_____

UDC 811.161.2+ 1'37

ONTOLOGICAL FEATURES OF STATICS AND DYNAMICS AS DIFFERENTIAL ATTRIBUTES OF PREDICATES

Halyna Kutnia

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,
The department of Ukrainian Language,
1/234, Universytets'ka Str., Lviv, Ukraine, 79001
phone: (0 322) 239 47 17
e-mail: kutnia@ukr.net

The article is devoted to the problems of predicate typology from the point of structural semantics and functions. Statics and dynamics as the differential attributes of the process, action, state, quality predicates have been analyzed.

Key words: statics, dynamics, predicate, action, process, state, quality.

Problem setting. Differentiation of predicates has long time tradition. By establishing criteria for this or that group of attribute words the linguists refer to the classification of Aristotle. The Greek philosopher distinguished three basic categories describing the relations in the real world: essence, state and relations – in logical and linguistic interpretation the researchers equate them to predicate signs. Logical field of 'state of things' is universal for all the languages, but is filled with real meaning only in a specific linguistic cover. Therefore, classification of predicate units, being of general character, appeals to specific linguistic content. Predicative meanings show close relations between linguistic functions and notion categories. The latter ones are expressed in lexical, morphological and syntactic systems.

Predicate groups are subordinated to specific requirements: every class of these units should have semantic features that would clearly delineate the field of certain grammatical notions and would be present in syntactic rules. According to the principles of semantic identification to such attributes belong non-substantive (paradigmatic approach) and substantive (syntagmatic approach) components. Non-substantive semes within the structure of a predicative sign determine morphological and lexical peculiarities of the units connected with time. Such attributes of physical time as linearity, length, vector, segmentation, etc. are reflected in attributes which are grouped by categories of temporality and aspectuality. If the first category includes 'external' characteristics of general time, then the second one reflects 'internal' temporal peculiarities of the action. One of such internal features of verbal predicates is binary opposition dynamics / statics, the characteristic of which is an **aim of the research.**

Topicality of the research is stipulated by the necessity to conduct deeper structural and semantic analysis of different types of predicates, which, apart from their semantic universality, in every language have their grammatical and lexical peculiarities.

Analysis of latest researches and publications. In Ukrainian linguistics the issue

_____

of predicate system is studied by many scholars. In particular, the scholars study structural and semantic and grammatical peculiarities of sentences forming different types of attribute words [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, 24, 27]. In recent years researchers of grammar address secondary units, transposition processes, semantic complications of sentences due to the reduction of complex structures [13, 16]. Linguistics, in particular, Ukrainian one, clearly identifies semantic differential attributes of predicates [6, 7, 14, 19, 20, 27], however**,** despite the fact that there are a lot of publications on this topic, research of dynamics / statics as key semantic peculiarities of predicates of state and quality, as well as locativity and quantity have not been analyzed as yet.

Main part of the research. Classifications aimed at analysis of predicate internal features are often defined by morphologized approach, as the key means of expressing an attribute word is a verb. Close relations of lexical, morphological and syntactical fields can be traced in the process of analysis of the verb and predicate. Thus, in some works of the researchers of syntax classes of verbs are likened to the classes of predicates, and predicates – to the types of situations reproduced by semantic models of the sentence [4, 29, etc.].

Traditionally predicates are divided into two generalized classes – 'action' and 'state', or 'process' and 'state'. Such differentiation reflects ontology of dynamic (action, process) and static phenomena (state). As it is known, such a division is related to the deep hierarchical division of verbs: "Grammar books all the time attempt to show the difference between the meanings of the verbs expressing 'action' from those expressing 'state' (mechanical movement and state in which a person or an object can be)" [18: 322].

When it goes about distinguishing types of predicates, Ukrainian grammar includes both temporal and substantial characteristics, with latter being taken as the basis. Such an approach is convincing one, as non-predicate words are more characterized by paradigmatic semes, while predicate ones – by syntagmatic, as those that potentially determine a valent model of the sentence. The article is based on the variant of predicate typology developed by I. Vykhovanets [6]. Following him and other Ukrainian linguists [7, 17, 19, 20, 27] we distinguish action, process, state and quality as key functional and semantic types of predicates and also quantitative and locative predicate syntaxemes [6: 256]. These units differ according to the content-related oppositional features: dynamics / statics, temporal locality, stage, activity / passivity of the subject. Large number of categorized semantic features present in the predicate structure reveals complexity of this linguistic sign. Functional and semantic field of the predicate is a macrostructure which is formed by the grammar elements of the language in combination with lexical and word-building ones. Attribute word combines in itself universal and idioethnic, and its meaning is related to a number of linguistic levels.

