

UKRAINIAN PAREMIAS: LAWS OF CREATION

^aVICTOR BRITSYN, ^bTETIANA SUKALENKO, ^cLIUDMYLA MARCHUK, ^dOLGA SAKHAROVA, ^eMARINA PAUK

^a*Institute of Linguistics of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Hrushevsky Street, 4, 01001, Ukraine*

^b*State Tax University Universytetska str., 31, Irpin, Kyivska region, Ukraine*

^c*Kamianets-Podilskyi National Ivan Ohienko University, Ohienko str., 61, Kamianets-Podilskyi, Hmelnytskyi region, Ukraine*

^d*Ukrainian National Tchaikovsky Academy of Music, Architect Gorodetsky str., 1-3 / 11, 01001, Ukraine, Kyiv*

^e*Mukachevo State University Mukachevo, Uzhgorodska Street, 26, 89600, Ukraine*

email: ^avmbritsyn@ukr.net, ^bsukalenko78@gmail.com,

^clyudmylamarchuk60@gmail.com, ^dolsakh@ukr.net,

^emarina.pauk72@ukr.net

Abstract: The article highlights one of the main ways of creating Ukrainian paremias, which is a determinant limitation of the scope of judgment. This strategy transforms categorical general judgments, often marked by aphorisms, imagery, and even paradoxicality, into non-categorical ones. This function is inherent in all singular forms of the noun, including in the nominative case. The objectives of the research: to determine the ability of the nominative case forms of nouns to perform determinant functions in Ukrainian proverbs, as well as to establish the most frequent lexico-semantic groups of nouns in this function. The complex of research methods is used in the work: The study is based on a descriptive method, and also uses lexico-semantic, transformational and frequency analysis. Theoretical results: observations on nouns in the nominative case, which reveal a determinant function, expand theoretical ideas about the repertoire of forms of expression of determinants and duplexes, show new, not yet fixed possibilities of the language system. Empirical results: The application of the method of continuous sampling allowed determining the most frequent in the composition of proverbs lexical groups of forms of the nominative case with determinant functions. The vast majority here are substantivized adjectives that name persons. The most common among them are the names of people by mental abilities, by ethical qualities, by state of health, by alcohol consumption, by age, by wealth, by education. Rarely, determinative word forms of the noun in proverbs are a means of naming abstract entities.

Keywords: Determinants, Duplexes, Lexical-semantic groups, Semantic structure of paremias, Ukrainian paremias.

1 Introduction

One of the characteristic features of proverbs, which determines their nature, is that they reproduce certain generalized judgments and do not serve as a means of denoting specific situations of reality that the speaker directly observes [1]. This determines the uniqueness of the semantics of the proverbs components, especially the non-reference reading of their arguments. The same temporal disconnection with the moment of speech characterizes the predicates of proverbs; here the denotations of predicates do not lie on the time axis, but convey certain generalized manifestations abstracted from reality, manifestations that are not a direct reflection of specific situations.

This non-referential nature of arguments and timelessness of predicates determine the predicative bases of proverbs to categorical general judgments, which are characterized by the fact that they attribute the predicate characteristic to each subject of the class. Logical schemes of such judgments have the form *All S is P* or *None S is P*. In linguistic activity, categorical general judgments are used relatively rarely, because, as a rule, there are always exceptions that deny categoricity – one can always find facts that confirm the position that *Not all S are P* or *Some S are not P*.

One of the strategies to transform categorical general judgments into non-categorical ones is to introduce into proverbs the members of the sentence that limit the conditional space of realization of the judgment placed in the predicative basis [10]. Such members of the sentence have a characteristic formal feature – prepositionality. Their semantic-syntactic function, given the relation to the whole predicative basis, can be characterized as determinant. According to the analysis of Ukrainian proverbs, the removal of such prepositional determinant limiters leads to the formation of logically

unmotivated paradoxical or banal judgments. For example: *Without the owner the yard cries, and without the mistress – the house* (UPP: 85). *The yard cries; There is no learning without torment* (UPP: 110). *There is no learning; From the profit the head does not hurt* (UPP: 345). *The head does not hurt; for the fool there is no mountain, but all the plain* (UPP: 249). *There is no mountain, and all the plain* (UPP: 249); *In bad times even the god-parent is for the dog* (UPP: 268). *And the god-parent for the dog* [4].

