

**МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ**  
**КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ**  
**Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології**

**Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики**  
**на тему:**

**«МОВНІ ЗАСОБИ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦІЇ ПРЕДМЕТНОСТІ**  
**В СУЧАСНИХ АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ І УКРАЇНСЬКІЙ МОВАХ:**  
**МОРФОСИНТАКСИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ»**

Допущено до захисту

«\_\_\_» \_\_\_\_\_

року

студентки групи МЛа 51-21  
факультету германської філології і  
перекладу  
освітньо-професійної програми  
сучасні філологічні студії (англійська мова  
і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика та  
перекладознавство  
за спеціальністю 035 Філологія  
спеціалізація 035.041 Германські мови та  
літератури (переклад включно), перша –  
англійська  
**Зіневич Ольги Вадимівни**

Завідувач кафедри

Шутова М.О.

Науковий керівник:

**канд. філол. наук, доц. Березенко В.М.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(підпис)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(підпис)

Національна шкала \_\_\_\_\_

Кількість балів \_\_\_\_\_

Оцінка ЄКТС \_\_\_\_\_

КИЇВ – 2022

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE**  
**KYIV NATIONAL LINGUISTIC UNIVERSITY**  
**Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology**

**Master's Qualification Paper**

**LANGUAGE MEANS OF REPRESENTING SUBSTANTIALITY**  
**IN MODERN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN:**  
**MORPHOSYNTACTIC ANALYSIS**

**OLHA ZINEVYCH**

Group MLa 51-21

Department of Germanic Philology and Translation

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof. **VIKTORIYA BEREZENKO**

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv – 2022

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	6
<b>CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL FUNDAMENTALS OF THE CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF THE ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE MEANS REPRESENTING SUBSTANTIALITY.....</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1. Types of languages.....	9
1.1.1. Morphological classification .....	9
1.1.2. Syntactic classification.....	11
1.2. Parts of speech typology in the contrasted languages.....	12
1.3. Morphosyntactic study of language units.....	14
1.4. Nouns as a lexico-grammatical class representing substantiality, their semantic classes.....	15
1.5. Nominal parts of speech denoting substantiality.....	16
<b>Conclusions to Chapter One.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>CHAPTER TWO. MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE LANGUAGE UNITS REPRESENTING SUBSTANTIALITY IN MODERN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN.....</b>	<b>19</b>
2.1. Morphological properties of nouns in the contrasted languages.....	19
2.1.1. Structure of the Noun.....	19
2.1.2. Category of number.....	20
2.1.2.1. Realization of the category of number in English.....	20
2.1.2.2. Realization of the category of number in Ukrainian.....	22
2.1.2.3. Contrastive analysis of presenting number in English and Ukrainian.....	23
2.1.3. Category of case.....	23
2.1.3.1. Noun cases in English.....	23
2.1.3.2. Noun cases in Ukrainian.....	24
2.1.3.3. Contrastive analysis of the morphological markedness of cases in English and Ukrainian.....	26

2.1.4. Category of gender.....	27
2.1.4.1. Gender of the English nouns.....	27
2.1.4.2. Gender of the Ukrainian nouns.....	27
2.1.4.3. Contrastive analysis of the morphological markedness of gender in English and Ukrainian.....	28
2.1.5. Category of definiteness/indefiniteness.....	29
2.1.5.1. Realization of the category of definiteness/indefiniteness of nouns in English.....	29
2.1.5.2. Realization of the category of definiteness/indefiniteness of nouns in Ukrainian.....	30
2.1.5.3. Contrastive analysis of the morphological markedness of definiteness/indefiniteness in English and Ukrainian.....	31
2.2. Morphological features of nominal parts of speech denoting substantiality in the languages under contrast.....	31
2.2.1. Verbal nouns description.....	31
2.2.2. Pronouns realization as substitutors of language units denoting substantiality.....	34
2.2.3. Numerals use in the function of representors of objects of the objective reality.....	37
2.2.4. Substantivized adjectives in representing reality.....	39
<b>Conclusions to Chapter Two.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>CHAPTER THREE. SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS OF THE LANGUAGE UNITS REPRESENTING SUBSTANTIALITY IN MODERN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN.....</b>	<b>45</b>
3.1. Syntactic properties of nouns in the contrasted languages.....	45
3.1.1. Syntagmatic valency of Nouns.....	45
3.1.2. Nouns in structuring the Noun phrases.....	46
3.1.2.1. Nouns with premodifiers.....	46
3.1.2.2. Nouns with postmodifiers.....	48

3.1.2.3. Nouns in mixed modified phrases.....	49
3.1.3. Noun-Verb agreement.....	50
3.1.4. Nouns in patterning simple two-member sentences.....	53
3.1.4.1. Nouns as subjects.....	54
3.1.4.2. Nouns as subjective complements.....	55
3.1.4.3. Nouns as objects.....	57
3.1.4.4. Nouns as objective complements.....	58
3.1.4.5. Nouns as attributes.....	59
3.1.4.6. Nouns as a part of prepositional phrases in the function of adverbial modifiers.....	61
3.1.4.7. Nouns in two-member incomplete sentences with different communicative aims.....	62
3.1.5. Nouns in composing simple one-member sentences.....	64
3.1.6. Nouns use in non-sentence utterances.....	64
3.2. Syntactic features of nominal parts of speech denoting substantiality in the languages under contrast.....	65
3.2.1. Verbal nouns use.....	65
3.2.2. Pronouns functions.....	66
3.2.3. Numerals roles.....	69
3.2.4. Substantivized adjectives positions.....	70
<b>Conclusions to Chapter Three.....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>RÉSUMÉ.....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>LITERATURE CITED .....</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS.....</b>	<b>86</b>

## INTRODUCTION

“In order to understand Language, it is essential to understand languages.” (Mairal & Gil, 2006, p. 130) This quotation is certainly true for any language (hence, no article). And serving to the above-mentioned purpose, typological linguistics as a discipline has been flourishing ever since the first half of the nineteenth century. Languages have been classified and reclassified according to numerous principles by numerous scholars. Particular importance can be assigned to contrastive studies within the scope of typological linguistics as it can play a great role in certain spheres of applied linguistics as well (Crystal, 2008).

The **topicality** of the research done in this paper lies in the fact that typological investigations and morphosyntactic analyses are conducted in many languages, and the contrastive studies are now used in various areas of life. Therefore, the contrastive morphosyntactic analysis of English and Ukrainian language means denoting substantiality is one of the steps towards deeper comprehension of the two languages.

**The object of the research** is the language units representing substantiality in the English and Ukrainian languages.

**The subject of the research** is the morphological and syntactic features of these units in English and Ukrainian.

**The aim of the research** is to establish the key differences in the realization of all the morphological and syntactic properties of the language units denoting substantiality in the contrasted languages.

Therefore, we have formulated the following **tasks**:

- to study the morphological and syntactic classifications and pinpoint where the contrasted languages belong;
- to consider the typology of the parts of speech in English and Ukrainian;
- to establish the fundamentals of morphosyntactic analysis;
- to characterize the noun as a lexico-grammatical class as well as nominal parts of speech denoting substantiality;

- to analyse the realizations of each grammatical category of nouns in the languages under discussion;
- to investigate morphological properties of other nominal parts of speech with the meaning of substantiality;
- to conduct the syntactic analysis of these parts of speech;
- to highlight the allomorphic and isomorphic features.

The main **methods** used in this study include induction, deduction, theoretical analysis of the reference literature, synthesis, generalisation and contrastive method.

**The novelty of the research** lies in consideration of the isomorphic and allomorphic features observed in the contrasted languages with regard to morphology and syntax of the parts of speech with the meaning of substantiality.

**The theoretical value** of the research is that the data provided in this paper can become a ground for further investigation in the field of contrastive studies.

**The practical value** of this work is that all the information and conclusions can be applied to teaching, translation and any other kind of activity involving both English and Ukrainian.

This course paper consists of an introduction, three chapters with their respective conclusions, general conclusions, résumé, literature cited and list of illustration materials.

**Introduction** includes a brief summary of the reason for choosing the topic, the main aim and tasks of the investigation, its theoretical and practical value.

**Chapter One “Theoretical Fundamentals of the Contrastive Study of the English and Ukrainian Language Means Representing Substantiality”** deals with the basic classifications in typology as well as with the parts-of-speech typology in Ukrainian and English. Moreover, different aspects of noun as a lexico-grammatical class in addition to other parts of speech denoting substantiality are discussed.

**Chapter Two “Morphological Analysis of the Language Units Representing Substantiality in Modern English and Ukrainian”** covers the

structure of the noun, the four categories of the noun, sheds light on their realization in the two languages and proposes their contrastive analysis as well as provides morphological description and analysis of the nominal parts of speech with the meaning of substantiality.

**Chapter Three “Syntactic Analysis of the Language Units Representing Substantiality in Modern English and Ukrainian”** is concerned with the syntactic properties of these units and establishment of allomorphic and isomorphic features in their realization in the languages under contrast.

**General conclusions** sum up the results of the research by stating the most significant observations throughout the course of the study.

**CHAPTER ONE**  
**THEORETICAL FUNDAMENTALS OF THE CONTRASTIVE**  
**STUDY OF THE ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE MEANS**  
**REPRESENTING SUBSTANTIALITY**

**1.1. Types of languages**

First and foremost, it is important to establish that there exist a number of ways to classify languages. For example, we could analyse languages from the genetic point of view, i.e. according to their corresponding language families. In this paper, however, we are looking at Ukrainian and English language units denoting substantiality from the standpoint of typological linguistics. David Crystal (2008) defines **typological linguistics** as “a branch of linguistics which studies the structural similarities between languages, regardless of their history, as part of an attempt to establish a satisfactory classification, or typology, of languages” (p. 499). For this contrastive study, two major classifications bear great importance: morphological and syntactical.

**1.1.1. Morphological classification.** The morpheme is considered a linguistic universal or, in other words, it can be found across all languages regardless of their type or language family. Nevertheless, morphemes have different combinability properties in different languages, thus, serving as a reliable basis for the morphological classification. Generally, four types of languages are established under this classification: isolating, polysynthetic or incorporating, agglutinative or agglutinating and flexional.

It is characteristic for the words from the **isolating type** of languages to consist of a single morpheme. Hence, all the grammatical meanings are realized via separate words and not the change of a root morpheme. A great example to demonstrate this phenomenon is the Chinese language. If we take a look at the grammatical category of aspect, the aspect-marker *-le* is used to show the completion of some action when it follows the verb (Brown, 2006).

*e.g. Wǒ qù kànle nà bù diànyǐng.*

I go see+past that one film.

*I went to see that film.*

The **incorporating type** of languages is characterized by the absence of any distinction between a word-form and a sentence. It is primarily typical for many languages of American Indians like Cherokee, Mohawk, or Menominee (Fromkin, 2011). Let us exemplify the use of one of such constructions in Central Siberian Yupik: *iitghesqesaghiisqaa*, where *itegh-* means ‘come in’, *-sqe-* means ‘ask to’, *-yaghtugh-* means ‘go to’, *-aa* signifies third-person singular, indicative mood. And overall this construction is translated as ‘He asked him to go ask him to come in’ (Brown, 2006, p. 745). Some linguists prefer not to regard this type of languages as a distinct one, including Wilhelm von Humboldt, whose classification consisted of only three types: isolating, agglutinating, and inflecting (Trask, 2007).

Grammatical categories in **agglutinative languages** are realized by means of affixes that are added to the root morpheme. Since in this case the root morpheme is invariable, there is no inner flexion, and each affix has its own grammatical meaning, the word’s morphological structure can be easily traced. For instance, in Turkish, affix *-ler* indicates plurality, hence, *koj* (village) is *kojler* (villages) in plural (O’Grady et al., 1996, p. 381). Another example would be the Korean language. Let us examine the following sentence: 이 여자는 대학교에 다닙니다. The root morphemes in question are 이 (*this*), 여자 (*woman*), 대학교 (*university, college*), 다니- (*go, attend*). Then we can easily trace the affixes in this sentence and their functions, namely: the topic-maker -는, the affix showing direction for verbs of motion -에, and the marker of present tense on the formal and polite level of speech -습니다. Thus, this sentence may be translated as *This woman goes to college*.

Last but not least, we have the **flexional type**. Languages belonging to this type possess a set of distinctive features. Firstly, inner flexion is a common phenomenon occurring in the flexional languages. For example, *mouse – mice* in English or *день – дні* in Ukrainian. Secondly, in such languages, one and the same affix can combine different grammatical meanings, e.g. English formant *-s* is used to indicate third-person singular in Present Indefinite as well as plurality in nouns.

Vice versa, one and the same grammatical meaning can be expressed by means of various suffixes. This feature is known under the term ‘synthetosemia’. And finally, the flexional type is also characterized by fusions, which make the process of a word’s division into morphemes more complicated due to the fuzziness of the morpheme boundaries (Crystal, 2008).

Taking the above-mentioned features into account, we can arrive at the conclusion that both English and Ukrainian are representatives of the flexional type of languages. For the purposes of this contrastive study, however, we pay more attention to the further subdivision of the flexional languages into the analytical and synthetic ones.

**1.1.2. Syntactic classification.** The synthetic and analytical subdivisions are distinguished within the syntactic classification, particularly according to the type of grammatical word-formation. As the use of additional words and fixed word order to express grammatical meanings is established to a greater degree in English, it is considered **analytical**. Consider the following example: *I will help you*. In this sentence, we can distinguish the fixed word order (SVO) and analytical structure *will + bare infinitive* to show futurity. Ukrainian, on the other hand, is primarily of **synthetic** nature due to the major use of the change of word-forms, which allows a relatively free word order in a sentence. This key difference will provide extensive opportunity for the contrastive study in this paper.

Another syntactic classification was proposed by professor Meshchaninov (Мещанинов, 1967), and it consists of the following types according to the realization of the relations between subject and predicate: nominative, ergative and passive. In **nominative languages**, the agent is the subject of the sentence and stands in nominative Case.

In **ergative languages**, sentences with predicates expressed by a transitive verb create an ergative construction. This occurrence is often connected with the absence of the accusative case in a language, thus, the subject acquires the form of the ergative case while the object takes the nominative case. It is mainly intrinsic for Caucasian languages, but one may encounter this kind of structure in the

languages under the discussion as well. For example, Ukrainian *Їй сподобався подарунок*, or archaic English *methinks*.

Then, the third type of languages is the **passive type**. Here, the subject and the object are not morphologically marked but rather they merge with the predicate forming a single unit (Мещанинов, 1967). The passive type is widespread among the languages of the American tribes, i.e. polysynthetic or incorporating languages.

### 1.2. Parts of speech typology in the contrasted languages

The history of the parts of speech classification dates back as far as Ancient Greece and the works of Aristotle, so it goes without saying that since the study of Latin grammar was quite developed back in the day, it could not but influence the development of the English parts of speech classification as well. For example, the classical parts of speech theory uses Latin grammar as its basis to establish two groups: declinable and indeclinable parts of speech. The application of this classification to English as an analytical language, however, is irrelevant (Волкова, 2009).

Although English has a **differentiated parts-of-speech system** with the syntactic slots filled in, including head of predicate phrase, head of referential phrase, modifier of referential phrase, modifier of predicate phrase (Hengeveld et al., 2004), identifying parts of speech in English can pose quite a challenge. This fact is proven by numerous studies and classification attempts of various grammarians. Charles Fries, for instance, takes a **functional approach** to the problem. The American linguist introduced three utterance frames where by means of substitution four classes of words can be singled out: class 1 words functioning as the subject, class 2 words functioning as the predicate, class 3 words performing the function of attribute and class 4 words performing the function of the adverbial modifier.

*e.g. She was not elegantly dressed* (Alcott, 1996, ch. 1).

1    2                    4            3

Words that do not fit the frames are allotted into 15 classes of functional words (Fries, 1952).

For the purposes of this contrastive study more importance will be given to C. F. Hockett's (1964) classification into parts of speech and classes of words. Besides the three main classes, i.e. class N words, class V words and class A words, he observed that a significant bulk of the words from these classes have various distributions. That is why, he also established **mixed classes** such as:

- the NA class, where words can perform the functions of nouns and adjectives;
- the NV class, where words can function as nouns and verbs;
- the AV class, where words can have the distribution of adjectives and verbs;
- and the NAV class, where words can perform the functions of nouns, adjectives and verbs (Hockett, 1964, p. 227).

Taking the above-mentioned classification into account we can conclude that if an English notional is taken out of context, in many cases it is impossible to pinpoint its lexico-grammatical category at a purely language level.

In Ukrainian, however, notional words always have their explicit morphological markers pointing to the lexico-grammatical meaning of the word. Thus, establishing Ukrainian equivalents of some notional words in English is only possible if the context, their distribution, is known.

Despite such variable nature of a lot of English notionals, there is also a number of words that are not so flexible, e.g. proper nouns, internationalisms, some common verbs, etc. This means that words of such categories can be easily identified at language level. Furthermore, the so-called '**closed system**' of functionals display quite an explicit lexico-grammatical nature both in English and Ukrainian (Quirk et al., 1985).

It is worth mentioning that there exists a discussion as to some notional and functional parts of speech. For instance, some grammarians question the status of statives and numeral as well as some modal words. Nonetheless, in this chapter we will follow the opinion of the majority of grammarians who worked or have been working on this problem.

Considering the isomorphic, i.e. common, features characteristic to different lexico-grammatical classes both in English and Ukrainian, the following **notional parts of speech** can be established: noun, verb, adjective, adverb, pronoun, numeral, and stative. The system of the **functional parts of speech** is also mainly isomorphic consisting of conjunctions, prepositions, particles, modal words and interjections. The key difference between the functional parts of speech in the English and Ukrainian languages is the presence of the article in English, which is not represented in Ukrainian.

### 1.3. Morphosyntactic study of language units

When it comes to the morphosyntactic study of language units in the contrasted languages, it is essential to understand that it incorporates two separate aspects of study – morphology and syntax, as is suggested by the name. Let us elaborate what each of these aspects presupposes.

According to the Encyclopaedia Britannica (2016), **morphology** is the “study of the internal construction of words.” Since both the Ukrainian and English language belong to the flexional type of languages, the contrastive morphological study becomes relevant due to the presence of isomorphic as well as allomorphic morphological features in different language units representing substantiality.

As for **syntax**, it is generally defined as “the rules governing the arrangement of words and phrases into sentences” (Garner, 2016, p. 7). The syntactic side of this study interests us because of the analytical nature of English and the synthetic one of Ukrainian. In Chapter 3, we will consider various syntactic properties of language units representing substantiality and dwell on them from the contrastive perspective.

Although the morphosyntactic study has two different aspects, they are analysed in conjunction for a reason. Shahid et al. (2021) states the following: “In essence, morphology and syntax are both studies of the same thing - the rules that govern the formation of a language – but at different levels” (p. 79). In addition to this common focus on the way a language is structured, the term **morphosyntax** can be used to denote the role of morphemes in phrases and sentences

(Morphosyntax, n.d.). As morphology and syntax are so closely interrelated, the necessity of morphosyntactic study of language units emerges, especially, in the field of typological linguistics.