Within the aspect of grammatical semantics, dynamics / statics is defined as one of the differential features of a predicate that is related to its temporal characteristic. Philosophy of language rightly binds time to the image of the predicate-verb, and associates space with the substantive characteristics of the model of reality: in the consciousness of a man objectivity is associated with the spatial and qualitative and quantitative parameters of objective reality, while procedural – with the existence of material bodies in the flow of time. The analyzed opposition is based on the physical concepts of statics and dynamics of action. Its main substantive opposition concerns the temporal interpretation of the predicate. Selected categorical opposition is a powerful semantic parameter of the predicate, subordinated to the conceptual foundations of the attribute word – existence in space and time. The categorical component of dynamics (statics) is also distinguished at the

_____

lexical level of the predicate word. That is why, following this dichotomous feature traditional grammar has identified the axiomatic notions for the verb such as 'action' and 'state'. The division associated with such a distinction of verb vocabulary also covers the predicate signs. According to the categorical features, units that denote action in a broad sense qualify as dynamic. Static are those that have a stable, absolute temporal nature. Therefore, predicates of action and process are characterized with an attribute of dynamics, predicates of state and quality are characterized with that of statics.

In the Ukrainian language verbs are lexicalized by the analyzed opposition: dynamics / statics has no morphological indicators, native speakers mostly determine the degree of activity of the verb-predicate a priori, based on knowledge of the semantics of the unit, which gives grounds to consider it to be a hidden category. Hidden categories have different meanings to characterize a predicate unit. Usually 'concealment' is a characteristic feature of the lexical level. Lexical attributes serve as distinguishing features, as they are constants for the predicate and semantic model of the sentence. However, those features, which depend on the external factors of the utterance, have a modifying character. They arise in certain actualized situations and for the predicate play the role of speech concretizers, pointing to the possibility of combination with different adverbial modifiers.

Oppositional features of dynamics / statics are related not only to the lexical peculiarities of the verb, but also grammatical ones – they are related to the semantics of the aspect-related meanings of the verb, therefore, they can be considered in the plane of aspectuality [15: 59]. In particular, verbal predicates can be analyzed at the background of 'internal threshold' which is an aspectual feature characterizing temporal limit of the action and is correlated with aspect semantics. According to this feature, boundary (limiting) are those verbs the meaning of which includes time restrictions; non-boundary (non-limiting) – where this restriction is absent [21: 11]. Internal threshold is present in all the verbs of the perfective aspect, as in such verbs this feature is expressed grammatically, and selectively – in those of the imperfective aspect: this feature in such verbs has lexical expression. Regarding the latter ones, this feature is present only in those imperfect forms, the action of which is aimed at the result shown by the corresponding perfect form. According to such interpretation, we consider that to the boundary verbs belong such verbs as *розцвісти, побілішати, спорудити, розбудити,* as they indicate the result expressed in the form of a perfective aspect, as well as such verbs as *розцвітати, білішати, споруджувати, будити,* as their semantics is result-oriented. Non-boundary verbs are *блищати, яснітися, мерзнути, ненавидіти, сумувати*, as their semantic structure does not include the component 'oriented at completion'. Thus, the feature of internal threshold is peculiar for those verbs that are morphological expressions of dynamic predicates – action and process; it is absent in those verbs, which express static predicates – state. This classification of the predicate words shows correlative character of dynamics and statics features.

The opposition under analysis also correlates with other categorical attributes of the predicate, for example, with activeness / passiveness of action. Thus, dynamic predicates 'require' from the subject 'the flow of energy', while static ones do not. Relation with stage-related attribute lies in the fact that dynamic situations presuppose change of different, in terms of their character, stages (*бігти, намалювати, відрости, червонішати)*, while static ones – identical (*знати, висіти, любити, виднітися)*. Dynamics of action and process predicates on the one hand, and statics of state and quality on the other hand, are revealed in peculiarities of temporal localization.

Within the category under research the scholars mainly focused on the attribute of **statics**, which is present in the predicates of state [5: 32], [8: 55], [9: 16], [12: 15], [22: 5],

90   *Галина Кутня*

ISSN 2078-5119 Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філологічна. 2020. Вип. 72.