Such clarifying prepositional clauses in proverbs reveal features of bifunctionality. On the one hand, they demonstrate the ability to belong to the whole sentence and determine the validity of the statement containing the predicative basis of the sentence, and this gives grounds for classifying such word forms as determinants, in the strict sense of determinants found in early works of Yu. Shvedova [5, p. 629]. On the other hand, one cannot fail to notice the obvious fact that restrictive word forms also retain proverbial connections with specific members of a sentence. For example, in the proverb *“In the good mistress even the rooster pays”*, the restrictive syntaxeme may indicate the condition under which the *rooster pays*, and may be a definition of the word *mistress*. This feature gives grounds for bringing them closer to the members of the sentence with double relations, which are called duplexes [2, p.47-50, 5, 7, p. 4].

2 Materials and Methods

The material of Ukrainian proverbs gives grounds for a number of theoretical clarifications regarding the properties of determinants. In particular, it has become a classic statement that determinants are included in a sentence as its distributor, not formally associated with any word form [6, p. 624, 9, p. 239-240]. No less common is the opinion that only secondary members of a sentence can be determinants: “determinants are secondary members of a sentence that do not depend on a single word, but on the grammatical center of the sentence as a whole and express circumstantial meanings” [8, p. 139]; determinants “are not included in the structural minimum of a two-syllable or one-syllable sentence” [3, p. 531].

As mentioned above, the presence of features of duplexes does not prevent restrictive word forms in proverbs to combine determinant functions with proverbial connections, which denies the first of these opinions as too categorical. Clarification of the second and third of the above ideas about the repertoire of word forms with determinant functions is based on the facts of use in proverbs as a limiter of forms of the nominative case of nouns.

The article is devoted namely to this common phenomenon. The study is based on a descriptive method, and also uses lexico-semantic, transformational and frequency analysis.

3 Results

There are 200 examples of Ukrainian proverbs in which prepositional word forms of the nominative case become a means of limiting the scope of fairness of judgments. However, we observe this under rather harsh conditions, because the role of the subject in the structure of a sentence inherent in the forms of the nominative case prevents the appearance of “wrapping” determinant properties in them. Restrictive functions are given only to those nouns that have a clear semantics in their meaning nature. These are, first of all, substantivized adjectives. In the case of prepositional use, they actualize the attributive seme, which acquires the characteristics of a condition within which a judgment expressed on a predicative basis is fair. For example: *Rich man does not like to give* (UPP: 24); *The lazy man does everything with all his might* (UPP: 113); *A healthy man does not understand sick one* (UPP: 211); *Fool is rich with thoughts* (UPP: 251); *The evil one beats himself* (UPP: 265); *Drunk is worse than a rabid dog* (UPP: 319). The actualization of the attributive seme is evidenced by the synonymous connections of these proverbs: *If a person is rich, he does not like to give; If a*

person is lazy, he does everything sitting; If a person is healthy, he does not understand the ill person; If a person is stupid, he is rich in thought; If a person is evil, he beats himself; If a person is drunk, he is worse than a rabid dog.

In the case of experimental elimination of such actualized attributive features, judgments expressed in proverbs acquire paradoxical features: *Man does not like to give; Man does everything hard; A man does not understand the ill person; Man is rich in thought; Man beats himself; A man is worse than a rabid dog* [4].

The vast majority of forms of the nominative case with determinant functions are substantivized adjectives that name persons. Analysis of such designations of persons in proverbs allows concluding that, firstly, their range is limited in inventory, and secondly, Ukrainian paremias show a very clear differentiation in the frequency of involvement of different types of persons who become subjects of paremic expressions. Although there are about 50 types of proverbial names in proverbs, most of them are few.