#### **1.4. Nouns as a lexico-grammatical class representing substantiality, their semantic classes**

Since the noun is one of the core parts of speech representing substantiality in the Ukrainian and English languages, it is necessary to establish some isomorphic and allomorphic features of the noun as a lexico-grammatical class.

First and foremost, the noun in both languages has the lexico-grammatical meaning of **substantiality**. The presence of such meaning allows us to establish the isomorphic subdivision of nouns into two paradigmatic classes of **common** and **proper nouns** (Леонова, 1983). Common nouns in their turn can be split into such subcategories as:

- concrete nouns: *street, field* – *вулиця, поле*;
- abstract nouns: *happiness, depth* – *щастя, глибина*;
- collective nouns: *family, team* – *сім'я, команда*, etc.

Subcategorization of proper nouns is also shared by both English and Ukrainian. For example, names of people and nationalities (*Steven, the Chinese, Степан, китайці*), surnames (*Griffith, Jefferson, Miller, Довженко, Шевченко, Іваненко*), geographical and astronomical names (*Germany, Wales, the Carpathians, the Mississippi, San Francisco, Mars, Україна, Луганщина, Альпи, Дністер, Мадрид, Земля*), names of companies and organizations (*Tesla, Hershey's, «Форд», «Рудь»*), names of books, newspapers, publications (*“Beloved”, The Sun, «Місто», «Факти»*), and names of holidays and events (*Thanksgiving, Великдень*) etc. (Леонова, 1983).

Furthermore, both English and Ukrainian have other groups of nouns, including **animate / inanimate** (*dog / table, собака / стіл*) and **countable / uncountable** nouns (*pencil, flower, fork / bravery, sadness, boredom; олівець, квітка, виделка / сміливість, сум, нудьга*) (Wallwork, 2018). Although the existence of these semantic classes is isomorphic, the features of some groups have

different realizations in the contrasted languages, which will be discussed and exemplified in detail in Chapter Two of this paper.

### 1.5. Nominal parts of speech denoting substantiality

Besides the noun, there are other parts of speech that can convey the meaning of substantiality. These include verbal nouns, pronouns, numerals, and substantivized adjectives. Let us reflect in exactly what ways they denote substantiality.

First, we have got **verbal nouns**. In English, they can be subdivided into two types: deverbial and gerundial nouns. It is also necessary to highlight that, although some dictionaries have a tendency to state that gerunds are verbal nouns, it is important to draw the line between gerunds per se and gerundial nouns due to their distinct syntactic characteristics, which we will study later in this paper (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002). In general, Professor Ilc (2016) defines the nature of verbal nouns in the following manner: “English deverbial and gerundial nouns are traditionally analysed as instances of verbal nominalisations with a hybrid syntactic and semantic nature: while predominantly having nominal properties, they display some of the verbal characteristics as well” (p. 153). The same hybridity is characteristic of Ukrainian nouns, too (Пчелінцева, 2019).

Next, **pronouns** are also a nominal part of speech denoting substantiality. Various dictionaries define the term ‘pronoun’ differently and it is difficult to provide a clear definition due to the pronouns referring to an object rather than naming it directly (Любанова, 2019). For instance, Merriam-Webster (n.d.a, Definition 1) gives this definition of pronouns: “any of a small set of words ... in a language that are used as substitutes for nouns or noun phrases and whose referents are named or understood in the context.” As we can observe, it encompasses both the substitutional nature of pronouns and the notion of a **referent**, which basically represents an entity on our cognitive level (Azuma, 2009). Since pronouns correlate with the noun in terms of their grammatical meaning, declension and syntactic functions (Микитюк, 2013), they can be duly investigated as a part of speech indicating substantiality.

Another part of speech worth our attention with respect to the meaning of substantiality is the **numeral**. Within traditional grammar, the adjectival and pronominal nature of numerals is highlighted while contemporary grammar looks at numerals from the point of view of their syntactic function (Aarts et al., 2014). Regarding this last aspect, both cardinal and ordinal numerals can occupy the position of a head in a noun phrase and act as regular nouns as well (Biber et al., 2021). Therefore, their substantive nature can be observed and further studied in this paper.

Finally, we will reflect on **substantivized adjectives**. Generally, **substantivization** is a semantic and syntactic transformation of notional parts of speech into nouns (ЗВОНСЬКА ТА ІН., 2017, с. 494). In other words, a substantivized adjective acquires the implicit grammatical meaning of substantiality and partially loses its meaning of quantitiveness (ХАНТІЛЬ, 2010). With varying degrees and means of substantivization, adjectives can have different properties in the contrasted languages, which presents a fascinating point for investigation.

### **Conclusions to Chapter One**

Typological linguistics lies at the theoretical basis of this contrastive study of language units representing substantiality in the English and Ukrainian languages. We have established two main classifications within the framework of typology: morphological and syntactic.

Under morphological classification languages are divided into four groups: isolating, incorporating/polysynthetic, agglutinative/agglutinating and flexional, both English and Ukrainian belonging to the latter.

Syntactic classification, in its turn, has two principles according to which languages are subdivided. The first one is the type of grammatical word-formation including synthetic and analytical languages. In this regard, Ukrainian and English are allomorphic with Ukrainian being a synthetic language and English an analytical one. The second principle is the realization of the relations between subject and predicate according to which there are nominative, ergative and

passive language types. Here, on the other hand, English and Ukrainian are isomorphic as they belong to the nominative type.

As for the parts of speech typology in the languages under discussion, the contrasted languages have many features in common. Among the notional parts of speech, the following are established in both languages: noun, verb, adjective, adverb, pronoun, numeral, and stative. Furthermore, the English and Ukrainian language also have such functional parts of speech as conjunctions, prepositions, particles, modal words, and interjections, with the article being the only allomorphic part of speech belonging to English.

Noun as a lexico-grammatical class in either language is characterized by lexico-grammatical meaning of substantiality, which further allows for the subdivision of nouns into common and proper with their own subgroups. In addition, nouns in Ukrainian and English can also be grouped into animate/inanimate and countable/uncountable.

Lastly, there are other nominal parts of speech that are capable of representing substantiality in contrasted languages. In this study, we will focus on the following four: verbal nouns (both gerundial and deverbal), pronouns, numerals (both cardinal and ordinal), and substantivized adjectives.

## CHAPTER TWO

### MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS OF THE LANGUAGE UNITS REPRESENTING SUBSTANTIALITY IN MODERN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

#### 2.1. Morphological properties of nouns in the contrasted languages

Hooper (1979) has once said that “morphology is inherently messy” (p. 113). It is certainly so and the deeper we dive into the realm of morphology, the more things we learn. Therefore, we naturally need to systematise the available knowledge on morphological properties of nouns and other language units representing substantiality to succeed in providing the contrastive analysis.

**2.1.1 Structure of the Noun.** Structurally, English and Ukrainian nouns exhibit a wide range of isomorphic characteristics. Both languages contain compound and composite nouns:

- compound: *headache, greenhouse, freeway, пройдисвіт, лісостеп, перекотиполе;*
- composite: *merry-go-round, mother-in-law, мати-й-мачуха, яхт-клуб.*

If we take a look at the **structure of derivative nouns** in the contrasted languages, we will observe that it is practically the same as well: prefix + root + suffix + inflection. In addition, the **system of suffixes and prefixes** in English and Ukrainian has the subdivision into productive / unproductive, native / borrowed along with a number of semantic groups suffixes and prefixes of which typically perform isomorphic functions. For instance, there is a class of suffixes that are agent-makers. In English, it comprises such suffixes as -er (*teacher, speaker*), -ar (*scholar, beggar*), -or (*impostor, translator*), -ent (*student, president*), -ant (*applicant, assailant*), etc. Some common suffixes forming agent nouns in Ukrainian include -ач/яч (*перекладач, викладач*), -тель (*вчитель, любитель*), -ник (*засновник, месник*), -ець (*кравець, виконавець*), -ень (*учень*), -ак/як (*співак, жебрак*), etc (Корунець, 2003).

Another typologically relevant isomorphic group of suffixes are such suffixes as -ism / -ізм/изм (*sexism* – *сексизм*, *impressionism* – *імпресіонізм*), -tion / -ція/сія (*nation* - *нація*, *protection* – *протекція*), -or / -ор (*rector* - *ректор*, *aggressor* - *агресор*), -ess/-ness / -еса/-иса/-иця (*actress* - *актриса*, *heiress* - *наслідниця*), -y / -ія (*geography* - *географія*, *autonomy* - *автономія*). This group of suffixes is mainly isomorphic due to the existence of **internationalisms**, which form “lexical parallels” in many languages of the world. Even though these lexical units do not always coincide fully in their meaning, their affixes do. With respect to the suffixes national by nature, suffixes forming abstract nouns are one of the common characteristics of the contrasted languages. These suffixes are -hood (*livelihood*), -dom (*martyrdom*), -ing (*feeling*), -ness (*hopelessness*), etc. In Ukrainian this group contains suffixes like -ність (*вірність*), -ивість (*хтивість*), -ість (*самотність*), etc.

Concerning allomorphic features in the system of suffixes, we cannot but consider the group of **diminutive suffixes**. As Professor Korunets mentioned in his typological study (Корунець, 2003), the Ukrainian language is more abundant in diminutive suffixes amounting to 53 suffixes, while English only has 14-16, the majority of which are unproductive. In addition to this group, there is also a group of suffixes that exists in Ukrainian but is not represented in English. These are **augmentative suffixes**, i.e. suffixes bearing the general meaning of being large in size. For example, -ил- (*вітрило*), -ищ- (*вітрище*), -ук-/-юк- (*зміюка*), -уг-/-юг- (*злюдога*), etc. (Корунець, 2003). Thus, we may observe that Ukrainian due to its synthetic properties is more prone to have a richer system of affixes, especially suffixal ones.

**2.1.2. Category of number. 2.1.2.1. Realization of the category of number in English.** When we have a certain quantity of things and want to state this quantity by means of language, we can use numerals, pronouns, nouns, etc. It is, however, not the only way to do this. In such cases, one may turn to grammatical means of expression of the objective category of quantity, i.e. the **category of number**.

The category of number in English, like in any other language, finds its realization through the opposition of the marked plural form to the unmarked singular one. Naturally, this noun category has its own limitations due to the implicit grammatical meaning of uncountableness (Волкова, 2009, с. 102). With all of this taken into account, we can establish the following classes of nouns within the category of number: singular invariable nouns or *Singularia Tantum*, plural invariable nouns or *Pluralia Tantum* and variable nouns which can acquire both singular and plural forms (Quirk et al., 1985).

Firstly, **Singularia Tantum** is a class of uncountable nouns that are always singular. These include abstract notions (*happiness, trust*), proper names (*Steven, Mark*), materials (*silver, milk*) and some collective nouns (*hair*) (Quirk et al., 1985). Obviously, one may use words of the *Singularia Tantum* class in plural with a change in the meaning, e.g. *paper (material for writing) – papers (documents)*. Or they could be used with a stylistic colouring and a tinge of emphasis:

e.g. *I ride rough waters and shall sink with no one to save me* (Woolf, 1931, para. 383).

Secondly, the class of **Pluralia Tantum** nouns consists of summation plurals (*spectacles, pyjamas*), abstract notions (*wages, surroundings*), games, subjects, sciences, diseases, even though they demand the verb in the singular (*darts, physics, linguistics, measles*) (Quirk et al., 1985).

Finally, we have **variable nouns**. There are a number of formal markers to indicate the plural. The most common way of forming plurals would be by means of the inflection -(e)s: *boy – boys, pot – pots, try – tries*. Among other flexions one can encounter -(r)en (*ox – oxen, child – children, brother – brethren*) and those belonging to the borrowed nouns, including but not limited to nouns ending in -a (*alga – algae, formula – formulae*), -um (*stratum – strata, medium – media*), -us (*stimulus – stimuli, corpus – corpora*), -ex/ix (*index – indices*), -is (*analysis – analyses, oasis – oases*), -on (*criterion – criteria, phenomenon – phenomena*), etc. (Quirk et al., 1985). In addition, zero inflection can be a marker of plurality, too. This feature can be most easily observed in the names of animals in English:

*salmon – salmon, sheep – sheep, fish – fish*. And lastly, there are some nouns plural forms of which are formed by means of inner flexion or what professor Quirk calls ‘mutation’ (Quirk et al., 1985), e.g. *woman – women, goose – geese, mouse – mice, foot – feet, etc.*

**2.1.2.2. Realization of the category of number in Ukrainian.** Since the category of number is universal for all human languages, the Ukrainian nouns can be grouped into the variable and invariable one comprising Singularia and Pluralia Tantum (Бобкова, 2008).

Nouns used **only in singular** in Ukrainian include material (*цукор, деревина*), collective (*волосся, рідня*), abstract (*добро, справедливість*), and proper nouns (*Ольга, Дніпро*). Of course, abstract and material nouns may be used in plural forms whenever it is necessary to underline something semantically (Караман, 2011).

As for **Pluralia Tantum**, the following Ukrainian nouns belong to this class: summation nouns (*ворота, солодоці, оплески*), some materials and remnants (*консерви, ліки*), names of actions or processes (*вибори, піжмурки*), nouns denoting time notions (*сутінки, роковини*), games (*піжмурки, схованки*), some geographical proper names (*Карпати, Піски*) and this list can be further expanded (Тернова, 2009).

Formal markers of plurality of **variable nouns** are primarily predetermined by their declension group and, in cases of the first and the second ones, their further subdivision. Nouns are allotted into these groups in accordance with the final sound as well as their gender. In general, there are four declension groups, yet not all nouns belong there. For instance, summation nouns, substantivized adjectives, indeclinable borrowings, and female surnames ending in -o – all these classes of words are not part of the four groups (Zhluktenko, 1960). Regarding the realization of the category of number of indeclinable borrowings, we can notice that zero inflection marks the plurality.

e.g. *Але він схопив перше-ліше таксі і сказав «sea port please»* (Андрухович, 2011, пар. 943). – *Магістраллю проїздили поодинокі вечірні таксі та рейсові гелікомобілі* (Тесленко, 1982, с. 3).

**2.1.2.3. Contrastive analysis of presenting number in English and Ukrainian.** As can be observed from the information provided above, the category of number in the English and Ukrainian languages has a range of isomorphic features. First of all, plurality of both English and Ukrainian nouns can be expressed by means of zero and marked inflections.

e.g. *...there stared at him the glass eyes of a monster moose.* – *There are moose and caribou in there...* (Curwood, 1923, ch. 24, 13).

*Козаки позбивали мазепинки на потилицю, дивуючись на розбурхане місто* (Шкляр, 2014, с. 124). – *І постійно подорожувати до міст, які мені сняться* (Андрухович, 1994, с. 4).

e.g. *house – houses, couch – couches; стіл – столи, кінь – коні.*

Other phenomena common for the contrasted languages are Singularia and Pluralia Tantum, e.g. *foliage – листя, the Carpathians – Карпати, scissors – ножниці.*

Despite such a prevalence of isomorphic features, there are some allomorphic ones as well. Besides the before mentioned declension groups, there is the form of dual number in Ukrainian. This form is realized in noun phrases with the adjuncts expressed by the cardinal numerals *два, три, чотири*. Typically, it is marked by stress shift, although not necessarily, which makes this feature typologically recessive (Корунець, 2003).

e.g. *Дві жінки, дві квітки з глибинних провінцій Великогорова* (Андрухович, 2000, с. 1). – *Цвіли в осоці якісь дрібненькі фіолетово-сині квітки...* (Мушкетик, 1985, с. 38)

Furthermore, it is quite possible for a lot of the English and Ukrainian nouns not to coincide in number. For instance, *contents – зміст, money – гроші.*

**2.1.3. Category of case. 2.1.3.1. Noun cases in English.** The problem of the category of case of English nouns has been widely discussed by many scholars.

For instance, professor Vorontsova (Воронцова, 1960) suggested the postpositional theory, according to which there are no cases since the use of the formant -s is optional and may be substituted by the of-phrase. Some scholars distinguish three cases in accordance with the cases of objective pronouns: the nominative, genitive and objective cases. Charles Fillmore suggested his own classification comprising six cases (див. Волкова, 2009). In this paper, however, we will accept the existence of two cases of English nouns: the **common case** and the **genitive case**.

It is worth mentioning, that sometimes the term ‘possessive case’ is employed, yet the term ‘genitive case’ is more appropriate for the binary opposition of cases as it embraces a number of meanings including:

- possessive: *my cousin’s job, his brother’s stubbornness;*
- subjective: *the man’s disappearance;*
- objective: *her co-worker’s relocation, the prisoner’s conviction;*
- origin: *the seamstress’s suit;*
- description: *men’s clothes;*
- measure: *a two weeks’ journey, a ten minutes’ drive;*
- attribute: *the soldiers’ devotion;*
- partition: *his sister’s eyes* (Quirk et al., 1985).

In writing, the genitive case of nouns in singular is marked by -‘s, e.g. *boy – boy’s, mother – mother’s, teacher – teacher’s*. Regarding regular nouns in plural, the genitive case is formally unmarked with only an apostrophe added after the noun in writing. That is why this type of genitive has got a name of **zero genitive**: *farmers – farmers’, parents – parents’*.

On the contrary, plural forms of irregular nouns when in the genitive case do acquire the ending -‘s (Quirk et al., 1985), e.g. *child – children’s, women – women’s, people – people’s, alumnae – alumnae’s*, etc.

**2.1.3.2. Noun cases in Ukrainian.** Nouns in the Ukrainian language possess **seven cases**: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, locative and

vocative. Each case also has a marked singular and plural opposition. (Pugh & Press, 2005) Just as in the category of number, the realization of the category of case in Ukrainian is predetermined the **declension group** of the noun. The first group includes nouns ending in **-а, -я** of feminine and masculine gender; the second one – masculine and neuter nouns ending in **-о, -е, -я, ∅**; the third one – feminine nouns ending in **∅** and the noun *мати*; and the fourth one – neuter nouns ending in **-а, -я** which acquire suffixes **-ам, -ям, -ен** when declined. In addition, nouns of the first and second declension groups have further subdivision into smaller groups depending on the palatalization of the final consonant (Pugh & Press, 2005). To demonstrate the difference in the inflections, let us decline one noun from each declension group.