[24: 65], [25: 74], [29: 488]. Such focus is not accidental, as these predicates, irrespective of elementary sense structure – concentration of an attribute in a subject, are complex ones regarding their functionality. In linguistic literature apart from the term 'static' there are also such terms as 'stative', 'statal', 'statual', 'state'. The popular idea about interchangeability of these notions is not always justified, as it allows overlapping of aspectual and generic features. The notion of 'stativeness' is a general attribute of a category; 'states' and 'statives' have narrower meaning; 'statality', 'statuality' are more frequently used in the meaning of 'mode of action'. Philosophical understanding of static character as quietness provides for its adequate interpretation in the language. This notion includes two attributes of the predicate regarding time: 1) static feature of the subject regardless of time; 2) attribute that can include time characteristics. On this basis we differentiate between predicates of state and quality: one can virtually imagine the beginning or the end of a certain state, but not the attributes the object has. Nominative predicates of quality (properties) are 'panchronic' ones; they are beyond temporal characteristics. Statics of predicates of quality is an inseparable feature of a being or an object, indicating their peculiarity, difference from other beings or objects: *Сукня **довга**. Усі дівчата були **працьовитими**. Парубок **вродливий**. Пес неймовірно **злий**. Ганнуся **вродливіша** від сестри.*

Statics of predicates of state is ambiguous as they, contrary to dynamic predicates of action or process, can be expressed, apart from verbs, also by adverbs, nouns with prepositions and sometimes by adjectives, compare: *Хлопчик **спить**. Мені **сумно**. Він у **відчаї**. Марія **сумна**.*

State-related features of a verb can depend on the will of the subject *(Жінка стоїть)* or not *(Я мерзну)*. Regarding functionality the former are related to actions, as there is a possibility to paraphrase certain structures with such predicate words into passive constructions, compare: *Упорядкувати подвір'я* (action). *Бачити світ* (state) → *Упорядковане подвір'я. Бачений світ.*

In linguistics there is differentiation between temporal or physical states → *спати, горіти*; stable (mainly psychic) → *любити, ненавидіти*; irreversible (unchanged) → *бути смаженим, бути дорослим* [26: 6], [10: 16]. The latter ones can be considered within the category of the predicates of quality as they do not have temporal relations and are inseparable features of the subject. Predicate models *Хлопець голодний. Дівчина доросла. Курка смажена* indicate the features of subjects which are beyond temporal relations.

An inseparable component of verbal state is a feature of procedurality expressed by the imperfect aspect. The state does not have signs of internal threshold and it is expressed in aspect-related peculiarities – absence of a pair (perfective) form. Formation of a perfective form requires changes in the lexical and grammatical structure of the verb: the static balance of a subject is "ruined", consequently, the meaning of the predicate situation is changed: *Я хворію* → static situation; *Я захворію. Я перехворів* → change of state, dynamic situations.

Dynamics of verbal predicates is a complicated and multi-functional phenomenon which differs from static attribute, but has dialectic relations with it: formation of linguistic meanings transforms static features into dynamic ones, which different stages are related to certain stages of predicative situations. In general dynamics is a perceptive attribute: evaluating an event we estimate with the help of our senses the likelihood of action of

_____

process. On the one hand, such evaluation is related to the temporal prospect of a predicate, and on the other hand, – with the abilities of a subject-doer.

Dynamics is a major semantic attribute of action predicates and less important attribute of process predicates. The verbs in first predicate function have the meaning of actionality: their subject is an active doer. Action-related predicates are given broader functional possibilities than other types of predicates. They have better valent potential and, consequently, more extended valent frames, which can be illustrated by the sentence that apart from subject syntaxemes, have also object or addressee syntaxemes: *Шумів зелений лист, а голос той коханий про волю золоту **співав** мені (Lesia Ukrainka). Дівчата **дарували** хлопцям писанки (D. Pavlychko).* The highlighted predicates have features of causality and determinativeness related to the characteristics of the active subject-doer. A clear marker of "action" is conscious and determined character of the feature bearer.

Predicate units with the meaning of process are characterized by moderate expression of dynamics which in terms of its character is uncontrolled. Dynamic process is arbitrary, even spontaneous. This attribute is marked by the absence of active beginning in the situation reflected by these predicates. Its dynamics is motivated by objective factors of existence. It is shown in gaining or losing features of a subject. It can be external or internal changes that are perceived by visual, audial and tactile receptors and are related to certain properties of the environment, development of flora and fauna, physical and physiological states of people, etc.: *Вже надворі **вечоріло**, вже й **смеркалось** (I. Nechui-Levytskyi). Вигон і цвинтар **спустів** (I. Nechui-Levytskyi). …Була-бо весна, листя тільки **проросло**… (V. Shevchuk). Обличчя його ще більше **почорніло** (V. Shevchuk).* Dynamics of process predicates is a contradictory feature in a sense that it is not the result of subject's will.