3.1 Names of Persons by Mental Abilities

In the preposition, such forms of the nominative case are fixed in 42 proverbs. Of these, 22 examples are high mental abilities, denoted by the nouns *clever* (14 proverbs), *wise* (8 proverbs).

In the content of proverbs, mainly, we see mainly the opposition of the *wise* to the *stupid*, *fool*: *The wise will teach, and the fool will torment* (UPP: 241); *The wise man will be warmed by fire, and the foolish will be burned* (UPP: 245); *A wise man cares, but a fool obtains from God* (UPP: 245); *A wise man loves to teach himself, and a fool loves to teach another* (UPP: 245); *The wise is silent when a fool shouts* (UPP: 245); *The wise will not be surprised, but the fool will not see* (UPP: 245); *The wise will judge, but the fool will condemn* (UPP: 245); *A wise man is afraid of words, but a fool is not afraid of a stick* (UPP: 245); *A wise man teaches, a fool edifies* (UPP: 245) [4].

These paremic judgments, as can be seen from the examples, are mostly expressed by compound sentences; only in two cases we observe a conjunctionless and compound sentence. Therefore, these examples go beyond the research material – simple sentences. The peculiarity of these sentences is that they convey judgments about the differences between situations in which the subject is wise and stupid. In most cases, the predicates of these situations are systemic or contextual antonyms: *silent – screams, afraid – not afraid, warms – burns, teaches – torments, learns – teaches, judges – condemns, teaches – edifies*.

The form of a simple sentence with the prepositional noun *clever* is represented by the following examples: *Clever gives order to everything* (UPP: 245); *The clever one goes forward and looks back* (UPP: 245); *The wise will not stumble twice on one stone* (UPP: 245); *The clever one does not climb under the table* (UPP: 245); *The clever prepares everything in advance* (UPP: 245) [4].

These sentences, among other things, have signs of judgment and demonstrate synonymous connections with complex sentences with contractual conditions in which we observe the actualization of the sign *clever* (*wise*). Cf.: *If a person is clever, he puts everything in order; If a person is wise, he will not stumble twice on one stone*. By means of explicit or implicit actualization of a sign narrowing of limits of realization of judgment is reached. Another reason for the actualization is that in this way the semantic motivation to include proverbs in the text is achieved: they are introduced when it comes to the presence or absence of a sign of *reasonableness* in actions. In the proverb *The clever goes forward and looks back*, which informs about the typical behavior of the clever person, the sign *clever* does not receive such a motivational load, and, therefore, the transformation of the proverb into a sentence *If a person is clever, he goes forward and looks back* in which the sign *clever* acts as a motivation of predicate signs *to go, look around*, looks a bit artificial. This test gives grounds not to involve the form of

the noun in this sentence to units with the function of a limiter of the sphere of fairness of judgment.

The word form *wise* is also opposed to the word form *stupid*, which determines the use of compound sentences with the conjunction *a* (*while, but*). For example: *A wise man has a tongue in his heart, while a fool has a heart in his tongue* (UPP: 243); *The wise man is silent, but will teach a hundred fools* (UPP: 243); *The wise man thinks what he says; while the foolish man says what he thinks* (UPP: 243); *The wise will change his minds, but the fool will never change* (UPP: 243); *A wise man does not say everything he knows, while a fool does not know everything he says* (UPP: 243) [4].

As part of a simple sentence, the prepositional form *wise* is presented in the following paremias: *The wise man makes way to the fool* (UPP: 243); *The wise man will not be led by the nose* (UPP: 243); *The wise man does not climb under the table* (UPP: 243) [4].

The first example is about ordinary actions, and, therefore, in the word form *wise* there is no semantic actualization of the sign *wise*. In the second and third examples, we observe judgments in which actions marked by predicates are dependent on the wisdom of the subject. This is confirmed, in particular, by the synonymous equivalents of these proverbs: *If a person is wise, he will not allow to lead him by the nose; If a person is wise, he does not climb under the table*.