Table 2.1

## Noun cases in Ukrainian

Case	Singular	Plural
I declension group		
Nom.	ШКОЛ- <b><u>а</u></b>	ШКОЛ- <b><u>и</u></b>
Gen.	ШКОЛ- <b><u>и</u></b>	ШКІЛ-∅
Dat.	ШКОЛ- <b><u>і</u></b>	ШКОЛ- <b><u>ам</u></b>
Acc.	ШКОЛ- <b><u>у</u></b>	ШКОЛ- <b><u>и</u></b>
Instr.	ШКОЛ- <b><u>ою</u></b>	ШКОЛ- <b><u>ами</u></b>
Loc.	ШКОЛ- <b><u>і</u></b>	ШКОЛ- <b><u>ах</u></b>
Voc.	ШКОЛ- <b><u>о</u></b>	ШКОЛ- <b><u>и</u></b>
II declension group		
Nom.	БАТЬК- <b><u>о</u></b>	БАТЬК- <b><u>и</u></b>
Gen.	БАТЬК- <b><u>а</u></b>	БАТЬК- <b><u>ів</u></b>
Dat.	БАТЬК- <b><u>ові/у</u></b>	БАТЬК- <b><u>ам</u></b>
Acc.	БАТЬК- <b><u>а</u></b>	БАТЬК- <b><u>ів</u></b>
Instr.	БАТЬК- <b><u>ом</u></b>	БАТЬК- <b><u>ами</u></b>
Loc.	БАТЬК- <b><u>ові/у</u></b>	БАТЬК- <b><u>ах</u></b>

Voc.	батьк- <u>у</u>	батьк- <u>и</u>
III declension group		
Nom.	піч- $\emptyset$	печ- <u>і</u>
Gen.	печ- <u>і</u>	печ- <u>ей</u>
Dat.	печ- <u>і</u>	печ- <u>ам</u>
Acc.	піч- $\emptyset$	печ- <u>і</u>
Instr.	пічч- <u>ю</u>	печ- <u>ами</u>
Loc.	печ- <u>і</u>	печ- <u>ах</u>
Voc.	печ- <u>е</u>	печ- <u>і</u>
IV declension group		
Nom.	ім-' <u>я</u>	імен- <u>а</u>
Gen.	імен- <u>і</u>	імен- $\emptyset$
Dat.	імен- <u>і</u>	імен- <u>ам</u>
Acc.	ім-' <u>я</u>	імен- <u>а</u>
Instr.	імен- <u>ем</u>	імен- <u>ами</u>
Loc.	імен- <u>і</u>	імен- <u>ах</u>
Voc.	ім-' <u>я</u>	імен- <u>а</u>

**2.1.3.3. Contrastive analysis of the morphological markedness of cases in English and Ukrainian.** The category of case in the English and Ukrainian is highly allomorphic in its realization due to the following aspects.

In English, the category of case is represented by 2 cases: common and genitive with the latter marked by the formant -s or just an apostrophe in writing after regular plurals.

By contrast, there are seven cases in Ukrainian with each case having an opposition of singular and plural in its turn. Morphologically, the category of case of Ukrainian nouns possesses a much wider range of markers than that of the English ones. While analysing Table 2.1 one can notice that the category of case is expressed through inflections (in some cases more than one option is possible) and

vowel interchange as in, for example, the first and third declension groups. Moreover, nouns of the fourth declension group also require additional suffixes - *ам*, -*ям*, or -*ен* in all cases in plural and in genitive, dative, instrumental and locative cases in singular.

#### 2.1.4. Category of gender. 2.1.4.1. Gender of the English nouns.

Proceeding to the **category of gender**, we must remember that the category of gender is relevant in a language if it is grammatically expressed. The category of gender in English is morphologically unmarked. Actually, there is no grammatical gender per se, but we can distinguish the noun's natural gender. It depends on whether the noun is animate or inanimate, and if it is animate, then whether it is personal or nonpersonal. In fact, one may identify gender by considering pronouns that can substitute the noun. The following tendency of substitution can be observed (Crystal, 1995):

- inanimate: *it/which*, e.g. *It was the best day of my life* (Pulavarthy, 2022, p. 60).
- animate:
  - personal: *he/she/who* as well as *they* as a nonbinary pronoun (Merriam-Webster, n.d.b, Definition 3d), e.g. *After a time he is replaced by another guard. Then she turns and scampers up the stairs. He keeps wondering who wrote it. Who saw him in that alleyway with the door and why they wrote it down* (Morgenstern, 2019, ch. 1).
  - Nonpersonal: *it/which*, e.g. *My heart leaped, thinking it was a tiger* (Thapar, 1999, p. 23). Or if it is a precious, beloved creature, one can use *he/she/who*, e.g. *This is my dog. She is a husky.*
- collective: *it/which* or *they/who* with regard to the perspective.

**2.1.4.2. Gender of the Ukrainian nouns.** In Ukrainian, three genders are distinguished: masculine, feminine and neuter. The noun's gender can be identified by means of different approaches.

Firstly, the noun's gender can be identified through the inflections of its adjuncts expressed by adjectives, pronouns and ordinal numbers (Караман, 2011).

e.g. ...*тільки велика жовта пляма, притлумлена туманцем...* (Шкляр, 1999, с. 41) – «пляма» is feminine;

*Це відповідь на моє донесення про тутешні події* (Трублаїні, 1945, с. 26). – «донесення» is neuter;

*...і грандіозну залізобетонну споруду Держпрому – цей перший український хмарочос* (Гончар, 2017, с. 28). – «хмарочос» is masculine.

Secondly, some suffixes in animate nouns can indicate the noun's gender, e.g. *іспанець - іспанка; спортсмен - спортсменка.*

Finally, the category of gender in Ukrainian is most commonly realized morphologically through the inflections in the nominative case and a system of inflections of other cases. Masculine nouns are those ending in a consonant (*кінь, хвіст, тин, дім*) with some exceptions belonging to the feminine gender; nouns ending in **-а/я** that are semantically masculine (*Микола, суддя*); some nouns ending in **-о** (*батько, Дмитро*). Feminine nouns include most nouns ending in **-а/я** (*сім'я, Неля, стіна*) and some nouns ending in a consonant (*ніч, подорож, любов*) and the noun *мати*. Neuter nouns are almost all nouns ending in **-о, -є** (*кермо, золото, горе*) and some nouns ending in **-а/я** (*життя, весілля, багаття*) (Караман, 2011). Naturally, relying on these principles only would be insufficient, hence, different approaches must be combined to identify the gender of Ukrainian nouns.

**2.1.4.3. Contrastive analysis of the morphological markedness of gender in English and Ukrainian.** The category of gender in English is not morphologically marked. It can be indicated only through pronoun coreference. The category of gender in Ukrainian, on the contrary, can be easily pinpointed in the noun's inflections and suffixes and the form of its adjuncts.

Thus, we may conclude that gender in English is grammatically irrelevant, while in Ukrainian, it plays a major role for noun as a part of speech in a synthetic

language. Therefore, the category of gender is, without a doubt, an allomorphic one for the languages contrasted in this study.

**2.1.5. Category of definiteness/indefiniteness. 2.1.5.1. Realization of the category of definiteness/indefiniteness of nouns in English.** With regard to the **category of definiteness/indefiniteness**, it is important to mention that this is a semantic category that helps the listener identify the corresponding meaning of some words which would otherwise not be understood outside the context.

In English, the category of definiteness/indefiniteness is realized by means of a range of various **determiners**, which are, as a rule, closely attached to a head noun in a noun phrase (Larson, 2010). Quirk et al. (1982) distinguish five types of determiners. First are the determiners used with countable singular and plural as well as uncountable nouns. These include:

- definite article **the**: ...the house jumped up in a gorging fire... (Bradbury, 1953, p. 1);
- possessive pronouns: my laptop, their children, his courage;
- relative determiners: ...the Master whose doctrine he professed to follow (Corelli, 1900, p. 8);
- wh-determiners ending in *-ever*: Take whichever thing appeals to you the most.;
- interrogative determiners: What information? Which book? Whose pens are these?
- Negative determiner *no*: I've got no siblings.

Among these the definite article, possessive pronouns, relative and interrogative determiners indicate definiteness, while the wh-determiners in *-ever* and the negative determiner are used to show indefiniteness.

The second type includes determiners used with plural countable and uncountable nouns: zero article (*There is milk in the fridge.*), indefinite pronoun **some** and **any** (*some facts, any information*) and quantitative determiner **enough** (*enough patience*) all of which are markers of indefiniteness (Quirk et al., 1985).

Although, zero article may serve to indicate definiteness in the case of proper nouns, e.g.  $\emptyset$  *Manchester* (a city) – *the Manchester* (a pub).

The third and fourth types are represented by the demonstrative determiners *this/that* for singular countable and uncountable nouns (*this cherry, that pain*) and *these/those* for the plural ones (*these scissors, those hens*).

Next we have the fifth type that includes determiners for countable nouns in singular: the indefinite article (*a shop, an arm*), the universal determiners *every* and *each* (*every student, each participant*), and the determiners *either/neither* (*Either table is alright. Neither institution recognized their mistake*) (Quirk et al., 1985). Apart from the indefinite article, all the determiners from this group mark the noun's definiteness.

And finally, the sixth type of determiners is used for uncountable nouns. This type is represented by the determiner *much*. For example, *We haven't got much time left*.

Another way to show definiteness is by syntactic means, particularly, through the **adjuncts** of a noun phrase. For example, *I tell you she stood up there and received with as much dignity as Queen Victoria herself* (Sampson, 2009, ch. 16). Here, the noun 'Queen' can be categorized as definite due to the appositive noun 'Victoria' in postposition.

**2.1.5.2. Realization of the category of definiteness/indefiniteness of nouns in Ukrainian.** The category of definiteness/indefiniteness in the Ukrainian language can be expressed by morphological and syntactic means.

Morphologically, nouns can be made definite using demonstrative and possessive pronouns, e.g. *Але що ж у цій корзинці?* (Трублаїні, 1945, с. 15) *Його орда сприйняла цю лють як наказ...* (Шкляр, 2009, с. 3). Correspondingly, the category of indefiniteness can be realized by means of indefinite pronouns, e.g. *...здоровий, як тур, а бурмоче про якусь глину* (Загребельний, 1968, с. 65).

Syntactically, the Ukrainian nouns can be made definite by means of different adjuncts, e.g. *Чи врятує нас золото гетьмана Полуботка?* (Андрухович, 1997, с. 9), where the adjunct is expressed by an appositive noun,

making the noun ‘*зетманна*’ definite. In addition, it is possible to express indefiniteness through placing the indefinite noun in the sentence-final position, e.g. *Хлопчик* *підійшов до мене. (definite)* – *До мене підійшов хлопчик (indefinite)*.

**2.1.5.3. Contrastive analysis of the morphological markedness of definiteness/indefiniteness in English and Ukrainian.** The category of definiteness/indefiniteness in the contrasted languages is characterized by some shared features. For example, on the morphological level, pronouns can be used to show markedness. Furthermore, in both English and Ukrainian adjunct can serve as markers of definiteness on the syntactic level.

On the other hand, there are some allomorphic characteristics, too. For instance, in Ukrainian, we can use grammatical shifts in order to underline the noun’s indefiniteness. The English language, on the contrary, does not allow such shifts being an analytical language with fixed SVO word order. Nonetheless, the article is the key part of speech responsible for definiteness/indefiniteness.

## **2.2. Morphological features of nominal parts of speech denoting substantiality in the languages under contrast**

**2.2.1. Verbal nouns description.** As we have mentioned before, two kinds of verbal nouns can be distinguished in the English language: gerundial nouns (or nominal gerunds) and deverbal nouns. Let us consider their formation in terms of morphology.

In case of **gerundial nouns**, their formation can be clearly observed due to the presence of morphological marker of gerund – the *-ing* suffix (Alexiadou, 2001).

e. g. *Have you ever recommended the closing of an orphanage in your seventeen years, Mr. Baker?* (Klune, 2020, p. 41)

*Some nights she stays until the moments before the changing of the guards* (Morgenstern, 2019, p. 6).

Although mainly productive in formation of gerunds, the suffix *-ing* can form some deverbal nouns as well.

e.g. *And now, when it's the opening of our movie?* (Reid, 2017, p. 67)

*But it was the beginning of my millions* (Reid, 2017, p. 148).

When it comes to formation of **deverbal nouns**, Bauer (1983) states that deriving nouns from verbs is quite common. He also distinguishes a set of suffixes characteristic of deverbal nouns. These include:

- productive **-ation** (*to modernize – modernization, to accuse – accusation, to cauterize – cauterization*);
- productive **-ee** (*to abandon – abandonee, to indict – indictee, to train – trainee*) which is becoming more and more productive in modern English with some prominent examples being *quarantinee* and *bullyee*;
- unproductive **-ure** (*to compose – composure, to expose – exposure*);
- **-al** (*to accrue – accrual, to betray – betrayal, to rebut – rebuttal, to transfer – transferral*);
- **-ary** (*to distribute – distributary, to dispense – dispensary*);
- **-er** (*to mine – miner, to teach – teacher, to clean – cleaner, to wash – washer, to cut – cutter, to sprinkle – sprinkler*);
- **-ment** (*to align – alignment, to commit – commitment, to embarrass – embarrassment, to state – statement*), etc.

As we can see from these examples, English deverbal nouns can have the meaning of a substantivized action, state, or process as well as of an object or person. The same is true of Ukrainian deverbal nouns (Вакарюк & Панцьо, 2007). In general, there are three **degrees of transition** into another part of speech: syntactic, which is essentially conversion, morphological and semantic, which occurs after the morphological one due to associative shifts (Вихованець & Городенська, 2004). As the first and last degrees are not marked morphologically, we shall focus now on how deverbal nouns are formed in the Ukrainian language by means of derivation.

While prefixation is not very productive in forming Ukrainian nouns, the same cannot be said about **suffixation**. Pliushch (Плющ, 2005) provides great insight into different kinds of noun-forming suffixes that can be added to verbal roots.

First, we have got agent-making suffixes denoting the actor or the performer of some process that determines their behaviour. These can be exemplified by the following:

- productive suffixes: **-ник**, **-івник**, **-льник** (*мріяти – мрійник*, *працювати – працівник*, *постачати – постачальник*), **-ач**, **-яч** (*слухати – слухач*, *оглядати – оглядач*, *діяти – діяч*), **-ець**, **-нець** (*мовити – мовець*, *стріляти – стрілець*, *бігти – біженець*), **-ар**, **-яр** (*володіти – володар*, *пекти – пекар*, *гендлювати – гендляр*);
- unproductive suffixes: **-тель** (*примиряти – примиритель*, *жити – житель*), **-ій** (*носити – носій*, *водити – водій*), **-ак**, **-як** (*сіяти – сівак*, *воювати – вояк*), **-ун** (*брехати – брехун*, *опікуватися – опікун*), **-к(о)**, **-к(а)** (*хвалитися – хвалько*, *зівати – зівака*), **-ок** (*знати – знаток*), **-чик**, **-щик** (*розпоряджатися – розпорядчик*, *пиляти – пильщик*);
- borrowed suffixes: **-атор** (*оперувати – оператор*), **-ер** (*зачіплятися – зачепер*), **-ор** (*редагувати – редактор*), **-ан** (*критикувати – критикан*), **-ат** (*дегенерувати – дегенерат*), **-ант** (*дебютувати – дебютант*), etc.

Then, Ukrainian concrete and abstract nouns can be derived by means of suffixation, too. Some concrete noun-makers include **-ак** (*дзюбак*), **-ач** (*скіач*), **-к** (*жатка*), **-ець** (*різець*), **-л(о)** (*вішало*), **-иц(я)** (*теслиця*), **-ушк(а)** (*тертушка*), **-ун** (*дерун*), etc. And among abstract deverbal noun-making suffixes, we can subdivide two groups:

- the productive ones: **-анн(я)** (*зневажати – зневажання*), **-енн(я)** (*зіткнутися – зіткнення*), **-інн(я)** (*гасити – гасіння*), **-ув-анн(я)** (*планувати – планування*);

- the unproductive ones: **-к(а)** (*вибірка, снішка*), **-ь(а)** (*відчуття, забуття*), **-от(а)** (*турбота, другота*), **-ощ(і)** (*нахощі*), **-ин(а)** (*розмовини*), **-н(я)** (*біготиня*), **-б(а)** (*стрільба, клятьба*).

Finally, deverbal nouns in the Ukrainian language can be formed by means of **zero suffixation**. Quite often the verb that serves as a stem for this kind of derivation already includes the prefix. In addition, this type of derivation may or may not cause vowel change in the root of the word, e.g. *духати – подух*, *бігти – забіг*, *викладати – виклад*, but *підходити – підхід*, *боліти – біль*, and so on.

From this description of verbal nouns in contrasted languages, we can distinguish that the existence of deverbal nouns and a system of suffixes for their derivation is an isomorphic feature for both English and Ukrainian. Nonetheless, the Ukrainian language tends to dispose of a wider system of tools for derivation of verbal nouns, including zero suffixation. This allomorphic feature appears due to the synthetic nature of Ukrainian, while the analytical nature of English allows it to have further subdivision of verbal nouns into gerundial ones.

**2.2.2. Pronouns realization as substitutors of language units denoting substantiality.** Being one of the oldest parts of speech, pronouns play a huge role in substituting language units denoting substantiality. In fact, different kinds of pronouns perform this function in a certain way with their specific morphological characteristics. Before we start our morphological analysis, we need to establish what types of pronouns will be relevant to this study, i.e. which pronouns serve as substitutors of nominal parts of speech with the meaning of substantiality. In this regard, Otto Jespersen (2006) turns to **rank assignment**, where primary, secondary and tertiary ranks can be assigned to various parts of speech to discriminate between them. For instance, in a phrase *extremely difficult task*, the ranks are assigned in a descending order with the word *task* taking the primary one. From this example, we can conclude that any pronoun that can fit the primary rank should be subject to our investigation. Hence, the thematic groups of **substantive** and **adjectival pronouns** (Горпинич, 2004) shall be the focus of this study.

In general, pronouns can have four grammatical categories depending on their type: the category of person, number, gender, and case. Let us begin with **the category of person**. This category is characteristic of personal and possessive pronouns, including the absolute ones representing substantiality. Here is how they are subdivided:

- 1<sup>st</sup> person – referring to the speaker or the group to which the speaker belongs: *I, we, mine, ours* and *я, ми, мій, мої, наш, наші*;
- 2<sup>nd</sup> person – referring to the addressee(s): *you, yours* and *ти, ви, твій, твої, ваш, ваші*;
- 3<sup>rd</sup> person – referring to something or someone besides the speaker and the addressee: *he, she, it, they, his, hers, its, theirs* and *він, вона, воно, вони, його, її, їхній*.

We may also speak of the **generic person** representing all people collectively, e.g. personal pronouns *we, you* and *ми* and the indefinite pronoun *one* (Jespersen, 2006). In addition, cases of the author's *we/ми* and the compassionate-diminutive *we/ми* can be found in the contrasted languages (Горпинич, 2004).

