahnitko, A. P., *Linhvistyka tekstu: teoriia i praktyka*, Donetsk, TOV “Yugo-Vostok Ltd”, 2007. (Zahnitko 2007)
- Zahnitko, A. P., *Teoria suchasnoho syntaksysu*, Donetsk, 2006. (Zahnitko 2006)
- Zavalniuk, I. Ya., *Syntaksychni odynytsi v movi ukrainskoi presy pochatku XXI st. : struktura ta prahmastylistychni funksii*, Extended abstract of candidate’s thesis, Kyiv, 2010. (Zavalniuk 2010)
- Zhadan, S., *Depeche Mode*, Kharkiv, Folio, 2004. (Zhadan 2004)

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the lexical-grammatical nature of half-predicative appositive units as idiolect markers of Ukrainian literature of the late 20th - early 21st centuries, and the type of semantic-syntactic connection between the identified component of the separated substantive unit and the appositive unit. One-word half-predicative units have been described in relation to the signified component in terms of semantic and grammatical indices; phrasal, coordinating series and sub-appositive separated components have been analyzed by the nature of the morphological expression of an appositive unit. In addition, the models of half-predicative appositive units have been described by the valency of the appositive unit with the attributive syntaxemes. The research has proved grammatical interdependence between the identified component and the half-predicative appositive unit, which is manifested in the literary context. All selected examples to designate the denotative field “man” are composed by continuous writing out, which testifies their frequency and idiolectivity.

Key words: half-predicative appositive unit, anthropocentricity, semantic-grammatical aspect

REZUMAT

Articolul abordează natura lexico-gramaticală a unităților apozitive semipredicative, ca marcatori idiolectali ai literaturii ucrainene de la sfârșitul secolului al XX-lea și începutul secolului XXI, precum și tipul de legătură semantico-sintactică dintre componenta identificată a unității substantivale separate și unitatea apozitivă. Unitățile semipredicative monolexematice au fost descrise în raport cu componenta semnificată din punctul de vedere al indicilor semantici și gramaticali; seriile coordonatoare și componentele subapozitive separate au fost analizate în funcție de natura expresiei morfologice a unei unități apozitive. În plus, au fost descrise modelele de unități apozitive semipredicative în funcție de valența unității apozitive cu sintaxeme atributive. Cercetările au dovedit o interdependență gramaticală între componenta identificată și unitatea apozitivă semipredicativă, care se manifestă în context literar. Toate exemplele selectate pentru desemnarea câmpului denotativ „om” sunt realizate printr-o scriere continuă, ceea ce le demonstrează frecvența și caracterul idiolectal.

Cuvinte-cheie: unitate apozitivă semipredicativă, antropocentricitate, aspect semantico-gramatical