Prepositional word forms to denote a subject with low mental abilities are less common – in 20 proverbs. Of these, 11 cases fall on the word form *fool* and 9 – on the word form *stupid*. Unlike proverbs, in which the subject is a bearer of high mental abilities, these proverbs are rarely based on antithesis. Opposition to the *clever/wise* is observed only in two proverbs, expressed by compound sentences: *The stupid man betroths, but the wise marries* (UPP: 173); *A fool seeks out a good place, but a wise man will be seen in a corner* (UPP: 251) [4].

The peculiarity of these proverbs is that their judgments are built by comparing typical situations inherent in the *stupid* and *wise*, and therefore, the semantics of the components does not contribute to the actualization of attributive semes. This is evidenced by the lack of the possibility of synonymous transformation in some cases with predicative actualization of the attributive seme: *If a person is stupid, he woos, and if wise – marries*.

A similar property is observed in the following proverbs that convey the typical manifestations of the subject: *A fool sleeps, and happiness lies in the heads* (UPP: 250); *Stupid and small ask what they see* (UPP: 250); *The fool asks the wise why he has a better mind* (UPP: 251); *A fool trembles on a sleigh, and a shroud lies beneath him* (UPP: 251) [4].

They are also difficult to turn into a sentence with an actualized attribute seme: *If a person is stupid, he sleeps, while happiness lies in his head; If a man is foolish, he asks the wise why he has a better mind; If a person is stupid, he trembles on a sleigh*.

Usually proverbs with the subject *fool, stupid* demonstrate the ability to actualize the attributive seme, which determines the condition of realization / non-realization of a certain action by the subject. For example: *Stupid has no grief* (UPP: 250); *Stupid will not buy the mind even in Kiev* (UPP: 250); *Stupid is rich with thoughts* (UPP: 251); *A fool is rich in thought* (UPP: 249); *Fool will break makogin even in makita* (UPP: 250); *Fool will burn house, so he is glad with the fire* (UPP: 250); *A fool will go overseas and return still as a fool* (UPP: 250); *A fool will throw even an empty cart on a level road* (UPP: 250); *Fool laughs at funerals* (UPP: 250); *The fool will not be silent* (UPP: 250); *A fool does not grieve, drinks vodka and smokes a pipe* (UPP: 250); *A fool dislikes the wise, but a drunkard dislikes the sober* (UPP: 250); *Fool to Kyiv, fool from Kyiv* (UPP: 362) [4].

Proverbs and prepositional forms of the noun that characterize a person by his ethical qualities are widespread in proverbs: *angry*

(8 examples), *evil* (3 examples), *good* (5 examples). For the most part, these word forms actualize the attributive seme, as evidenced by their synonymous connections with complex conditional sentences, in which this seme acquires explications. Cf.: *The evil one will spoil the good, but he will not become good himself* (UPP: 265) *If a person is evil, he will spoil the good, but will not become good himself*; *Evil thinks as evil* (UPP: 265) *If a person is evil, he has evil thoughts*; *Evil man perishes by evil* (UPP: 267) *If a person is in calamity, he perishes in calamity*; *Good is brother to a fool* (UPP: 262) *If a man is good, he is a fool's brother*; *The good do not do evil and is not afraid of anything* (UPP: 262) *If a person is good, he does not do evil and is not afraid of anything*. Proverbs where the attributive seme does not receive actualization include the following: *The evil one sleeps, and sees dreams about evil* (UPP: 265); *Evil ones know evil because they do not leave it* (UPP: 266) [4].

Prepositional designations of subjects are also common in the proverbs on such ethical grounds as *laziness*, *avarice*: *lazy* (8 examples), *sluggish* (2 examples), *stingy* (7 examples). Most often, proverbs with these subjects, expressed by substantivized adjectives, show signs of judgments in which the attributive seme of the subject is the basis for forming a certain conclusion about the properties of the subject. For example: *A miser is poorer than a beggar* (UPP: 297); *Stingy shakes over a penny* (UPP: 297); *The stingy men live like beggars and die like the rich* (UPP: 298); *The lazy man does everything sitting* (UPP: 113); *Lazy one will die as lazy* (UPP: 119); *Lazy will die even near finished bread* (UPP: 113). Cf.: *If a person is stingy, he is poorer than a beggar*; *If a person is stingy, he shakes over a penny*; *If people are stingy, they live like beggars and die like the rich*; *If a person is lazy, he does everything sitting*; *If a person is lazy, he dies also as lazy*; *If a person is lazy, he will die even near ready-made bread* [4].