Proceeding to the next category, morphological realization of **number** is typical of personal and demonstrative pronouns in both English and Ukrainian. With regard to personal pronouns, the following oppositions can be observed: *я – ми, ти – ви, він / вона / воно – вони* and *I – we, he / she / it – they*. Evidently, the personal pronoun *you* lacks this morphological opposition of singular and plural, thus, its number can be distinguished only in context. As for demonstrative pronouns, the oppositions are as follows: *this – these, that – those* and *цей – ці, той – ті, такий – такі*. Naturally, the category of number is not relevant for English demonstrative pronoun *such*, equivalent of *такий*. While demonstrative and personal pronouns have this category represented in both of the languages under contrast, the same does not apply to possessive pronouns. Ukrainian possessive pronouns agree with their antecedents, e.g. *Я загубила свою ручку. Мені потрібна твоя*. Consequently, if the antecedent is plural, the pronoun substituting it is plural as well: *Вона зустріла своїх родичів. А ти вже бачив*

*мвоіх*? Absolute possessive pronouns in English, on the other hand, do not require such agreement and their number can only be indicated syntactically, not morphologically.

Concerning the category of **gender** per se, it is realized morphologically only in Ukrainian. Among Ukrainian personal pronouns, *він* is masculine, *вона* is feminine, and *воно* is neuter. Realization of this category in possessive and demonstrative pronouns once again comes down to Ukrainian being a synthetic language and demanding the pronoun-antecedent agreement. Therefore, most singular possessive and demonstrative pronouns in Ukrainian have gender: masculine *мій, твій, цей, той*; feminine *моя, твоя, ця, та*; and neuter *моє, твоє, це, те*. In English, however, the existence of the category of gender is under question, as we have previously mentioned. According to **gender reference**, Jespersen (2005) distinguishes such groups as “words used of animate beings without regard to sex” (*anybody, who*), “words used of male beings” (*he*), “words used of female beings” (*she*), “words used of inanimate “things”” (*it, anything, what*), and “words used of animates as well as of inanimates” (*any, both, they*) (p. 159).

Last but not least, the **category of case** deserves mentioning. In English, personal pronouns have two cases: nominative and objective. Their paradigm is presented in the table below. The interrogative/relative pronoun *who*, in fact, has three cases – the nominative *who*, the objective *whom* and the genitive *whose*.

**Table 2.2**

**Personal pronouns cases**

Nominative	I	you	he	she	it	we	they
Objective	me	you	him	her	it	us	them

In Ukrainian, not only personal, but interrogative, relative, indefinite, possessive and demonstrative pronouns all have their paradigms as does the Noun. In other words, all types of pronouns mentioned above have their respective forms in nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental and locative cases.

All in all, despite pronouns having the same number of categories in the contrasted languages, their realization is quite distinct. While personal pronouns in English and Ukrainian share the same categories, the same is not true of other types of pronouns, making morphological realization of this part of speech predominantly allomorphic.

**2.2.3. Numerals use in the function of representors of objects of the objective reality.** In the English and Ukrainian languages, numerals can serve not only as determiners, but also as substitutors of the quantified objects. This can be done by means of **cardinal** and **ordinal** numerals.

According to Dalmolin (2010), English numerals “are normally classified as invariable units” (p. 230), e.g. *Fourteen guests were invited, but only ten could make it*. Nonetheless, when functioning as pronouns, cardinal numerals can also acquire the marker of plurality *-s*. For instance, in the sentence ‘*Why are there so many twos in the deck?*’, numeral *twos* refers to a range of playing cards labelled by this cardinal number. If we want to use an ordinal numeral in the pronominal function to replace something in the objective reality, a definite article *the* must be attached before it (Greenbaum & Nelson, 2013).

e.g. *The first is passed an integer value whereas the second is not* (Keogh & Gray, 2002, p. 206).

When it comes to the use of Ukrainian numerals as representors of objects, their realization is more complex. Arpolenko et al. (Арполенко та ін., 1980) suggest that one of the primary reasons for this is the complicated nature of historical evolution of cardinal numerals as a separate part of speech. Proceeding from different parts of speech, some cardinal numerals preserve certain grammatical categories while others do not. With regard to the category of **gender**, only these cardinal numbers preserve it: *нуль* is masculine, *один, одна, одно/одне* are masculine, feminine and neuter respectively, *тисяча* is feminine, and *мільйон, мільярд, трильйон* are masculine. Arpolenko et. al (Арполенко та ін., 1980) also points out that gender distinctions in such numerals as *два – дві, обидва – обидві*,

*нівтора – нівтори* are now considered as a remnant phenomenon since they are only preserved in nominative and accusative cases.

As for the category of **number**, cardinal numeral *один* can have a plural form when referring to an object that corresponds to a Pluralia Tantum noun.

e.g. *Одні з численних дверей на третьому поверсі, куди вони зійшли широкими мармуровими сходами, були прочинені* (Савченко, 1997, с. 4).

Other numerals can demonstrate plural and singular forms when declined. For instance, numerals *два, три, чотири* have plural forms when declined. Numerals of substantive origin, on the other hand, exhibit both plural and singular forms. These include cardinals from five to twenty and all tens starting from thirty and ending with eighty. In terms of collective numerals, they preserve their singular form.

e.g. *...четверо мовчки презирнулися між собою, вдоволені, що тіснява й колотнеча їх зовсім не зачіпають...* (Загребельний, 1968, с. 2).

Regarding the category of **case**, Arpolenko et al. (Арполенко та ін., 1980) observe that there are six main types of declension of cardinal numerals in modern Ukrainian. Therefore, cardinal numerals can be grouped in accordance with their declension type:

- 1) *один, одна, одно/одне;*
- 2) *два, три, чотири;*
- 3) *п'ять – двадцять, тридцять, and tens from п'ятдесят to вісімдесят;*
- 4) *сорок, дев'яносто, сто;*
- 5) *двісті – дев'ятсот;*
- б) *нуль, тисяча, мільйон, мільярд.*

Lastly, Ukrainian ordinal numbers correspond to Ukrainian adjectives and have the categories of gender, number and case. In case of complex ordinal numbers, only the last word is declined.

e.g. *...прослуховувати, наприклад, кожного десятого за виборчими списками?* (Забужко, 2009, с. 270)

З чим прийшли у двадцяте століття, з тим входимо і в двадцять перше (Костенко, 2011, с. 27).

Finishing this point, we can conclude, that the use of numerals on morphological level in the contrasted languages presents a lot of allomorphic features. While English numerals tend to remain unchanged with the exception of cardinal numerals that can have a plural form, Ukrainian ones can have declension paradigms with ordinal numbers having full paradigms with number and gender distinctions and cardinal numbers having these two latter categories limited in realization to certain numerals.

**2.2.4. Substantivized adjectives in representing reality.** In English, substantivization of adjectives is accompanied by their acquisition of noun features, viz. the categories of case, number and gender, if we take into consideration pronoun reference. So, some substantivized adjectives may take the indefinite article and have plural marker *-s* being fully countable, some belong to the *Singularia* and *Pluralia Tantum* classes. Let us consider them from the point of view of their meaning. Otto Jespersen (2013) subdivides them into two major classes: those denoting persons and neuters. **Substantivized adjectives denoting persons** are countable and include the following groups:

- human beings, e.g. *a mortal – mortals*;
- races and nationalities, e.g. *a black – the blacks, a native – natives, an American – Americans, a Chinese – the Chinese* (nationalities ending in *-ese* take no plural inflection);
- social ranks or positions, e.g. *an equal – equals, a superior – superiors*;
- genders, e.g. *a female – females*;
- age, e.g. *an innocent – innocents* in the meaning of a baby;
- creed, e.g. *a Christian – Christians, a Muslim – Muslims*;
- parties, e.g. *a liberal – liberals, a republican – republicans*;
- person's characteristics, e.g. *a criminal – criminals, a mute – mutes*;

- personal relations, e.g. *a relative – relatives, dear – dears*;
- comparatives, e.g. *an elder – the elders*;

Besides the countable groups of people, there are certain groups belonging to the Pluralia Tantum class. These are people sharing some characteristic, for instance, *the rich, the poor, the young, the wounded*, etc. However, not all substantives derived from participles are always plural. Jespersen (2013) points it out by referring the use of genitive in legal discourse.

e.g. “Some suggestions have been thrown out at the bar intimating a doubt whether the statutes of Rhode Island giving to its courts authority to sell lands for payment of debts extended to cases where the deceased was not, at the time of his death, an inhabitant of the state (Wilkinson v. Leland, 1829, p. 660).

The groups of the second subdivision of **neuters** can be noted in the table below, with respective assignment of their number classes.

**Table 2.3**

**Number classes of neuters**

<b>Singularia Tantum</b>	<b>Pluralia Tantum</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– abstract notions, e.g. <i>the unknown</i>, with some exceptions like <i>absolutes, universals</i>, etc.;</li> <li>– languages, e.g. <i>Italian, Ukrainian, Korean</i>;</li> <li>– colours, e.g. “<i>Green is not a creative colour</i>” (Don’t Hug Me .I’m Scared, 2011). But when talking about shades, we may use colours as countables like <i>a baby pink – pinks</i>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– subjects, studies, exams, e.g. <i>physics, finals</i>;</li> <li>– substances, foods, e.g. <i>chemicals, greens, sweets</i>;</li> <li>– body parts, e.g. <i>genitals, vitals</i>;</li> <li>– clothes, e.g. <i>tights</i>;</li> <li>– field-specific terms, e.g. <i>italics, sharps and flats</i>.</li> </ul>

With regard to substantivization of adjectives in Ukrainian, the morphological means employed for this purpose are quite abundant. In fact, **suffixation** tends to be very prolific in this area. Hryshchenko et al. (Грищенко та

ін., 2002) provide an extensive list of different groups of substantivized adjectives according to their meaning and corresponding suffixes typically used.

When forming substantives denoting people from adjectival stems, productivity is characteristic of such suffixes as **-ик** (*молодик*, *дурник*) and **-ак, -як, -чак** (*простак*, *мертвак*, *весельчак*). In modern Ukrainian, such suffixes as **-ач, -ань, -ун, -ш(а)** are no longer productive, but they do appear in substantivized adjectives, e.g. *багач*, *погань*, *дикун*, *лівша*, and so on.

Abstract nouns can also be formed from adjectives by means of suffixation. Suffixes functioning for this purpose fall into two categories:

- productive: **-ість** (*свідомість*, *нерухомість*), **-ств(о)**, **-цтв(о)**, **-зтв(о)** (*достойнство*, *бідацитво*, *убозтво*), **-от(а)** (*гіркота*, *кислота*), **-ин(а)** (*величина*, *далечина*), **-изн(а)** (*жовтизна*, *прямизна*), **-изм/-ізм** (*еготизм*, *егоїзм*, *формалізм*);
- unproductive: **-інь** (*далечінь*), **-об(а)** (*злоба*, *жалоба*), **-яв(а)** (*порожнява*).

As for the syntactic substantivization of adjectives in Ukrainian, it is not marked morphologically, e.g. *бідні*, *багаті*, *приїжджі*, *вчений*, *черговий*, *поранений*, *передова*, etc.

To summarize the points presented above, substantivization of adjectives in English and Ukrainian is a relatively allomorphic process. In the English language, substantivized adjectives are formed by means of conversion and acquire the same categories as nouns. In the Ukrainian language, the same process is realized through suffixation with both productive and unproductive suffixes playing their part in addition to syntactic substantivization.

## Conclusions to Chapter Two

In this chapter, we have considered the morphological features language units denoting substantiality in English and Ukrainian. Moreover, we have established which of their features are isomorphic and allomorphic in the contrasted languages.

Morphologically, English and Ukrainian nouns have isomorphic structure. They can be compound and composite as well as derived, with a similar derivational pattern. A number of suffixes in both languages can perform the same functions, for example, agent-forming suffixes. The key difference in the system of suffixes of the languages under study is the presence of augmentative suffixes in addition to the greater number of diminutive ones in Ukrainian.

The noun in the contrasted languages also possesses the same categories. These include the category of number, the category of case, the category of gender, and the category of definiteness/indefiniteness.

First, the category of number is discussed. It has been proved that this category is mainly isomorphic due to the wide use of zero and marked inflections in both languages as well as the existence of the *Singularia* and *Pluralia Tantum* classes. Regarding the most prominent differences, it is necessary to mention that the Ukrainian language has four declension groups which predetermine the formation of the plural form. Besides, vowel interchange in some plural forms when the noun is used with the cardinal numerals 2, 3 and 4 is evidential of the existence of the dual number.

Secondly, the category of case is undoubtedly an allomorphic category. The number of cases in English differs in different scholars' works, but, generally, we consider the binary opposition of two cases – common and genitive. Morphologically, it is marked by the 's formant and semantically the genitive case expresses more than possession. By contrast, in Ukrainian, the number of cases amounts to seven, each case having marked singular and plural oppositions. In the category of case, great importance is given to the declension groups as well, since

they determine the inflections and even vowel interchange and the appearance of some suffixes.

Thirdly, the category of gender is also allomorphic in the contrasted languages. The fundamental reason for this is the fact that the category of gender of the English nouns is morphologically unmarked. However, it is possible to distinguish natural genders through pronoun coreference, i.e. by establishing which pronoun is used for substituting the noun. In Ukrainian, on the other hand, gender is one of the categories most characteristic of the noun as a part of speech. Masculine, feminine and neuter are the genders which can be morphologically marked by means of inflections and suffixes as well as identified by looking at the forms of the noun's adjuncts.

Lastly, the category of definiteness/indefiniteness has its differences in the contrasted languages. The English language has various determiners and most importantly the article to indicate this category. Furthermore, the adjuncts help determine the noun's definiteness/indefiniteness on the syntactic level. The latter applies to the Ukrainian language as well. Besides demonstrative, possessive and indefinite pronouns, one may use grammatical shifts to indicate the noun's definiteness/indefiniteness, which is something impossible to do in an English sentence owing to the analytical nature of the language and the corresponding SVO word order.

Regarding other nominal parts of speech denoting substantiality, we have arrived at some conclusions as well. The analysis of verbal nouns in English and Ukrainian has allowed us to recognize that the class of deverbal nouns and the presence of a suffix system used to form them are isomorphic in both languages. Due to the difference in nature of the two languages, Ukrainian as a synthetic language has a bigger set of verbal noun derivation means, including zero suffixation, whereas English's analytical nature enables the subdivision of verbal nouns into gerundial nouns in addition to the deverbal ones.

After taking a look at the realization of pronouns, we have noticed that despite the contrasted languages sharing the same number of categories, their

realization is very different. In general, this part of speech is morphologically more allomorphic with the exception of isomorphic personal pronouns.

As for numerals as representors of objects, we have observed that there are numerous allomorphic features in the morphological realization of numerals in English and Ukrainian. Ukrainian numerals can have declension paradigms, with ordinal numbers having full paradigms with distinctions for number and gender and cardinal numbers having these two latter categories limited in realization to certain numerals. This contrasts with English numerals, which typically remain unchanged with the exception of cardinal numerals, which can have a plural form.

Finally, adjective substantivization is allomorphic in the contrasted languages. In English, conversion is key in this process. In Ukrainian, on the other hand, suffixation is mainly used for this purpose with some instances of syntactic substantivization.

**CHAPTER THREE**  
**SYNTACTIC ANALYSIS OF THE LANGUAGE UNITS**  
**REPRESENTING SUBSTANTIALITY IN MODERN ENGLISH AND**  
**UKRAINIAN**

**3.1. Syntactic properties of nouns in the contrasted languages**

**3.1.1. Syntagmatic valency of Nouns.** Before we proceed with the analysis of syntagmatic valency of Nouns, we need to have a basic understanding of the term ‘**valency**’. This notion was first introduced by Lucien Tesnière in valency theory within the scope of dependency grammar. Under this approach, valency is “the number of the potential actants of a verbal valency carrier” (Ágel & Fisher, 2015, p. 232). As we can notice, he treats valency as primarily a verbal feature. Nonetheless, valency theory is now extended to include other parts of speech as well, including nouns, which can be seen termed as ‘secondary valency’ (Галій, 2011).

An important distinction to consider regarding noun valency is the distinction between complements and peripheral elements or adjuncts of a phrase, which is also known as **c/a-delimitation** (Ágel & Fisher, 2015). This division is by no means an easy matter due to a range of factors, including the semantic one, as suggested by Herbst’s (1988) gradience scale, where dependence on the governing noun and the number of forms available for expression of a particular semantic role affect the complement character of a noun (p. 270).

When dealing with complements, we need to differentiate between obligatory and optional ones. As the name suggests, **obligatory** complements are necessary to make the sentence grammatical, whereas **optional** complements may be omitted without effect on the grammaticality of a sentence or phrase. For example, the sentence “*We experience a lack*” is meaningless and requires the *of*-phrase (Herbst, 1988, p. 285). Herbst (1988) also raises a significant point, that semantic and syntactic valency are rather intertwined, since the omission of an optional but semantically inherent complement makes it unacceptable.

e.g. *There will be a fall.*

This sentence may be understood properly provided there is context (Herbst, 2013, p.338). Without the context, however, the word *fall* requires some optional inherent complement.

e.g. *There will be a fall from 23 to 17 degrees.*

*There will be a fall of heavy snow.*

*There will be a fall in our sales next month.*

Or to exemplify this phenomenon in Ukrainian, let us take the noun *розмова* in the meaning of ‘conversation’. We could say «*наша розмова затягнулася*» and no postmodifying element would be necessary. But if we say «*його розмова*» in the meaning of ‘conversation’ we understand that it involves more than one party and an optional complement becomes inherent: «*його розмова з дівчиною*».

Overall, the higher valency the word has, the more meanings it produces when combined with meanings of other words (Кочерган, 1980, с. 23). In general, the use of nouns is classified into zerovalent, monovalent, divalent and trivalent (Herbst, 1988, p. 284-285). We shall consider how these valency types work in practice in English and Ukrainian nouns further on in this point of Chapter Three.

**3.1.2. Nouns in structuring the Noun phrases. 3.1.2.1. Nouns with premodifiers.** When not used in a zerovalent way, nouns become a head, i.e. the central element, of noun phrases or NPs. In such phrases, the head can be premodified and postmodified by different kinds of elements. Let us begin with **premodifiers**. These include identifiers, quantifiers, adjectives, participles and nouns (Junaid, 2018; Волкова, 2009).

Both in English and in Ukrainian, nouns can be premodified by such **identifiers** as demonstrative and possessive pronouns, e.g. *this issue, those letters, their needs, my idea – ця проблема, ті листи, їхні потреби, моя ідея*. As can be noticed from these examples, the demonstrative pronoun is in a relationship of **agreement** with the head noun. In other words, this is a subordinate kind of relation where the grammatical form of a modifier becomes identical to the grammatical form of the head (Вихованець, 1993, с. 201). Agreement is also

typical of Ukrainian NPs with possessive pronoun premodifiers and other adjectival pronouns like *сам, весь, інший, будь-який, ніякий*, etc., whereas the same phenomenon is not applicable to the same kind of pronouns in English. In addition to these modifiers, English also allows the use of articles as premodifiers, e.g. *a book, an apple, the room*.

When dealing with **quantifiers**, Junaid (2018) draws the subdivision into the definite and indefinite ones (p. 318). In English, the head noun can be premodified by cardinal and ordinal numerals, which are the definite quantifiers, e.g. *twelve months, one opportunity, first generation, third attempt*. The head noun in Ukrainian, on the other hand, can be premodified by ordinal numerals only, e.g. *перша дівчина, п'ятий місяць*. In these examples, the head noun and the numeral are in a relationship of agreement. In phrases with cardinal numbers followed by nouns, the cardinal number is the head element and governs the number and case of the noun, e.g. *дві корови* – the numeral requires the noun to be in the nominative plural; *п'ять доріз* – the numeral demands the genitive case plural. As for the indefinite quantifiers, these include such indefinite pronouns as *some, any, many, several* and the like. These pronouns in the function of quantifiers correspond to Ukrainian adverbs, and when combined with a noun, they form an adverbial phrase, not a noun one.

In terms of **adjective** use in the function of a NP premodifier, the languages under contrast are isomorphic, with the only allomorphic point being the presence of agreement in Ukrainian. For example, *beautiful picture – красива картина, polite waiters – ввічливі офіціанти*.

When it comes to participles as premodifiers in English, both present and past participle can precede the head noun (Волкова, 2009), e.g. *a functioning device, a proven point*. In Ukrainian, present participle corresponds to active verbal adjectives, and past participle – to passive ones. Generally, active verbal adjectives are considered to be outside of the norm (Отрохова, 2021) and tend to be substituted by a postmodifying relative clause, e.g. *зотуюча дівчина – дівчина,*

що готує. Passive verbal adjectives, on the contrary, are more common and acceptable, e.g. намальована картина, відчинене вікно, зламаний велосипед.

Last but not least, **nouns as premodifiers** in NPs are an essential feature of the English language. Due to its analytical nature, such phrases can be structured with ease to denote some objects or phenomena, e.g. *a birthday party*, *a car tyre*, *market sales*, *a chess tournament*, *state representatives* and so on. Moreover, nouns in the genitive case, can also serve as premodifiers in English NPs, e.g. *Peter's glasses*, *the group's result*, etc. In Ukrainian, however, the head noun cannot be premodified by another noun.

**3.1.2.2. Nouns with postmodifiers.** In terms of postmodification of nouns in the contrasted languages, there is a certain degree of allomorphy. While nouns can be premodified by other nouns in the English language, head nouns in Ukrainian can be postmodified by **nouns**, specifically if the head noun is of deverbal nature. Essentially, deverbal nouns in Ukrainian preserve the verb's case government over the object (Щербій, 2021, с. 56), e.g. *малюнок собаки*, *завершення виступу*, *вирішення проблеми*.

In Ukrainian NPs, the deverbal head noun can also be followed by the **infinitive**, e.g. *бажання допомогати*, *потреба підтвердити запит*, *прохання залишити приміщення*. In addition to infinitives, Ukrainian nouns can be followed by **passive verbal adjectives**, e.g. *сукня пошита на замовлення*, *посуд оздоблений квітами*. In English NPs, on the other hand, all nouns can be postmodified by all **non-finite verbs**. These include the infinitive, present and past participle (Junaid, 2018, p. 321), e.g. *the tasks to be finished by noon*, *the cashier scanning our products*, *the assistance provided by volunteers*.

As for the common features of noun postmodifiers in the languages under study, we may point out **adverbial** postmodifiers. For instance, we can build such NPs as *the apartment below* and *the morning after* in English and *листування потайки*, *м'ясо по-французьки* in Ukrainian.

Quite frequently, the head noun in both languages is postmodified by a **prepositional phrase**. To provide some examples from English and Ukrainian, we

may say *a conversation with a friend* – *розмова з другом*, *the book on the shelf* – *книжка на полиці*, *the car at the parking lot* – *машина на стоянці*, etc.

Finally, **relative clauses** as postmodifiers are worth mentioning. Also known as finite clauses (Junaid, 2018), they introduce additional information about the head noun, e.g. *the employee that was fired last week*, *the room which I booked for us*, *the boy who delivers flowers* and *сім'я, що нещодавно переїхала*, *кіт, якого ми купили*, *квиток, який я знайшла*.

To sum up, both English and Ukrainian nouns can have such postmodifiers as adverbs, prepositional phrases, relative clauses and infinitives. Postmodification by nouns, however, is only typical of Ukrainian nouns, and non-finite clauses with participles can serve as postmodifiers in English NPs, not in Ukrainian.

**3.1.2.3. Nouns in mixed modified phrases.** As one may have noticed from the previous examples, premodifiers and postmodifiers are not mutually exclusive. They may be used together with the head noun to form mixed modified phrases.

According to the noun valency models proposed by Thomas Herbst (1988), we deal with mixed modification with regard to divalent and trivalent uses of nouns (p. 284-285), e.g. *his wish to travel more*, *Jack's conversation with Emily about the report*, *моя спроба допомогти, написана доповідь для конференції*. Taking into account all of the options stated in last two points, let us provide a table of all the possible premodifiers and postmodifiers in the languages under contrast.

**Table 3.1**

**Premodifiers and postmodifiers in English**

<b>Premodifiers</b>		<b>Postmodifiers</b>
Adjectives	NOUN	Adverbs
Articles		Infinitives
Nouns		Participles
Numerals		Prepositional phrases
Participles		Relative clauses

Pronouns		
----------	--	--

Table 3.2

### Premodifiers and postmodifiers in Ukrainian

Premodifiers		Postmodifiers
Adjectives	NOUN	Adverbs
Ordinal numerals		Infinitives
Pronouns		Nouns
Verbal adjectives		Passive verbal adjectives
		Prepositional phrases
		Relative clauses

Overall, NPs can be structured from the elements in these tables. Naturally, more than one element can appear as a premodifier and postmodifier to the head noun and can be layered in accordance with the rules of grammar of that particular language. For example, the NP *an extended car warranty to be signed* consists of an article + past participle + premodifier noun + head noun + infinitive. To exemplify mixed modification in Ukrainian, we may consider the NP *його колишня сусідка з Італії* as personal pronoun + adjective + head noun + prepositional phrase. In general, the higher the noun's valency, the more NP structuring opportunities it has.

**3.1.3. Noun-Verb agreement.** Besides the agreement within NPs, there is also agreement between nouns and verbs within sentences. When dealing with this topic, we will use certain terms, viz. the controller, the target, the domain, features and values. Corbett (2006) defines these terms in the following manner: “We call the element which determines the agreement ... the **controller**. The element whose form is determined by agreement is the **target**. The syntactic environment in which agreement occurs is the **domain** of agreement. And when we indicate in what respect there is agreement, we are referring to agreement **features**” (p. 4).

The agreement feature of **number** is relevant for both English and Ukrainian Noun-Verb agreement. Two number values are distinguished in the languages under contrast – singular and plural (Harrison, 2009). The general rule for both languages is that a singular noun as the controller requires the target verb to have a singular form, and a plural noun requires a plural form. Nonetheless, there are some cases where people tend to struggle with Noun-Verb agreement, and there is reasonable ground for that.

On the one hand, agreement lies within the realm of syntax, since the controller defines the target's form. For instance, when the controller noun is premodified by such words and phrases as *every*, *each*, *neither*, *either*, *many a* in English it is followed by a target verb in singular due to the head noun form being singular as well. The same is relevant for subjects followed by an intervening phrase, since the verb agrees with the subject and not the phrase (Christiansen et al., 2020).

e.g. *Lieutenant Lapointe, together with another French officer, was killed last night in a brawl in the north-east of the city, near the Danube Canal* (Butters, 1991, p. 45-167).

*Ще й не смеркло, як студентський батальйон разом з усім училищем був у поході* (Гончар, 2017, с. 92).

On the other hand, Corbett (2006) duly notes, that agreement can admit some variants with regard to semantics. In English, this can be applied to collective nouns. Christiansen, et al. (2020) provide this rule: “When the group is regarded as a unit, the singular verb is the appropriate choice” (p. 435). “When the individual members ... are emphasized, ... the plural verb is correct” (p. 436).

e.g. *However the staff does not acknowledge that it does not have the necessary resources at its disposal to work with Vanessa* (Paik, 2011, p. 162).

*But it is also highly desirable that the staff have at least some understanding of the Principles of data protection* (Morgan & Boardman, 2003, p. 68).

In Ukrainian, however, the same semantic criterion is not applicable to collective nouns. Here, the noun as a controller determines the singular form of a target verb

e.g. *Геологічний комітет обіцяв найближчим часом надіслати на Лебединий острів нову партію дослідників* (Трублаїні, 1945, с. 68).

Another interesting case where the number feature of agreement is allomorphic for the contrasted languages is the proximity rule in English when dealing with homogeneous subjects connected by *neither...nor*, *either...or*. When both subjects are in plural, the verb is in plural, when both are singular, the verb is singular as well (Christiansen et al., 2020). But when the value of two subjects is different, the one closer to the verb becomes the controller, e.g. *neither the children on the tree stump nor those on the ground were facing us* (Butler, 2003, ch. 3). – *Neither Howard nor Dr. Cummins was present* (Moreno-Garcia, 2020, p. 225). In Ukrainian, on the contrary, the verb acquires the plural form regardless of the number value of nouns due to the semantic meaning of plurality created by this structure, e.g. *ні мати, ні сестра не одважились ухопити коня за повід або за стремена* (Куліш, 1990, с. 66).

Still, the highest degree of allomorphy in terms of Noun-Verb number agreement in English and Ukrainian can be observed when the subject is represented by a noun phrase consisting of a head noun with premodifying quantifiers. In English, the general rule still applies with the exception of time, distance, money, etc, where the subject has a plural form, but the verb has a singular one, e.g. ... *two minutes is adequate and five minutes is a lot* (Jewell, 2004, p. 65). In Ukrainian, on the other hand, there are options depending on the meaning conveyed. Hryhoriev et. al. (Григор'єв та ін., 2005) list these tendencies in such cases of Noun-Verb agreement:

- if the number of actors is emphasised, the verb is singular, while if the actors are emphasised as separate individuals, the verb is plural;
- another determining factor is animateness of the noun, where the active verb takes plural with animate controlling nouns, and singular with the inanimate ones;
- if the verb precedes the noun, it tends to be singular, whereas it takes plural in postposition;

- singular verb is frequently used with the subject expressed by a noun with an indefinite numeral premodifier;
- and, similarly to English, nouns referring to time, years, age, etc. take singular verbs (p. 309).

In addition to the number agreement differences mentioned above, the Ukrainian language includes the gender feature of Noun-Verb agreement. It is represented by masculine, feminine and neuter values, e.g. *Хлопець стояв з готовим у дорогу наплічником. Куля влучила йому в серце. Прохання було ризиковане тим, що Маруся не знала, кому ці лісовики підлягають...* (Шкляр, 2014, с. 213, 214, 216). As for the common difficulties in Noun-Verb gender agreement, they may arise in the use of:

- common nouns and masculine nouns denoting a profession, but referring to a woman, e.g. *Базіка пропустив / пропустила кульмінацію історії. Лікар прописав / прописала мені ліки.*
- proper nouns, where their gender is determined by the class noun's gender, e.g. *Орегон (штат) був першим.*
- abbreviations, where the controller is the head noun, e.g. *США (Сполучені Штати Америки) надали допомогу.*
- predicatives expressed by nouns in nominative case. Here, the copulative verb agrees in gender either with the subject or the predicative, e.g. *Школа була мій другий дім. / Школа був мій другий дім.* If the predicative noun is in the instrumental case, the subject is the controller of the verb form (Григор'єв та ін., 2005, с. 308), e.g. *Школа була моїм другим домом.*

As we can see, while having some isomorphic features, Noun-Verb agreement in English and Ukrainian is quite allomorphic. It concerns both the differences in number feature of agreement in the two languages and the presence of gender feature of Noun-Verb agreement in Ukrainian.

**3.1.4. Nouns in patterning simple two-member sentences.** The English and Ukrainian nouns manifest isomorphic characteristics when it comes to their

syntactic functions. They can perform all of the possible syntactic functions but that of a predicate, viz. they can function as subjects, subjective complements, objects, objective complements, attributes and adverbial modifiers.

**3.1.4.1. Nouns as subjects.** First of all, due to their lexico-grammatical meaning of substantiality, nouns in either language can perform the function of the **subject** in a sentence (Ореховська, 2021; Караман, 2011). Being one of the nuclear elements of a complete sentence, it is often considered to be the dominant part of the nucleus (Шатрюк & Вишняк, 2016).

In English, there are two ways to test whether the noun or a noun phrase is a subject of a sentence. The first property of subjects is their distribution within the sentence, i.e. subjects normally precede predicates in declarative sentences (Tallerman, 2015, p. 49).

e.g. *The sound came from the chest of drawers, and Peter made a merry face* (Barrie, 1991, para. 265). – The first subject is expressed by a common noun, and the second one by a proper one.

The second property of subjects in English is that they are the controllers in Subject-Verb agreement for present tense (Tallerman, 2015, p. 51), the examples of which we could see in the previous point. In fact, from the previous analysis of agreement in the contrasted languages, we can conclude that the same is relevant for subjects in Ukrainian.

While the free word order of the Ukrainian language does not demand the subject to precede the predicate, it demands the noun to be in the nominative case when the subject is simple, e.g. *Надійшла мати і, відчувши, що діється під яблуною, замислилась* (Довженко, 1931, пар. 9). When the subject is compound, the noun's case is determined by its relationship within the phrase, e.g. the head numeral *п'ять* requires genitive case from its target noun (Караман, 2011, с. 347).

On the whole, the nuclear nature of subjects and their agreement-controller function in the languages under study account for an isomorphic feature. Nonetheless, in English as an analytical language, the subject has a fixed position

in a sentence, while the subject in Ukrainian can either precede or follow the predicate with the simple subject noun taking the nominative case.

**3.1.4.2. Nouns as subjective complements.** When part of the predicate provides additional characteristics or information about the subject of the sentence it is known as a **subjective complement**. In this paper, we are chiefly concerned with **predicate nominatives** as this syntactic function is quite often performed by nouns.

In English, this type of compound predicate always consists of a **copula**, i.e. linking verb, and a subjective complement. Garner (2016) highlights two types of copulas – be-verbs and weakened intransitive verbs, including *appear, seem, feel, look, smell, taste, sound, become* and the like (p. 81). They are considered weakened due to their loss of original meaning when used as connecting verbs. Since we are concerned with predicate nominatives, we are interested in copulas with their valency admitting the noun.

As a matter of course, nouns as subjective complements can be preceded by the verb *be*, which indicates state or introduces description (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, n.d.).

e.g. *His mother is a teacher of English.*

*This young boy will be an Olympics champion.*

Regarding the weakened verbs above, let us consult Herbst et al. (2013) and their corpus study of valencies to determine which ones can serve as linking verbs for predicate nominatives. Having investigated the dictionary entries for these verbs, we can conclude that *appear, become, feel, look* and *seem* can all function as predicate nominative copulas.

e.g. ...*The absence of one ordinary officer at the Annual General Meeting may appear a misfortune* (Davies, 2004).

*Carol became a colourist for a children's animation company* (Herbst et al., 2013, p. 75).

*Socially, you do feel a bit of an outcast* (Herbst et al., 2013, p. 308).

*He came down with a bad cold, **looked a perfect wreck*** (Herbst et al., 2013, p. 501).

*Margaret **seemed a gentle, well-adjusted woman*** (Herbst et al., 2013, p. 730).

In the Ukrainian language, subjective complement can also be connected to the subject by a copula. There are three grammatical linking verbs in Ukrainian – *бути, являти собою, становити*, where the verb *бути* is the most common one (Караман, 2011). Unlike in English, this verb may be omitted when talking about present states. Depending on the meaning intended to be conveyed by the sentence, **zero-copula** may be followed by nouns in different cases, namely:

- ‘zero-copula + N in nominative case’ expresses a constant characteristic of the subject, e.g. *Життя – це сон.*
- ‘zero-copula’ + N in genitive case’ is used rarely and conveys the meaning of some qualitative characteristic, e.g. *Ви й тепер про Віктора... Івановича хорошої думки?* (Угляренко, 1977, с. 47);
- ‘zero-copula + N in accusative case’ shows some temporary characteristic of the subject, e.g. *...він буде вам за батька...* (Свидницький, 1886, с. 16).
- ‘zero-copula + N in instrumental case’ is also possible, e.g. *Наука наукою, а робота роботою* (Нечуй-Левицький, 1890, с. 40).

As for weakened linking verbs in Ukrainian, similarly to English, this group of verbs is represented by verbs denoting the change of state, appearance of some characteristic and preservation of some characteristic over time, e.g. *ставати, здаватися, лишатися*, etc. These verbs control the form of the subjective complement noun and usually demand the nominative or instrumental case (Караман, 2011, с. 355-357).

Overall, nouns as subjective complements function similarly in English and Ukrainian. In either language, they are linked to the subject by a copula, either grammatical or with weakened lexical meaning. The key allomorphic feature for the contrasted languages is that Ukrainian subjective complements take different

cases depending on the meaning conveyed, and the copula *бути* can be completely omitted in present tense.

**3.1.4.3. Nouns as objects.** Both in English and in Ukrainian, nouns can perform the function of an object, either direct or indirect, prepositional or not. This key characteristic is, therefore, isomorphic for the two languages. There are, however, certain allomorphic aspects when it comes to the approach the languages' traditional grammars take towards the object.

English syntax describes the object's function in the following manner: “**Objects** of verbs fulfil the requirement of a transitive verb for a second argument, other than the subject” (Tallerman, 2015, p. 51). In other words, objects follow only transitive verbs in English. **Direct objects** are represented by a noun that undergoes the verb's action, e.g. *He had his first laugh still* (Barrie, 1991, para. 265). **Indirect objects** “refer to people or entities that carry the semantic role of Goal, Recipient, or Benefactive of an action or event” (Aarts, 2011, p. 95), e.g. *They gave Hal a minute to clear the room with good-byes, then stepped onto the street* (Owens, 2018, p. 205). In addition to these, there are also **prepositional objects**, where NPs are preceded by a required preposition, e.g. *We're talking about the same person* (Owens, 2018, p. 172).