A notable group of prepositional subject syntaxes are word forms – the names of human health (15 examples). The most common word forms are represented by *blind* (8 examples). Word forms are *crooked*, *one-eyed*, *healthy*, *sick*, *seeing* are used once, *deaf* – twice. For example: *Blind does not need a mirror* (UPP: 217); *The blind man does not guide the blind man* (UPP: 217); *The deaf do not hear, he invents* (UPP: 216); *A healthy man does not understand the one who is sick* (UPP: 211); *The sick man praises health* (UPP: 213); *The seer will not enter the swamp* (UPP: 257) [4].

In these examples, as in most proverbs with the subjects of the analyzed group, we see the actualization of the attributive seme, which becomes a means of limiting the fairness of judgment. This is evidenced by synonymous equivalents: *If a person is blind, he does not need a mirror*; *If a person is blind, he is not a guide to the blind*; *If a person is deaf, he does not hear but invents*; *If a person is healthy, he does not understand the ill one*; *When a person is sick, he praises health*; *If a person is sighted, he will not get into the swamp*. In the proverb *The blind man does not carry a spoon behind his ear* (UPP: 217), the sign *blind* becomes a means of expressing not restrictive but permissible relations, which is confirmed by synonymous transformation: *Although a person is blind, he does not carry a spoon behind his ear*. The lack of actualization of the attributive seme in the considered group is observed only in the following two proverbs: *Blind catches up with the curve* (UPP: 217); *The blind man walks better than a guide leads* (UPP: 217). Cf.: *If a person is blind, he catches up with the one-eyed person*; *If a person is blind, he walks better than if a guide leads* [4].

Proverbs are common for people who are drunk or addicted to alcohol. The nouns *drunk* (9 examples) and *drunkard* (5 examples) are used to denote them, respectively. In the proverbs, not all subjective syntaxemes demonstrate the ability to actualize an attribute in order to limit the scope of fairness of judgment. This property is observed in the following proverbs: *Drunk is worse than a rabid dog* (UPP: 319); *Drunk fights, jumps, but when wakes up – cries bitterly* (UPP: 319); *Drunk will not light candles* (UPP: 319); *The drunken mind takes away* (UPP: 319); *Drunk is as small child: what is in the mind, the same is in the*

tongue (UPP: 319); *A drunkard seems brave, but when he falls asleep, he is afraid even of a pig* (UPP: 319); *Drunk is as a child: tells the truth even reluctantly* (UPP: 319); *A drunkard will drink even from a lamp* (UPP: 319); *A drunkard will sleep of a binge, but a fool will never* (UPP: 319). In the proverb *Drunk is brother to a fool* (UPP: 319); *Drunk and thief are brothers* (UPP: 319); *Drunkard and pig are the same titles* (UPP: 319); *Drunkard: he drank his pants and bragged* (UPP: 319); *A drunkard is the last man* (UPP: 319), actualization of the sign does not take place [4].

There are 12 examples of *age signs*, of which 7 proverbs contain the substantivized adjective *old* and 5 proverbs – *young*: *The old knows a lot, but forgotten even more* (UPP: 209); *The old man thinks about the old* (UPP: 209); *Young people are bending on all sides* (UPP: 208); *The young man will overcome everything* (UPP: 208) [4].

In the given examples, it is possible to state existence of processes of actualization of an attributive seme which becomes means of restriction of fairness of judgment. Cf.: *If a person is old, he knows a lot but has forgotten even more*; *If a person is old, he thinks about the old*; *If a person is young, he bends in all directions*; *If a person is young, he will survive everything*. Proverbs with age-marked subjects are characterized by the opposition of subjects *old* and *young*. For example: *Old people spin while young people learn* (UPP: 209); *The old man wants to sleep but the young man wants to go for a walk* (UPP: 209); *The young may die, but the old must* (UPP: 208, 218); *When young people quarrel, they rejoice, when old people quarrel – they go ape over* (UPP: 339) [4].

In these complex sentences, we observe the mutual actualization of attributive signs, which testify to the synonymous convergence of these proverbs with the sentences in which the sign finds explication.

4 Discussion

Large groups include prepositional nouns to denote the *subject's wealth* (11 examples). Among them, the word forms *rich*, *wealthy* predominate, the prepositional word form *poor* is recorded only in the proverb *Poor is Karmalyuk's brother* (UPP: 365), which demonstrates synonymous connections with complex sentences containing subordinate clauses: *If a person is poor, he is Karmalyuk's brother*. In most cases of the prepositional use of the word form *rich*, it is possible to state the actualization of the attributive seme, which acquires restrictive functions. For example: *Rich edges all in the small pieces* (UPP: 24); *The rich man complains that he has little* (UPP: 24); *The rich say what we will eat, while the poor say whether we will eat* (UPP: 24); *The rich eat when they want something, and the poor eat when something happens* (UPP: 24); *The rich eat better on Wednesday than the poor on Easter* (UPP: 24); *The rich do not like to give* (UPP: 24); *The rich whisper with the godmother, but the poor with the bag* (UPP: 24); *Rich as a horned bull: does not fit in a narrow gate* (UPP: 24). Only three proverbs do not actualize, as evidenced by the impossibility of explicating the attributive seme: *The rich wonder what the poor eats* (UPP: 24) *If a man is rich, he wonders with what the poor eats*; *Rich as he wants, and poor as he can* (UPP: 24) *If a man is rich, he is as he wants, and the poor as he can*; *The rich man does not praise another rich man – he glorifies him* (UPP: 24) *If a man is rich, he does not praise another rich – he glorifies him* [4].

A relatively small group (6 examples) is formed by subjects united by the sign of education: *Literate is seeing everything and is intelligent* (UPP: 237); *Literate can read lines and between lines* (UPP: 237); *Illiterate will not read even with glasses* (UPP: 237); *The educated man walks, but the ignorant stumbles after him* (UPP: 238); *The literate leads, while the ignorant wanders after* (UPP: 239); *The literate sees more at night than the illiterate during the day* (UPP: 240) [4]. All of them reveal the actualization of the attributive seme.

Designation of the subject by the pronoun *inside* are also widespread in proverbs (7 examples): *Inside is always worse*

than alien (UPP: 198); *Inside man, if doesn't bite, will pinch* (UPP: 199); *Inside man is better than devil: though he overthrows, he does not oppress* (UPP: 199); *Inside man will shake his own over the vortex, but will not throw into the water* (UPP: 199); *Inside man sees his relative from afar* (UPP: 199, 327); *Inside man at least through people pokes disaster in the chest* (UPP: 199); *If inside man does not cry, he will at least grimace and make it easier* (UPP: 340) [4].

The peculiarity of this pronoun subject is that in all registered cases of use it demonstrates the actualization of the attributive seme affiliation, which outlines the limits of fairness of judgment. This is indicated by the regular presence of synonymous equivalents, in which the attributive seme is explicated in the form of the predicate of the subordinate conditional part: *If someone is inside man, he is always worse than alien man; If someone is inside man, if he does not bite, he will pinch; If someone is inside man, he is better than the devil: although he overthrows, he does not press.*

According to three examples of substantivized adjectives, there are subjects that characterize a person on the grounds of arrogance, speed: *Proud one is a brother of stupid* (UPP: 289); *Proud and stubborn are worthless* (UPP: 289); *The arrogant is a brother to foolish* (UPP: 290); *Quick one will not warm up place, and sitting man feels cold even in place* (UPP: 306); *The quick will not warm the place, and the lazy will not die in one place* (UPP: 306); *The quick will not warm the place, and the lazy die even on one place* (UPP: 114) [4].