Objects in Ukrainian, on the other hand, differ from the English ones due to the fact that they can express objective relationships not only with verbs, but with other parts of speech as well. To be more specific, these can include nouns, adjectives, adverbs and statives (Караман, 2011), e.g. *менеджер відділу, скуний на компліменти, всупереч погрозам, соромно за Сергія.*

As for the direct object, it follows transitive verbs and usually takes accusative case without any prepositions, e.g. *Здається, навіть і з Колосовським він тепер знайшов би спільну мову* (Гончар, 2017, с. 233). If the verb is negated by a negative particle *не*, the direct object takes genitive case, e.g. *Грибів він не знайшов...* (Перетятко, 1989, с. 7). Regarding intransitive verbs, they require the indirect object, which can be either prepositional or non-prepositional. Non-

prepositional indirect objects can be expressed by nouns in genitive, dative and instrumental cases depending on the verb (Караман, 2011).

e.g. ...Ганнуся ледве дочекалася вечора... (Шкляр, 2009, с. 13).

Він заздрив своєму єдиноземцю, ненавидів його... (Загребельний, 1968, с. 184).

При писанні дорожж часом, надто ж – пергаментом... (Загребельний, 1968, с. 243).

The case of nouns functioning as prepositional indirect objects is determined, in its turn, by the preposition. Karaman lists such prepositions as *у/в, з, за, о/об, про, над, на, до, від, проти, для, між* and highlights that other parts of speech besides the intransitive verb can take this kind of an indirect object (Караман, 2011, с. 366), e.g. *Неймовірна скеля над річкою ... нагадувала мені сні про ніколи не бачену Швейцарію* (Андрухович, 2011, ч. «Орел і півень»)

As can be observed, syntaxes of the contrasted languages both have the notions of direct, indirect and prepositional objects. Nonetheless, the principal difference lies in what verbs and what parts of speech in general can take the object. Essentially, Ukrainian nouns have more options as to performance of the function of an object in a sentence, whereas English nouns as objects are limited to transitive verbs only.

**3.1.4.4. Nouns as objective complements.** If a subjective complement provides some information about the subject, an objective complement characterises a direct object preceding it. This typically occurs when a factitive word is used. In its narrow meaning, a **factitive verb** is a verb that “brings about a change in its object” (Garner, 2016, p. 513) and, depending on the kind of change, its complement can be expressed by a noun, e.g. *Why did the gods make him a manager?* (Baker et al., 2009, p. 51).

Garner (2016) also notes that the term ‘factitive verb’ can relate broadly to all transitive verbs that can take both a direct object and an objective complement. In this case, the list of such verbs becomes a bit longer with some examples including *to appoint, to call, to choose, to consider, to designate, to elect, to find,*

*to imagine, to judge, to keep, to make, to name, to prove, to render, to think, etc (p. 513).*

e.g. *I think you a strangely lovely and strangely interesting person* (Sedgwick, 2020, p. 28).

In the Ukrainian language, however, objective complements do not make a special case for differentiation in terms of syntax. They are simply considered indirect objects of divalent transitive verbs, e.g. *Я вважав тебе* (DO in accusative case) *своїм другом* (IO in instrumental case).

**3.1.4.5. Nouns as attributes.** When the noun becomes a modifier to another part of speech representing substantiality, it performs the attributive syntactic function (Crystal, 2008). Both Ukrainian and English nouns have the capacity to serve as attributes, but there are certain differences as well as similarities with regard to their realization. We propose to begin with some of the isomorphic features of nouns as attributes in the contrasted languages.

Firstly, **nouns in the genitive case** can perform the attributive function. As we have seen earlier when dealing with noun phrases, the genitive case noun can modify the head noun in either language. The main distinction between the languages is that the genitive noun attribute stands in pre-position to the noun that it modifies in English, but in post-position in Ukrainian.

e.g. *...but she figured Ma's words needed somewhere to go, so she absorbed them through her skin...* (Owens, 2018, p. 9).

*По царинці ступають білі ноги Марічки* (Коцюбинський, 1912, с. 6).

Secondly, the noun as **part of a prepositional phrase** can function as an attribute in a sentence both in English and Ukrainian. In English, it postmodifies the noun (Kortmann & van der Auwera, 2011), e.g. *Noemí was prepared for the chill of the mountain* (Moreno-Gracia, 2020, p. 16). In Ukrainian, attributive nouns are more likely to be preceded by the preposition *з/із* demanding the genitive or instrumental case and the preposition *у/в* demanding the locative case of the noun (Караман, 2011), e.g. *Я теж роблю соки з яблук на зиму* (Прохасько, 2010, с. 22).

Finally, **apposition** as the noun in attributive function is characteristic of the two languages. We can discriminate between the close apposition, which gives an identifying description to the noun, and the loose apposition, which is punctuated with commas and can be removed without making the sentence ungrammatical (Kim, 2014).

e.g. *When I began my research on “The Color Purple,” a story that I first read at 15, I knew that I would focus on Celie’s relationships with her sister, Nettie, her bawdy blues woman lover Shug and the defiant Sofia* (Tillet, 2021, para. 4). – Here, the first two appositions are loose, while the last one is close.

*Український футболіст Олександр Зінченко поговорив з прихильниками.* – close apposition.

*Олександр Зінченко, колишній гравець «Манчестер Сіті», підписав контракт з «Арсеналом».* – loose apposition (examples are mine).

Proceeding from isomorphic features of nouns as attributes in English and Ukrainian, we cannot but mention some allomorphic features as well. While non-prepositional use of nouns in the attributive function can be found in both languages, the English language allows such use only in pre-position. Niizuma (1969) highlights the attributive use of:

- material nouns: *A taffeta dress would look amazing.*
- proper nouns: *I would love to see Brighton beaches.*
- common nouns denoting places: *The city landscape is mesmerising at sunset.*

In Ukrainian, nouns as attributes typically stand in post-position and often form part of ‘**syntactically indivisible phrases**’ (Караман, 2011), e.g. *Через огорожу, на грядках біля хати, помітила дівчинку років чотирнадцяти...* (Трублаїні, 1945, с. 6).

So, in the languages under study, the attributive syntactic function can be performed by nouns in the genitive case, prepositional phrases, appositions, whereas other instances of noun use in this function would present allomorphic characteristics regarding their pre- and post-position.

**3.1.4.6. Nouns as a part of prepositional phrases in the function of adverbial modifiers.** Adverbial modifiers in a sentence “supply circumstantial information about the ‘when’, ‘where’, ‘how’ or ‘why’ of a situation and can express a very wide range of meanings” (Aarts, 2011, p. 103). Besides adverbs, they can be expressed by prepositional phrases with nouns in English and Ukrainian.

In general, all types of adverbial modifiers can be realized through prepositional phrases. Karaman classifies them in accordance with their semantic meaning into eight groups, viz. adverbial modifiers (AMs) of manner, degree and measure, place, time, reason, purpose, condition and concession (Караман, 2011). Let us consider how prepositional phrases with nouns function as adverbial modifiers of each of these types:

- AM of manner: *She’s cutting the cake with a big knife.* – *Його сестра вдягається як модель.*
- AM of degree and measure: *I’ve planned everything to the minute.* – *Наповніть стакан по вінця.*
- AM of place: *Jennifer will meet you at the gate.* – *Ми знайшли це кошеня на дорозі.*
- AM of time: *We’re setting out at midnight.* – *Давайте зустрінемось в п’ятницю.*
- AM of reason: *I’m running late because of the traffic jam.* – *Поліна розплакалась від радості.*
- AM of purpose: *He would do anything for his son.* – *Ми тренуватимемося кожного дня заради перемоги.*
- AM of condition: *Without self-love, you can’t love anybody else.* – *При отруєнні потрібно пити багато води.*
- AM of concession: *Steven goes to the gym every day despite his lack of energy.* – *Андрій зміг вступити до бажаного університету всупереч великій конкуренції.*

In essence, nouns can perform the function of adverbial modifiers as a part of prepositional phrases. As can be seen from the examples above, nouns in English prepositional phrases are in the common case, whereas in Ukrainian their case is governed by the preposition. So, ultimately, the possibility of nouns to function as AMs is isomorphic for the two languages, but the nouns' morphological realization differs due to the synthetic nature of Ukrainian as opposed to the analytical one of English.

**3.1.4.7. Nouns in two-member incomplete sentences with different communicative aims.** Structurally, incomplete sentences, also known as elliptical sentences, miss either the subject or the predicate or sometimes both. When only one of them is omitted, the sentence is partially elliptical, but if both the subject and the predicate are missing, such sentence is fully elliptical (Чепелюк & Орищак, 2008). In general, incomplete sentences are most often encountered in dialogues since the sentences in such units have close ties in their meaning and the ellipsis can help avoid repetitions (Крутько, 2013). When speaking about the role of nouns, they can appear in incomplete sentences of all communicative types including statements, questions, commands and exclamations.

Let us begin with the elliptical **statements**. Frequently, elliptical sentences, including statements, are fragment answers in their nature. As Putu Devi Maharani and I Ketut Suartawan Mudayasa (2020) mention in their study, the question serves to fill in the blanks created by ellipsis. Some fragment answers represented by nouns can consist of a subject only.

e.g. English: *Who will host the event today?* – Jack.

Ukrainian: *Що це буде?* – Наш холодильник.

Furthermore, both the subject and the predicate can be omitted in incomplete sentence responses in the two languages. Thus, the noun can stand on its own performing a certain function of that sentence, or it can be part of a noun or a prepositional phrase.

e.g. English: *What did you order?* – Some pizza.

*Have you seen my earrings anywhere?* – On the top shelf.

Ukrainian: *Що ти їси? – Лохину.*

*Коли твій день народження? – В червні.*

Furthermore, in English, the omission of operators accounts for ellipsis as well (Antonius Padua Hari Wibowo, 1999), while it is not a case in Ukrainian, e.g. *The cake burnt. The balloons deflating. This isn't looking good for us.*

Turning to incomplete **questions**, the omission of the subject and the predicate (or operator) is quite common and can be found in the contrasted languages. Similarly to statements, nouns can appear on their own or as part of a phrase in these sentences.

e.g. English: *I saw your sister yesterday. – My sister? In Southwark?*

*Could I have anything to drink? – Absolutely. Coffee or tea?*

Ukrainian: *Ти ж запросив мого брата? – Сергія? Так.*

Also, only the predicate can be missing in incomplete questions, e.g. *Maria has finished the report already. – Maria? I thought it was Mike's responsibility. Катя купить квитки. – Катя? Не Артур?*

Next, we have elliptical **commands**. Since imperatives presuppose the absence of the subject (Antonius Padua Hari Wibowo, 1999), only the imperatives missing the predicate are considered incomplete. To exemplify such a sentence, we may turn to the command of the police 'Hands where I can see them' and 'Руки за голову'. In English, the elliptical command is realized through a noun phrase where the noun 'hands' is the head postmodified by a relative clause. In Ukrainian, it is also realized through a noun, but the head noun *руки* is followed by a prepositional phrase that is not of a modifying type. In addition to this kind of command, the English language has a special subtype of elliptical imperatives – the general prohibition, e.g. *No visitors past 10 p.m.!* (Donovan, 2018, p. 46).

Last but not least, nouns in incomplete **exclamations** function just like in the previous examples. The only difference of sentences with this communicative aim from others is the emotional charge of the sentence.

In brief, the role of nouns in two-member incomplete sentences with different communicative aims is isomorphic in English and Ukrainian. While the

existence of general prohibitions in English is allomorphic, the sum of the points mentioned above makes the realization of nouns in elliptical sentences primarily isomorphic.

**3.1.5. Nouns in composing simple one-member sentences.** When a noun or a noun phrase is the subject of a simple one-member sentence, such sentence is called the **nominative sentence** (Томусяк, 2017). In English as well as in Ukrainian, it can be extended, in which case we deal with noun phrases, and unextended. In either situation, the noun takes the Common case in English and the nominative case in Ukrainian due to its syntactic function of the subject. To provide some examples, we shall establish that nominative sentences can be categorized into three groups according to their meaning – existential, demonstrative and emotive, which can express a range of emotions from positive to negative (Губарева & Калашник, 2019; Швець, 2018):

- **existential:** *This silent landscape. Snow and stopped cars with terrible things in them* (Mandel, 2014, ch. 36). – *Океан чистоти і сяйва* (Гончар, 1970, с. 5).
- **demonstrative:** *August dropped to one knee to prod at the ground. “Gravel,” he said* (Mandel, 2014, ch. 24). – *От травиця!* (Вишня, 1984, с. 113).
- **emotive:** *“A non-ransacked house,” August said, once they’d resumed walking... “I never thought I’d see another one.”* (Mandel, 2014, ch. 38) – *Весна! Ніхто не виглядав її так, як вони* (Шкляр, 2009, с. 78).

As we can see from these examples, the function of nouns in composing one-member simple sentences constitutes an isomorphic feature for the languages under contrast. Both nouns and noun phrases can form nominative sentences with different meanings in English and Ukrainian.

**3.1.6. Nouns use in non-sentence utterances.** When a certain part of speech lacks any kind of syntactic relation to other elements of an utterance, then we face

a case of non-sentence utterances. These can be formed either by vocatives or interjections.

In this point, we treat **vocatives** “as nouns or noun phrases that identify or describe the addressee.” In the English and Ukrainian languages, these can include personal proper names (*‘Sam’*, «*Поліно*»), titles and honorifics (*‘Professor’*, *‘Sir’*, «*Президенте*», «*Пане*»), terms of kinship (*‘Dad’*, «*Мамо*»), terms of endearment (*‘Sweetheart’*, «*Сонечко*»), nicknames (*‘Chrissy-Cakes’*, «*Щебетун*»), colloquial addresses (*‘Mate’*, «*Чуваче*») (Sokolets & Khanykina, 2021, p. 125) and sometimes common nouns, e.g. *‘O happy dagger!’* (Shakespeare, 1597, 5.3.169), «*Сонце! Ріки!*».

Among **interjections** expressed by nouns we can highlight those communicating emotions and those representing conversational formulas (Караман, 2011). For instance, such interjections as *‘My God’*, *‘Goodness gracious’*, *‘What a shame’* and «*Боже мій*», «*Ой лишенько*» convey emotions, while *‘Good morning’*, *‘Good luck’* and «*Добрий день*», «*На здоров’я*» and the like are used conventionally for various communicative purposes. Evidently, not only nouns, but noun and prepositional phrases can constitute interjections in the languages under study.

Consequently, the two contrasted languages are similar in terms of nouns’ use in composing non-sentence utterances, i.e. they can function as vocatives and interjections.

### **3.2. Syntactic features of nominal parts of speech denoting substantiality in the languages under contrast**

**3.2.1. Verbal nouns use.** Since verbal nouns are predominantly substantive in nature, they can perform the same syntactic functions as regular nouns in English and Ukrainian, i.e. they can be subjects, subjective complements, objects, objective complements, attributes and adverbial modifiers. Nonetheless, they do preserve some verbal features.

In English, both gerundial and deverbal nouns exhibit the remaining connection between their verbal root and its syntactic valency. According to Ilc

(2016), the **theta role** of the agent can be realized within the noun phrase by means of the genitive case or possessive pronoun modifier and the *by*-phrase, e.g. *his decision to leave, your parents' approval, the event catering by our service, polling by local authorities*. And the thematic participant is introduced by the *of*-phrase, e.g. *the implementation of new policies, my denial of that offer, the feeding of animals, the staging of this play*. The agent can also be introduced by this phrase, although it is more common for the deverbal nouns rather than the gerundial ones, e.g. *the announcement of the UN, the acceptance of his family* (as in 'his family accepts something'), *the resigning of Prime Minister*.

In Ukrainian, the preservation of these theta roles is also characteristic of verbal nouns. The key difference between English and Ukrainian in this respect is that both of these roles are marked by the genitive case in Ukrainian. In other words, the meaning of transitivity/intransitivity of deverbal nouns is not differentiated paradigmatically but it does influence their valency (Шепель, 2017), e.g. *підйом туристів на гору – підйом прапора; кусання комарів – кусання калити; вибір народу – вибір продуктів*.

To sum up, the syntactic properties of Ukrainian and English verbal nouns are generally isomorphic with some allomorphic features appearing in the realization of theta roles available for verbal roots of such nouns.

**3.2.2. Pronouns functions.** When used as substitutors of objects in the objective reality, pronouns perform the same syntactic functions as nouns do. Depending on the type of pronoun, these functions can fully or partially coincide with those of nouns in both languages.

When it comes to **personal pronouns**, they can serve as:

- subjects: *He has promised to help with the extra documents.* – *Вони загубили ключі від кабінету.*
- subjective complements: *Is it you?* – *Може, то був він.*
- objects: *Pass me the menu.* – *Я допоможу їй знайти адресу.*
- adverbial modifiers: *We were late because of you.* – *Вона переїхала до іншої країни заради нього.*

**Possessive pronouns** as substitutors function as:

- subjects: *Mine was certainly better.* – *Наша вже прийшла.*
- subjective complements: *The mistake was hers.* – *Хіба ця ковдра не твоя?*
- objects: *I have found theirs.* – *Ти йдеш забрати замовлення? Забери моє.*
- objective complements: *She considers it hers.* – *Я вважаю його твоїм.*
- attributes: *Let's hire Sullivan. I like his passion* (here, the pronoun is not absolute, but it does substitute the noun in the genitive case). – *Мене хвилює його стан.*
- adverbial modifiers: *Could we meet at yours?* – *Чий це телефон? Виглядає як Ваш.*

As for the **demonstrative** ones, English pronouns can perform all of the noun's syntactic functions, but in Ukrainian their adjectival nature prevents them from substituting objects in the objective reality and functioning as objective complements and attributes at the same time. We can see the use of demonstrative pronouns as substitutors with different function in the two languages below:

- subject: *This is ridiculous.* – *Це буде цікаво.*
- subjective complement: *My favourite colours are these.* – *За мною займав цей чоловік, а останній буде той.*
- object: *Can my brother have those?* – *Ні, цей ніж брудний, візьми той.*
- objective complement: *Why would you name your dog that?* – *\*Чому ти так назвав свого собаку (adverb).*
- attribute: *I can't stand the smell of these.* – *\*Я не можу терпіти їх запах (possessive pronoun) or цей запах, but the implicit grammatical meaning of the demonstrative pronoun is not substantive but qualitative in this instance.*

- adverbial modifier: *Do not behave like those.* – *Ти пну́хав сюди заради цього?*

**Indefinite** and **interrogative pronouns** function just like nouns in the sentence in both of the contrasted languages, meaning they can be:

- subjects: *Somebody is at the door.* – *Щось пішло не за планом.*  
*What is happening?* – *Хто відповідатиме за звіту?*
- subjective complements: *Don't worry. This is nothing.* – *Мій тато не був абиким.*  
*Who are those men?* – *Хто ти є?*
- objects: *Steve can complain about anything.* – *Схопись за що-небудь.*  
*Who did you meet yesterday?* – *Що вже завершили твої підлеглі?*
- objective complements: *She promises me a promotion. I don't know what kind, but she will make me something.* – *Сценаристи можуть зробити його хтозна-ким.*  
*You will designate him what? A manager?* – *Ким назначив тебе начальник?*
- attributes: *It is nobody's business.* – *Я знайшов чийсь телефон.*  
*Whose quotation was that?* – *Чия ручка залишилась на моєму столі?*
- adverbial modifiers: *She is down to meet anywhere.* – *Вони можуть розплакатись через будь-що.*  
*Where have you found my glasses?* – *В кого навушники Саші?*

In terms of **relative pronouns**, their syntactic functions are limited to the functions of subjects, objects and adverbial modifiers in a clause (Garner, 2016), e.g.:

- subject: *I know a girl who can play the electric guitar.* – *Вона знайшла деталь, що спричинила поломку машини.*
- object: *Sara has still not found what she's been looking for.* – *Той, кого ми назвемо, має написати нам в особисті повідомлення.*

- **adverbial modifier:** *He booked the whole restaurant in which they had their first date.* – *Ми проїжджали повз село, в якому виріс Богдан.*

Having analysed the examples of pronouns use in the two languages under study, we can conclude that their syntactic functions are mainly isomorphic with the exception of demonstrative pronouns that do not tend to serve as objective complements and attributes when employed in substantive meaning.