In the above examples, the actualization of the attributive seme is observed in the noun *quick*, which in compound sentences contrasts with other nouns to denote persons. This, in particular, confirms the presence of synonymous equivalents: *If a person is fast, he will not warm the place, and sitting and feels cold even sitting on one place; If a man is fast, he will not warm the place, and the lazy will not die in one place; If a person is fast, he will not warm the place, and the lazy will die even on one place.*

Two examples of substantivized adjectives have been recorded to denote persons who are carriers of the traits *timid, patient, full, hungry, sweet*: *Coward dies a thousand times, but brave only once* (UPP: 310); *Cowardly is afraid even of fleeing man* (UPP: 310); *Patient person starves to death* (UPP: 44); *The patient beats the strong* (UPP: 312); *The full does not understand the hungry, the old – the young, the rich – the poor* (UPP: 28); *The full is not a friend to the hungry* (UPP: 29, 332); *Hungry is not afraid even of a stick* (UPP: 43); *Hungry and the dog does not woof* (UPP: 43); *Dear girl has been crying for seven years for her dear one* (UPP: 164); *Cute and unwashed white* (UPP: 164) [4].

From the above list of proverbs, only the penultimate does not actualize the attributive seme, which is indicated, in particular, by the impossibility of transforming a proverb into a complex sentence with a contracted conditional part: *If a woman is sweet, she cries for seven years for her loved one.*

Substantiated adjectives, denoting the bearers of the signs of the *unbeaten* are used only once (*Unbeaten is silver, beaten is gold*) (UPP: 238), *sly* (*Sly, seeming wise, still is entangled in his webs*) (UPP: 289), *capricious* (*Capricious only boils water*) (UPP: 297), *envious* (*Envious dries up of someone else's happiness*) (UPP: 298), *naked* (*Naked does not call the hungry*) (UPP: 30)), *strong* (*Strong and rich are never guilty*) (UPP: 33), *stubborn* (*Stubborn is worse than a pig*) (UPP: 295), *good* (*Good to hell for money*) (UPP: 158), *angry* (*Angry is never full*) (UPP: 268), *bald* (*Bald man sees another bald man from afar*) (UPP: 158), *rescued* (*Rescued dies twice, but the unsaved only once*) (UPP: 218), *drowning* (*The drowning man grabs a sword*) (UPP: 367), *a horseman is not a comrade on foot* (UPP: 332). This also includes the example of the substantivized adjective (*Stinged by a snake is afraid even of rope*) (UPP: 310) and ordinal number (*The first is incomplete, the second is incompetent, the third is weedy, the fourth – without a quarter, the fifth is without heel, the sixth – without honor, the seventh is the same, the eighth is*

short, the ninth is without a house, the tenth is with a mustache, give me away, my mother!) (UPP: 172) [4].

In all the above proverbs, except the first and last, we observe the actualization of the attributive feature, which limits the scope of fairness of the judgment that contains the proverb.

In addition to the designation of a person, substantivized adjectives in proverbs can also be a means of naming inanimate objects and abstract entities. The number of such word forms is relatively small – they are fixed in 17 proverbs. The most common are word forms that reflect their sign *own – alien*, it is fixed in five proverbs: *The own dear, though rotten* (UPP: 340); *The own is better than devil: though he overthrows, he does not oppress* (UPP: 340); *The own puts on feet, but the alien underfoots* (UPP: 340); *Own will follow even fist, but alien does not want to follow even soft roll* (UPP: 340); *Alien will bite in the ass* (UPP: 341). Slightly lower frequency is characteristic of word forms that reflect the opposition of *good and evil*: *Good is remembered for a long time, but bad for even longer* (UPP: 262); *Evil does not love the good* (UPP: 267); *Evil will not perish like oil on top of water, it will flow* (UPP: 267); *Evil will not die, although his happiness will leave* (UPP: 267). Other word forms of this group occur once: *Stolen first sweet and then bitter* (UPP: 303); *Taken by force is not useful* (UPP: 307); *Borrowed is not eaten, everything must be given* (UPP: 346); *The things belonging to rich and the lord will never perish* (UPP: 24); *Boyish – saddled, maiden – waited* (UPP: 154); *Judged – not spoiled* (UPP: 174); *Small is cute, but bigger – worse* (UPP: 194) [4].

5 Conclusion

Thus, the analysis shows that in the composition of proverbs, nouns in the nominative case get the ability to develop a determinant function. This property is inherent primarily in substantivized adjectives and is associated with the actualization of the attributive seme. The regularity of the processes of semantic “splitting” of the word into components shows certain symmetry of the laws of the language system. It forms the means of expression not only by condensing of semes, as demonstrated by the processes of substantivization, but also by disintegrating and actualizing of semes. The latter gives the word form rather exotic syntactic properties, which, however, are widely established in the Ukrainian paremy fund. Actualized attributive semes, acquiring determinant functions, serve as a means of limiting the scope of fairness of paremic judgment. Given the universal logical nature of this technique, we can assume its applicability to the formation of paremias in other languages.

Linguocultural analysis of paremias allows, on the basis of accumulated information of cultural and historical nature, to identify existing value-significant ideas of the ethnos, especially about man in the set of certain properties, qualities, activities, his attitude to the world, his understanding of important categories of the world. The relevance of the study is determined by the growing interest in studying the interdisciplinary problem of the relationship between language and culture, which in the last third of the 20th century led to the emergence of a new scientific paradigm – linguoculturology. In addition, the relevance of this area of research is due to the need to study the role of language in shaping the personality traits of a particular linguistic and cultural continuum, as well as insufficient study of language units such as paremia as a means of verbal representation of basic categories of the world, including the subject category.

The paper contains a description of the composition and semantic content of paremiological units within the linguistic and cultural approach. The role of paremiological formations in the categorization and representation of the psychophysical world of ethnocultural personality, as well as ideas about the spatio-temporal continuum is shown. Thus, the work makes a certain contribution to the study of the relationship between language and culture, in particular, secondary semiosis, the peculiarities of the formation of concepts that reflect the content and cultural and historical connotations of paremiological meanings.

The study shows that man in the categorization and conceptualization of the real world historically appeals to a wide range of linguistic means, acting as a secondary nomination of objects, phenomena of the real world, that determines the need for further deepening of studies in this field.

The limitations of presented study include small size of the considered samples, while the main limitation still is the narrow focus on one language of non-international nature and the absence of comparisons. However, the scope of article did not allow conducting full-fledged comparative study, thus it will be the topic of our further studies in the field.

Literature:

1. Bilodid, I.K. (Eds.). (1972). *Modern Ukrainian literary language. Syntax*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukr.).
2. Chesnokova, L.D. (1973). *Semantic types of members of a sentence with double relations: Materials for a special course. Part II*. Rostov on Don (in Rus.).
3. Kulbabska, O.V. (2011). *Secondary predication in a simple sentence*. Chernivtsi (in Ukr.).
4. Mishanich, S.V., & Pozyaka, M.M. (Eds.). (1984). *Ukrainian proverbs and sayings (UPP)*. Kyiv.
5. Popovych, N.M. (2013). The problem of classification of the duplex in Ukrainian linguistics. *Scientific Bulletin of Chernivtsi University*. Issue 645: Romano-Slavic discourse, 47–50. Chernivtsi (in Ukr.).
6. Shvedova, N.Yu. (1970). *Grammar of the modern Russian literary language*. Moscow: Nauka (in Rus.).
7. Tomusiak, L.M. (1999). *Semantic-syntactic organization of sentences with duplexes*. Abstract for PhD thesis in Philology: 10.02.01. Ivano-Frankivsk (in Ukr.).
8. *Ukrainian language. Encyclopedia*. (2004). Kyiv: Publishing House "Ukrainian Encyclopedia". M.P., Bazhana (in Ukr.).
9. Vykhoanets, I.R. (1993). *Grammar of the Ukrainian language. Syntax: textbook*. Kyiv: Lybid (in Ukr.).
10. Vykhoanets, I.R., Horodenska, K.H., & Rusanivskyi, V.M. (1983). *Semantic and syntactic Structure of the sentence*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka (in Ukr.).

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AI, AJ