**3.2.3. Numerals roles.** Numerals as a notional part of speech denoting substantiality can take on the same roles that their corresponding noun would in a sentence. So long as numerals function as the nouns' substitutors, they share syntactic functions (Караман, 2011). We can prove this by studying some examples from the British National Corpus (Davies, 2004) and from Ukrainian fiction:

- **subject:** *And the two don't always coincide.* – *Двоє їх сидить, забарикадувавшись у порожній аудиторії істфаку* (Гончар, 2017, с. 3).
- **subjective complement:** *Harold Wilson was the first to reply.* – *Мені здавалося, що я був першим, а тепер я стаю нічим* (Матіос, 1995, с. 11).
- **object:** *I barely knew what step to take first, let alone what step to take second, let us not talk about the third.* – *Дівчинка побачила, що вони не збираються нікого топнути, а, навпаки, хочуть усіх трьох забрати з собою* (Трублаїні, 1945, с. 28).
- **objective complement:** *...Nippon's loss to New Zealand made her the first to be eliminated.* – *Коли визначали порядок виступів представників, він призначив його першим.*
- **attribute:** *A single mother of three, she relies on income support...* – *До нього першого й підійшли* (Шкляр, 2009, с. 7).
- **adverbial modifier:** *Eduord and Isobel would be back at five.* – *Хіба що на двох із тобою...* (Шкляр, 2009, с. 3).

Thus, the syntactic roles of numerals as substitutors in English and Ukrainian are isomorphic and, in fact, overlap with those of the noun.

**3.2.4. Substantivized adjectives positions.** Just like numerals, substantivized adjectives can fill in the same syntactic positions the noun does. To exemplify this, let us also turn to the analysis of substantivized adjectives functions in entries of the BNC and Ukrainian literature. The following instances demonstrate such syntactic functions as that of a:

- **subject:** *If only the British would pull their socks up things would be different.* – ...і коли один учений отримує таке звання, то інші мають ще почекаати (Загребельний, 1983, с. 14).
- **subjective complement:** *Like the heckler, he was a Liberal.* – Трохи ожила жінка, коли почула, що я не слідчий, а з редакції (Шкляр, 1999, с. 17).
- **object:** *I was getting tired of the rich and famous.* – На командирському містку стояв капітан-лейтенант Трофімов і задумливо дивився в далечінь (Трублаїні, 1945, с. 51).
- **objective complement:** *And although you are a man, in this way I consider you an equal* (Neuman, 2012, p. 153). – Вони призначили його уповноваженим з питань освіти.
- **attribute:** *...the pictures on his office walls are a gallery of the rich and powerful.* – Найкращі її роботи – саме ті, що викликали такий напад злости в Адіного мистецтвоїда (Забужко, 2009, с. 90).
- **adverbial modifier:** *After the finals it was time to pick the redcurrants and raspberries.* – Чоломбитько подивився на мене, як на дурника (Шкляр, 1999, с. 11).

Overall, substantivized adjectives represent yet another nominal part of speech denoting substantiality that corresponds to the noun in its syntactic functions both in the English and the Ukrainian languages.

### **Conclusions to Chapter Three**

Having conducted our syntactic analysis of the language units representing substantiality in modern English and Ukrainian, we arrive at a range of conclusions regarding their syntactic properties.

First, we delve deep into syntactic properties of the Noun as the main part of speech denoting substantiality. Its syntagmatic valency varies from word to word and accounts for its zerovalent, monovalent, divalent and trivalent uses. Both in English and in Ukrainian, nouns can be premodified, postmodified and have the mixed type of modification, where both of the latter types are used. In terms of isomorphic features for the two languages, we have observed that the Noun can be premodified by adjectives, numerals, pronouns and participles corresponding to verbal adjectives in Ukrainian, as well as postmodified by adverbs, infinitives, participles, prepositional phrases and relative clauses. Allomorphic features, in their turn, comprise premodification by nouns and articles in English and postmodification by nouns in Ukrainian. Consequently, the structure of NPs in English and Ukrainian is predominantly similar with some distinctions motivated by different syntactic natures of the languages under analysis, i.e. analytical and synthetic.

Then, we proceed to the analysis of Noun-Verb agreement in English and Ukrainian. In general, while demonstrating some similarities, these languages are quite allomorphic with regard to realization of the number feature in agreement with semantic criteria and the proximity rule coming into play in English. Furthermore, there is a gender agreement feature in Ukrainian, which is not present in English, due to gender not being a morphologically realized category of English nouns.

Next, when studying nouns in patterning simple two-member sentences, we have established that nouns can function as subjects, subjective complements, objects, objective complements, attributes and adverbial modifiers in sentences in either language. Nouns as subjects precede the predicate in English taking the common case, while Ukrainian nouns can stand anywhere due to free word order

and can take either nominative case when functioning as a simple subject, or some other case depending on its position within a phrase when the subject is compound.

When analysing nouns as subjective complements, we have concluded that predicate nominatives of the two languages are linked to the subject by a copula. Nonetheless, there is also a degree of allomorphy in this respect since Ukrainian has such a phenomenon as zero-copula, where the copula is omitted.

Nouns can function as objects in both languages as well, although only transitive verbs take objects in English whereas Ukrainian allows other parts of speech to take nouns as objects. Discussing objects, it is also worth to mention nouns as objective complements. In English they present a separate syntactic function because of the presence of factitive verbs. In Ukrainian, on the other hand, they are simply viewed as different kinds of objects, making this property allomorphic.

Attributive syntactic function of nouns in its realization is rather isomorphic for the contrasted languages, yet it has its differences, too. The use of genitive case, prepositional phrases and appositions as attributes is typical of both languages, and allomorphic features can be traced to the specifics of NPs in English and Ukrainian.

With regard to nouns as adverbial modifiers, they can be part of prepositional phrases performing this function in the sentence. If we do not consider prepositional government, which is absent in English but present in Ukrainian, then this syntactic property is isomorphic for the Noun in these languages.

Finishing with the syntactic properties of nouns, English and Ukrainian nouns share a great number of features in patterning two-member incomplete and one-member sentences. The same is true for non-sentence utterances.

Last but not least, the syntactic properties of other nominal parts of speech denoting substantiality are mostly isomorphic in English and Ukrainian. The only distinction is represented by demonstrative pronouns as substitutors as they do not normally function as objective complements and attributes in the Ukrainian language.

## GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, having conducted the morphosyntactic analysis of the language units denoting substantiality in modern English and Ukrainian, we have managed to achieve the objectives set at the beginning of our research.

Having analysed the existing morphological and syntactic classifications, we can claim that both English and Ukrainian belong to the morphological class of **flexional** languages. The primary basis for the contrastive study, however, comes from the syntactic classification where, while both nominative, English is an **analytical** language and Ukrainian – a **synthetic** one.

We have established that the parts of speech typology in the contrasted languages is mainly isomorphic. There are **seven notional parts of speech** in both languages: noun, verb, adjective, adverb, pronoun, numeral and stative. Among the functional parts of speech, the two languages share such functionals as conjunctions, prepositions, particles, modal words and interjection. The only allomorphic part of speech is the **article**, which is characteristic of English and not Ukrainian.

As for the **noun** as a lexico-grammatical class, the following features can be identified: lexico-grammatical meaning of substantiality; subdivision into common and proper, animate/inanimate, countable/uncountable nouns; derivational pattern *prefix + root + suffix + inflection* with some allomorphic characteristics in the system of suffixes in the Ukrainian language; categories of number, case, gender and definiteness/indefiniteness. As we have seen, the meaning of **substantiality** can be characteristic not only of nouns, but of verbal nouns, pronouns, numerals and substantivized adjectives as well.

In the second chapter, we have conducted the morphological analysis of the categories of noun in English and Ukrainian in addition to studying the morphology of other nominal parts of speech denoting substantiality. Structurally, nouns in English and Ukrainian are isomorphic. Suffixal morphemes in the two languages possess both isomorphic functions and allomorphic ones, viz. augmentative and diminutive suffixes in Ukrainian.

With regard to the **categories** of the noun, both languages have four categories, the realizations of which have similarities as well as certain differences. The category of **number**, for instance, is predominantly isomorphic as the languages share the existence of Singularia and Pluralia Tantum classes in addition to zero and marked inflections for plurality. Nonetheless, the Ukrainian language, being a synthetic one, has a system of four declension groups for the noun and root vowel change as a trace of dual number.

The category of **case**, in its turn, is distinguished by allomorphy with English opposition of the common and genitive case marked by the -'s formant. Meanwhile, the Ukrainian language has a system of seven cases with singular and plural oppositions marked morphologically as well.

The category of **gender** is also allomorphic since gender is a grammatical category in Ukrainian with the masculine, feminine and neuter genders. In English, on the other hand, gender is not marked morphologically but can be established through pronoun coreference.

Regarding the category of **definiteness/indefiniteness**, it can be determined by the noun's adjuncts in the two contrasted languages. The key difference here is that English has the article to account for this category, and Ukrainian can use changes in the word order to show definiteness/indefiniteness.

Finally, the **morphological features of other nominal parts of speech** have been considered. As a result, we have observed that verbal nouns in both languages possess a system of suffixes to form them with the English language having the distinction between deverbal and gerundial nouns. The realizations of pronouns as substitutors are mainly allomorphic for English and Ukrainian. The same is true for numerals, as they can be declined in Ukrainian, but are invariable in English. Substantivization of adjectives is yet another allomorphic process because conversion is the typical means for this in English while suffixation and syntactic substantivization are characteristic of the Ukrainian language.

The third chapter deals with the syntactic analysis of the units mentioned above. We begin with nouns and their **syntagmatic valency**. The uses of nouns

can be zerovalent, monovalent, divalent and trivalent in both languages. Therefore, premodification, postmodification and mixed modification are available in English and Ukrainian with the key differences being the English noun's ability to be premodified by articles and other nouns and the Ukrainian noun postmodification.

More allomorphic characteristics are defined in **Noun-Verb agreement**. While English and Ukrainian have the number agreement feature, English tends to take into account the semantic aspects as well as the proximity rule. The Ukrainian language, in its turn, has the gender agreement feature because of its morphological marking, which is not available in English.

When investigating the syntactic functions of **nouns in patterning simple two-member sentences**, we have noted that they can be subjects, subjective complements, objects, objective complements, attributes and adverbial modifiers both in English and in Ukrainian. While being predominantly isomorphic in these functions, nouns also have the following differences: (a) the subject in English takes the common case and the subject in Ukrainian can take the nominative case or any other case when part of a compound subject; (b) the Ukrainian language allows the omission of copula before the subjective complement; (c) in English, objects are taken by intransitive verbs while, in Ukrainian, other parts of speech objects; (d) objective complements appear after factitive verbs in English while they are viewed as distinct types of objects in Ukrainian; (e) the differences in the realization of attributive function of nouns correspond to the differences noun phrase modification in the two languages; (f) adverbial modifiers expressed by prepositional phrases with nouns require prepositional government in Ukrainian while no such thing is relevant for the English language.

Lastly, the most isomorphic features are found in the syntactic properties of English and Ukrainian nouns **in patterning two-member incomplete and one-member sentences** in addition to **non-sentence utterances**. The same is true for other nominal parts of speech representing substantiality but for Ukrainian demonstrative pronouns without the function of objective complements and attributes.

Overall, from the analysis conducted in this research, it can be observed that English and Ukrainian have both isomorphic and allomorphic features. Furthermore, we can **conclude** that the allomorphic features in the language means of representing substantiality of the two contrasted languages are accounted for by the analytical nature of English and the synthetic one of the Ukrainian language.

The results of this research can be taken as a basis for further studies in the topic of substantiality in various fields. For instance, the highlighted allomorphic features can serve as a ground for **translation studies**, especially in the realm of literary translation, where production of the same stylistic effect may be hindered by these differences. The aim of such research would be to propose certain strategies to overcome the specified obstacle. This type of study would require an extensive list of illustration materials to underline particular cases where it would be essential to represent substantiality and its features the way they are represented in the source text. In addition, this study can be taken into the field of **pragmatics** to investigate the ways in which language means of representing substantiality are utilized in certain contexts, paying a lot of attention to non-normative uses and the intentions behind them.

## RÉSUMÉ

Дослідження на тему «Мовні засоби репрезентації предметності в сучасних англійській і українській мовах: морфосинтаксичний аналіз» присвячене зіставному аналізу іменників, віддієслівних іменників, займенників, числівників та субстантивованих прикметників в двох мовах. Дипломна робота складається зі вступу, трьох розділів, загальних висновків, списку літератури та списку ілюстративних джерел.

У першому розділі «**Theoretical Fundamentals of the Contrastive Study of the English and Ukrainian Language Means Representing Substantiality**» («Теоретичні засади зіставного вивчення мовних засобів репрезентації предметності англійської та української мов») розглядається морфологічна та синтаксична класифікації мов, типологія частин мови в досліджуваних мовах, іменник як лексико-граматичний клас та інші частини мови на позначення предметності.

У другому розділі «**Morphological Analysis of the Language Units Representing Substantiality in Modern English and Ukrainian**» («Морфологічний аналіз мовних одиниць репрезентації предметності в сучасних англійській та українській мовах») проводиться аналіз морфологічних особливостей іменника, його структури, вираження категорій числа, відмінка, роду та означеності/неозначеності, морфологічних характеристик віддієслівних іменників, займенників, числівників та субстантивованих прикметників в англійській та українській мовах. Також в результаті цього аналізу визначаються ізоморфні та аломорфні риси двох мов.

У третьому розділі «**Syntactic Analysis of the Language Units Representing Substantiality in Modern English and Ukrainian**» («Синтаксичний аналіз мовних одиниць репрезентації предметності в сучасних англійській та українській мовах») вивчаються синтаксичні особливості іменників та інших мовних одиниць на представлення предметності з метою встановити спільні та відмінні риси.

**Ключові слова:** типологія, морфосинтаксичний аналіз, предметність.

## LITERATURE CITED

1. Арполенко, Г. П., Городенська, К. Г., & Щербатюк, Г. Х. (1980). *Числівник української мови*. Наукова думка.
2. Бобкова, Т. В. (2008). Системні і функціональні характеристики категорії числа українських і російських іменників. *Вісник Житомирського державного університету імені Івана Франка*, (39), 162-165.
3. Вакарюк, Л. О., Панцьо, С. Є. (2007). *Український словотвір у термінах*. Словник-довідник. Джура.
4. Вихованець, І. Р. (1993). *Граматика української мови. Синтаксис*. Либідь.
5. Вихованець, І. Р., Городенська, К. Г. (2004). *Теоретична морфологія української мови*. Пульсари.
6. Волкова, Л. М. (2009). *Теоретична граматика англійської мови: Сучасний підхід*. Освіта України.
7. Воронцова, Г. Н. (1960). *Очерки по грамматике английского языка*. Издательство литературы на иностранных языках.
8. Галій, Л. Г. (2011). Дефініції валентності та сполучуваності у сучасному мовознавстві. *Науковий вісник Волинського національного університету імені Лесі Українки*, 1(6), с. 147-152.  
<https://er.nau.edu.ua/handle/NAU/20450>
9. Горпинич, В. О. (2004). *Морфологія української мови*. Академія.
10. Григор'єв, О. М., Долман, С. Є., Лисенко, Ю. В., Макаренко, Є. А., Мамалига, А. І., Марчук, Н. Й., Пазяк, О. М., Пономарів, О. Д., Різун, В. В., Фурдуй, М. І., & Шевченко, Л. Ю. (2005). *Сучасна українська мова (3-тє вид.)*. Либідь.
11. Грищенко, А. П., Мацько, Л. І., Плющ, М. Я., Тоцька, Н. І., & Уздиган, І. М. (2002). *Сучасна українська літературна мова (3-тє вид.)*. Вища школа.
12. Губарева, Г., & Калашник, Ю. (2019). Функції номінативних речень у творах Остапа Вишні. *Вісник Запорізького національного університету. Філологічні науки*, (1), 32-35. <https://doi.org/10.26661/2414-9594-2019-1-07>

13. Звонська, Л. Л., Корольова, Н. В., Лазер-Паньків, О. В., Левко, О. В., Лучканин, С. М., Миронова, В. М., Михайлова, О. Г., Лефтерова, О. М., Мосенкіс, Ю. Л., Ничаюк, С. П., Поліщук, А. С., Руда, Н. В., Шовковий, В. М., & Штиченко, І. Ю. (2017). *Енциклопедичний словник класичних мов*. ВПЦ «Київський університет».
14. Караман, С. О. (2011). *Сучасна українська літературна мова*. Літера ЛТД.
15. Корунець, І. В. (2003). *Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов*. Нова книга.
16. Кочерган, М. П. (1980). *Слово і контекст (Лексична сполучуваність і значення слова)*. Вища школа.
17. Крутько, Т. В. (2013). Особливості відтворення еліптичних речень з англомовних художніх текстів українською мовою. *Проблеми зіставної семантики*, (11), 459-464. [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pzs\\_2013\\_11\\_81](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Pzs_2013_11_81)
18. Леонова, М. В. (1983). *Сучасна українська літературна мова. Морфологія*. Вища школа.
19. Лобанова, В. В. (2019). Англійський займенник: роль та зміни у сучасній мові. *Англістика та американістика*, (16), 34-40. <https://doi.org/10.15421/381903>
20. Мещанинов, И. И. (1967). *Эргативная конструкция в языках различных типов*. Издательство «Наука».
21. Микитюк, О. (2013). Український займенник – основа творення національної неповторності. *Філологічні науки. Мовознавство*, 1(250), 67-71. <https://evnuir.vnu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/5597>
22. Ореховська, А. І. (2021). Способи вираження підмета в англійській мові. *Theoretical and empirical scientific research: concept and trends*, 2, 111-113. <https://doi.org/10.36074/logos-10.12.2021.v2.35>
23. Отрохова, О. П. (2021). *Дієприкметник в освітній документації: особливості граматичної норми* [Магістер. робота, Сумський державний педагогічний університет ім. А. С. Макаренка]. eSSPUIR. <http://repository.sspu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/12042>

24. Плющ, М. Я. (2005). *Граматика української мови: Ч. 2. Морфеміка. Словотвір. Морфологія*. Вища школа.
25. Пчелінцева, О. Е. (2019). Функціонально-граматична специфіка українських віддієслівних іменників зі значенням дії на фоні інших слов'янських мов. *Термінологічний вісник*, (5), 33-40. <https://doi.org/10.37919/2221-8807-2019-5-4>
26. Тернова, А. І. (2009). *Формування словотвірної структури і семантики множинних іменників у новій українській мові кінця XVII – початку XXI століття*. [Автореф. дис. канд. філол. наук, Державний вищий навчальний заклад «Запорізький національний ун-т»]. Національна бібліотека України ім. В. І. Вернадського. [http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis\\_nbuv/cgiirbis\\_64.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=ARD&P21DBN=ARD&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=fullwebr&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=A=&S21COLORTERMS=1&S21STR=Тернова%20А.І.](http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/irbis_nbuv/cgiirbis_64.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=ARD&P21DBN=ARD&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=fullwebr&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=A=&S21COLORTERMS=1&S21STR=Тернова%20А.І.)
27. Томусяк, А. (2017). Комунікативно-прагматичні виміри номінативних речень в англomовному художньому тексті. *Актуальні питання суспільних наук та історії медицини*, 1(13), 60-63. <https://doi.org/10.24061/2411-6181.1.2017.14>
28. Хантіль, М. Б. (2010). Субстантивація в англійській мові. У Л. П. Валенкевич (Ред.), *Матеріали науково-теоретичної конференції викладачів, аспірантів, співробітників та студентів гуманітарного факультету* (с. 122). Сумський державний університет. <https://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/16426/1/75.pdf>
29. Чепелюк, А. Д., & Ріщак, І. О. (2008). Еліптичні речення. *Матеріали науково-теоретичної конференції викладачів, аспірантів, співробітників та студентів гуманітарного факультету : конференція присвячена Дню науки в Україні та 60-річчю СумДУ, 21-25 квітня 2008 р., 1*, 74-75. <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/14626>

30. Шатрюк, А. І., & Вишняк, О. Я. (2016). Статус підмета та присудка в англійській граматиці. У С. О. Швачко, І. К. Кобякова, О. О. Жулавська та ін. (Ред.), *Перекладацькі інновації: матеріали VI Всеукраїнської студентської науково-практичної конференції* (с. 77-79). СумДУ. <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/46590>
31. Швець, О. В. (2018). Номінативні речення як засіб вираження почуттів та емоцій в англійській, французькій та українській мовах. *Science and Education a New Dimension. Philology*, 52(177), 57-60. <https://doi.org/10.31174/SEND-Ph2018-177VI52-14>
32. Шепель, Ю. О. (2017). *Особливості семантики віддієслівних іменників української та російської мов.* Academia. [https://www.academia.edu/40065353/ОСОБЛИВОСТІ\\_SEМАНТИКИ\\_ВІД\\_ДІЄСЛІВНИХ\\_ІМЕННИКІВ\\_УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ\\_ТА\\_РОСІЙСЬКОЇ\\_МОВ](https://www.academia.edu/40065353/ОСОБЛИВОСТІ_SEМАНТИКИ_ВІД_ДІЄСЛІВНИХ_ІМЕННИКІВ_УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ_ТА_РОСІЙСЬКОЇ_МОВ)
33. Щербій, Н. О. (2021). Реакція дієслівних іменників у польській та українській мовах. *Південний архів (філологічні науки)*, (85), 54-59. <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2663-2691/2021-85-8>
34. Aarts, B. (2011). *Oxford Modern English Grammar*. Oxford University Press.
35. Aarts, B., Chalker, S., Weiner, E. (2014). *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*, (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Oxford University Press.
36. Ágel, V., & Fischer, K. (2015). Dependency Grammar and Valency Theory. In B. Heine, & H. Narrog (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis* (pp. 225-258). Oxford University Press.
37. Alexiadou, A. (2001). *Functional Structure in Nominals: Nominalization and Ergativity*. John Benjamins Publishing.
38. Antonius Padua Hari Wibowo. (1999). *A Contrastive Analysis on Ellipsis in English and Indonesian Sentences* [Skripsi thesis, Sanata Dharma University]. USD Repository. <http://repository.usd.ac.id/id/eprint/11166>
39. Azuma, H. (2009). On Pronoun Referents in English. In J. O. Askedal, I. Roberts, T. Matsushita, & H. Hasegawa (Eds.), *Germanic Languages and Linguistic Universals* (pp. 163-175). John Benjamins Publishing.

40. Bauer, L. (1983). *English Word-formation*. Cambridge University Press.
41. Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G. N., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (2021). *Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. John Benjamins Publishing.
42. Britannica, T. Editors of Encyclopaedia (2016, March 21). *morphology*. Encyclopaedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/morphology-linguistics>
43. Brown, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Elsevier.
44. Christiansen, S. L., Iverson, C., Flanagin, A., Livingston, E. H., Fischer, L., Manno, C., Gregoline, B., Frey, T., Fontanarosa, P. B., & Young, R. K. (2020). *AMA Manual of Style – A Guide for Authors and Editors* (11<sup>th</sup> ed.). Oxford University Press.
45. Corbett, G. G. (2006). *Agreement*. Cambridge University Press.
46. Crystal, D. (1995). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Cambridge University Press.
47. Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Blackwell.
48. Dalmolin, H. (2010). *The New English Grammar: With Phonetics, Morphology and Syntax*. Tate Publishing.
49. Donovan, M. (2018). General Prohibition: A New Type of English Imperative. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, 24(1), 46-55. <https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol24/iss1/7>
50. Fries, C. C. (1952). *The Structure of English. An Introduction to the Construction of English Sentences*. Harcourt, Brace and Company.
51. Fromkin, V. (2011). *An Introduction to Language* (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
52. Garner, B. A. (2016). *The Chicago Guide to Grammar, Usage, and Punctuation*. The University of Chicago Press.
53. Greenbaum, S., & Nelson, G. (2013). *An Introduction to English Grammar* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Routledge.

54. Harrison, A. J. (2009). *Production of Subject-Verb Agreement in Slovene and English* [Doctoral thesis, The University of Edinburgh]. ERA. <http://hdl.handle.net/1842/5811>
55. Hengeveld, K., Rijkhoff, J., & Siewierska, A. (2004). Parts-of-speech systems and word order. *Journal of Linguistics*, 40(3), 527-570. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226704002762>
56. Herbst, T. (1988). A Valency Model for Nouns in English. *Journal of Linguistics*, 24(2), 265-301. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700011804>
57. Herbst, T., Heath, D., Roe, I. F., & Götz, D. (2013). *A Valency Dictionary of English: A Corpus-Based Analysis of the Complementation Patterns of English Verbs, Nouns and Adjectives*. Walter de Gruyter.
58. Hockett, C. F. (1964). *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. The Macmillan Company.
59. Hooper, J. B. (1979). Substantive Principles in Natural Generative Phonology. In D. A. Dinnsen (ed.). *Current Approaches to Phonological Theory*. Indiana University Press.
60. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
61. Ilc, G. (2016). Construction or Constructing? Some Observations on English Deverbal and Gerundial Nouns. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 13(2), 153-164. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.13.2.153-164>
62. Jespersen, O. (2013). *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles: Volume 2, Syntax (first volume)*. Routledge.
63. Jespersen, O. (2006). *Essentials of English Grammar*. Routledge.
64. Junaid, J. (2018). A Syntactic Analysis of the English Noun Phrase (A Study at the Fifth Semester of English Department Faculty of Teacher Training and Education University of Muhammadiyah Makassar). *PERSPEKTIF: Jurnal Pengembangan Sumber Daya Insani*, (3)1, 317-326. <https://doi.org/10.26618/perspektif.v3i1.1328>

65. Kim, J. (2014). Similarities and Differences between the Close and Loose Apposition in English. *English Language and Linguistics* 20(3), 79-98. <https://doi.org/10.17960/eil.2014.20.3.005>
66. Larson, R. K. (2010). *Grammar as Science*. The MIT Press.
67. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. (n.d.). Be. In *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Retrieved July 25, 2022, from <https://www.ldoceonline.com/dictionary/be>
68. Mairal, R., & Gil, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Linguistic Universals*. Cambridge University Press.
69. Merriam-Webster. (n.d.a). Pronoun. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved July 07, 2022, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/pronoun>
70. Merriam-Webster. (n.d.b). They. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved April 26, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/they>
71. *Morphosyntax*. (n.d.). Emory University. <http://linguistics.emory.edu/home/resources/polyglot/morphosyntax1.html#:~:text=Many%20linguists%20use%20the%20word,noun%20an%20adjective%20is%20modifying>
72. Niizuma, H. (1969). Notes on the Attributive Functions of Nouns. *北見工業大学研究報告* 2(3), 487-497. <http://id.nii.ac.jp/1450/00006225/>
73. O'Grady, W., Dobrovolsky, M., & Katamba, F. (Eds.). (1996). *Contemporary Linguistics: An Introduction* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Longman.
74. Pugh, S. I., & Press, I. (2005). *Ukrainian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge.
75. Putu Devi Maharani, & I Ketut Suartawan Mudayasa. (2020). Ellipsis Phenomenon in Sentences Found in Novel Sherlock Holmes. *SPHOTA: Jurnal Linguistik Dan Sastra*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.36733/sphota.v11i1.1149>

76. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1982). *A University Grammar of English*. Vysshaya Shkola.
77. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman.
78. Shahid, M. A., Syed, T. H., Syed, A. F., Shahbaz, K., & Ahmad, F. (2021). Morphosyntactic Analysis: A Study of English and Urdu. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 5(9), 78-85.
79. Sokolets, I. I., & Khanykina, N. V. (2021). Vocatives in English and Ukrainian. In *Philological Sciences, Intercultural Communication and Translation Studies: Theoretical and Practical Aspects* (pp. 124-128). Baltija Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-039-1-88>
80. Tallerman, M. (2015). *Understanding Syntax*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Routledge.
81. Trask, R. L. (2007). *Language and Linguistics: The Key Concepts* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Routledge.
82. Wallwork, A. (2018). *Top 50 Grammar Mistakes*. Springer International Publishing.
83. Zhluktenko Yu. O. (1960). *A Comparative Grammar of English and Ukrainian*. Radyanska Shkola.

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

1. Андрухович, Ю. І. (1994). *Аве, «Крайслер!»*. УкрЛіб.  
<https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/books/printit.php?tid=12772&page=4>
2. Андрухович, Ю. І. (2011). *Лексикон інтимних міст. Довільний посібник з геопоетики та космополітики*. Flibusta. <http://flibusta.is/b/258552/read>
3. Андрухович, Ю. І. (2000). *Московіада*. УкрЛіб.  
<https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/books/printit.php?tid=14241>
4. Андрухович, Ю. І. (1997). *Рекреації*. Укрліт.  
[http://ukrlit.org/andrukhovych\\_yurii\\_igorovych/rekreatsii/18](http://ukrlit.org/andrukhovych_yurii_igorovych/rekreatsii/18)
5. Вишня, О. (1984). *Фейлетони. Гуморески. Усмішки. Щоденникові записки*.  
Наук. думка.
6. Гончар, О. Т. (1970). *Циклон*. УкрЛіб.  
<https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/books/printit.php?tid=553&page=5>
7. Гончар, О. Т. (2017). *Людина і зброя*. «БУЛ».
8. Довженко, О. П. (1931). *Земля*. Ukrclassic.  
<https://ukrclassic.com.ua/katalog/d/dovzhenko-oleksandr/192-oleksandr-dovzhenko-zemlya>
9. Забужко, О. С. (2009). *Музей покинутих секретів*. УкрЛіб.  
<https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/books/printitzip.php?tid=2745>
10. Загребельний, П. А. (1968). *Диво*. Укрліт.  
[http://ukrlit.org/zahrebelnyi\\_pavlo\\_arhupovych/dyvo/65](http://ukrlit.org/zahrebelnyi_pavlo_arhupovych/dyvo/65)
11. Загребельний, П. А. (1983). *Південний комфорт*. Освіта.  
<https://osvita.ua/school/literature/z/69549/list-13.html>
12. Костенко, Л. (2011). *Записки українського самашедшого. А-БА-БА-ГА-ЛА-МА-ГА*.
13. Коцюбинський, М. М. (1912). *Тіні забутих предків*. Освіта.  
<https://osvita.ua/school/literature/k/63981/list-5.html>
14. Куліш, П. О. (1990). *Твори: Т. 2. Чорна рада: Хроніка 1663 року; Оповідання; Драматичні твори; Статті та рецензії*. Дніпро.  
[http://ukrlit.org/kulish\\_panteleimon\\_oleksandrovych/chorna\\_rada](http://ukrlit.org/kulish_panteleimon_oleksandrovych/chorna_rada)

15. Матіос, М. (1995). *Чотири пори життя*. Читиво.  
[https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Mariya\\_Matios/Chotyry\\_pory\\_zhyttia/](https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Mariya_Matios/Chotyry_pory_zhyttia/)
16. Мушкетик, Ю. М. (1985). *Обвал*. Освіта.  
<http://osvita.ua/school/literature/m/81154/list-37.html>
17. Нечуй-Левицький, І. (1890). *Над Чорним морем*.  
<https://osvita.ua/school/literature/n/71948/list-39.html>
18. Перетятко, Ю. (1989). *Семеніада (Збірка)*. Читиво.  
[https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Peretiatko\\_Yurii/Semeniada\\_zbirka/](https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Peretiatko_Yurii/Semeniada_zbirka/)
19. Прохасько, Т. (2010). *FM «Галичина»*. Лілея-НВ.
20. Савченко, В. (1997). *З того світу – інкогніто*. УкрЛіб.  
<https://www.ukrlib.com.ua/books/printit.php?tid=4150&page=4>
21. Свидницький, А. (1886). *Люборацькі*.  
<https://ukrclassic.com.ua/katalog/s/svidnitskij-anatolij/1829-anatolij-svidnitskij-lyuboratski/16>
22. Тесленко, О. К. (1982). *Доц*. Читиво.  
[https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Teslenko\\_Oleksandr/Dosch/](https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Teslenko_Oleksandr/Dosch/)
23. Трублаїні, М. П. (1945). *Шхуна «Колумб»*. Освіта.  
<https://osvita.ua/school/literature/t/75972/list-25.html>
24. Угляренко, П. (1977). *Тривожна ніч*. Читиво.  
[https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Uhliarenko\\_Petro/Tryvozhna\\_nich/](https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Uhliarenko_Petro/Tryvozhna_nich/)
25. Шкляр, В. М. (2009). *Залишинець. Чорний ворон*. Освіта.  
<https://osvita.ua/school/literature/sh/78234/list-2.html>
26. Шкляр, В. М. (1999). *Ключ*. Освіта.  
<https://osvita.ua/school/literature/sh/78220/list-40.html>
27. Шкляр, В. М. (2014). *Маруся*. Читиво.  
[https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Shkliar\\_Vasyl/Marusia/](https://chtyvo.org.ua/authors/Shkliar_Vasyl/Marusia/)
28. Alcott, L. M. (1996). *Little Women*. Gutenberg.  
<https://www.gutenberg.org/files/514/514-h/514-h.htm>
29. Baker, A., Gilbert, W. S., Sullivan, A., & Henty, T. (2009). *Thespis Or the Gods Grown Old*. Lulu.com

30. Barrie, J. M. (1991). *Peter Pan*. Gutenberg.  
<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/16/16-h/16-h.htm>
31. Bradbury, R. (1953). *Fahrenheit 451*. Ccsoh.  
<https://www.ccssoh.us/site/handlers/filedownload.ashx?moduleinstanceid=16792&dataid=23409&FileName=Fahrenheit%20451.pdf>
32. Butler, O. E. (2003). *Kindred*. Beacon Press.
33. Butters, R. (1991). *Look about and die*. The Book Guild Ltd.
34. Corelli, M. (1900). *The Master-Christian*. Public Library. <http://www.public-library.uk/ebooks/61/92.pdf>
18. Curwood, J. O. (1923). *The Flaming Forest*. Gutenberg.  
<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/4702/4702-h/4702-h.htm>
36. Davies, Mark. (2004). *British National Corpus* (from Oxford University Press).  
<https://www.english-corpora.org/bnc/>
37. Don't Hug Me .I'm Scared. (2011, July 29). *Don't Hug me I'm Scared* [Video]. YouTube. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9C\\_HReR\\_McQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9C_HReR_McQ)
38. Jewell, A. (2004). *Ageing, Spirituality, and Well-being*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
39. Keogh, J. E., & Gray, J. S. (2002). *C++ Programmer's Notebook*. Prentice Hall PTR.
40. Klune, T. J. (2020). *The House in the Cerulean Sea*. Tom Doherty Associates.
41. Mandel, E. S. J. (2014). *Station Eleven*. Alfred A. Knopf.
42. Moreno-Garcia, S. (2020). *Mexican Gothic*. Del Rey.
43. Morgan, R., & Boardman, R. (2003). *Data Protection Strategy: Implementing Data Protection Compliance*. Sweet & Maxwell.
44. Morgenstern, E. (2019). *The Starless Sea*. Harvill Secker.
45. Neuman, A. (2012). *Traveler of the Century: A Novel*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
46. Owens, D. (2018). *Where the Crawdads Sing*. G.P. Putnam's Sons.
47. Paik, L. (2011). *Discretionary Justice: Looking Inside a Juvenile Drug Court*. Rutgers University Press.

48. Pulavarthy, V. (2022). *Uniquely United*. Bishara Publication.
49. Reid, T. J. (2017). *The Seven Husbands of Evelyn Hugo*. Washington Square Press.
50. Sampson, E. S. (2009). *The Comings of Cousin Ann*. Gutenberg.  
<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/28439/28439-h/28439-h.htm>
51. Sedgwick, A. D. (2020). *Franklin Kane*. Books on Demand.
52. Shakespeare, W. (1597). *Romeo and Juliet*. The Literature Network.  
[http://www.online-literature.com/shakespeare/romeo\\_and\\_juliet/27/](http://www.online-literature.com/shakespeare/romeo_and_juliet/27/)
53. Thapar, V. (1999). *Tiger: Portrait of a Predator*. Pavilion Books.
54. Tillet, S. (2021, February 5). Can an Abuser Make Amends? 'The Color Purple' Points the Way. *The New York Times*.  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/05/movies/onscreen-abuse-hollywood-movies.html>
55. *Wilkinson v. Leland*, 27 U.S. 627 (U.S. Sup. Ct. 1829).  
<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/27/627/>
56. Woolf, V. (1931). *The Waves*. Gutenberg.  
<http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks02/0201091h.html>