It is the aspectual trait of dynamics aimed at indicators of aspect-related meanings which makes it possible to differentiate between 'unlocked' character of this feature (in the imperfective forms) and 'locked' (in the perfective units), which is well-correlated with division of predicates into 'processes' and 'actions'. This division is imposed on notions of: 1) duration → *А Сакуниха при тому ганьбленні стояла не своя, і **червоніла**, й **біліла**, й **сіріла**, й **чорніла**, й **зеленіла**…(V. Shevchuk);* 2) instantaneousness of the predicate action (process) → *Він [Балабуха] **зблід**, потім **почервонів**, потім знову **зблід** (I. Nechui-Levytskyi).*

As the analyzed attribute does not have grammatical indicators in the language, native speakers intuitively feel what is hidden behind the notion of dynamic or static attribute, how much the action process) is result-oriented. However, such subjective evaluation is partially supported grammatically. In linguistics there have been developed certain methods to identify these categorical attributes of the predicate. One of such means is 'elimination rules' [2: 88], which are based on the basis of logical disjunction (exclusion). Using these rules one can identify the character of predicate dynamics (active or passive), i.e. identify whether predicate belongs to action or process. It is identified that process predicates require the question What has happened (or is happening) to the subject?, while those of action do not take this question [28: 119], compare: *Людина старіє / постаріла*" → What is happening to a person?; *Дівчина читає / прочитала книжку*" → What is the girl doing?

Also widespread is the distributive method or 'inclusion in the context' [23: 41], [10: 22]. Its initial statement – 'the meaning of the words is identified through its combinability'. Remark of H. Zolotova that statics is a constant unchangeable attribute with a generalized, not actual meaning [11: 246], has been supported by those scholars that

92   *Галина Кутня*

ISSN 2078-5119 Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філологічна. 2020. Вип. 72.

_____

researched combinability of different predicates. To differentiate between dynamic and state predicates (evaluating the former as the attribute with temporal restrictions, and the latter one – without is) T. Alisova suggests the test question When*?* [1: 87]. According to the researcher, the question will be answered only with a dynamic predicate localized in time. This idea can be taken into consideration, but with some restriction: temporal states also can be extended by adverbial modifiers of time, compare: *Навесні вони **посіяли тут кукурудзу*** → action; *Лице* *тоді* ***поповнішало й покращало** (I. Nechui-Levytskyi)* → process; *Уночі він **спить** міцно* → temporal state. Presence in a dynamic action of such integral semes as 'development' or 'movement' also is reflected in the combinability with adverbial determinants. Thus, verbal states cannot be combined with the words *швидко, повільно* as they are incompatible with the idea of speed. One can say *Дерева швидко жовкнуть,* but the utterance *Хлопець швидко слабує* will be incorrect. The more 'concentrated' is the attribute of dynamics in a predicate, the higher is syntactic connection with the aforementioned adverbs. Exemplary from this point of view are 'process states', expressed by such verbs as *горіти, кипіти, варитися, блищати.* Even minor attribute of dynamics in such units allows combinability with adverbial modifiers with the meaning of speed: *Юшка вариться швидко.* In this sentence predicate attribute is perceived as generalized one, deprived of the meaning of actuality and clear temporal localization. The change of the state of the soup is a regular process of existence, that is why it can be considered as general attribute of the subject.

Among the methods of semantic modeling an efficient one is paraphrasing of utterances. Yu. Apresian states that transformation method is also a tool to identify semantic classes, and to distinguish meanings of polysemantic units [2: 543]. Thus, dynamic predicates of action aimed at the object can be transformed in passive forms (causative → caused form): *Хлопчик намалював дерево → Дерево намальоване; Мати зварила куліш → Куліш зварений.* Predicates, where action(process) are subject-oriented, do not have these attributes: *Хлопчик біжить. Дерево розцвітає.*

Conclusions. Thus, attributes of dynamics / statics projected at predicate typology are reflected in the peculiarities of each type of predicates. According to the analyzed attributes predicate system of the Ukrainian language is divided into two planes – dynamic (action and process) and static (quality and state). Within these planes predicates are differentiated according to their features. Thus, action is characterized by active, conscious dynamism on the part of the subject; process is arbitrary, passive with a feature of passive subject. In the field of structural and semantic analysis dynamics and statics can be considered separate microfields with a nuclear and periphery. The fact that the language has predicate units of syncretic character as to the identified features shows that the fields in question exist not in an isolated way, but overlap.

Results of the research of semantic attributes of dynamics / statics for primary predicates **can be further used** for the analysis of secondary units; in particular, when it goes about syncretic manifestations of such attributes.

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНОЇ ЛІТЕРАТУРИ

1.   *Алисова Т. Б.* Очерки синтаксиса современного итальянского языка (Семантическая и грамматическая структура простого предложения): Монография / Т. Б. Алисова. – Москва : Изд. Московского ун-та, 1971. – 293 с.

_____

2.   *Апресян Ю. Д.* Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства языка: Монография / Ю. Д. Апресян. – Москва : Наука, 1974. – 367 с.

3.   *Апресян Ю. Д.* Синтаксическая обусловленность значений // Апресян Ю. Д. Избранные труды : в 2 т. / Ю. Д. Апресян. – Москва: Языки русской культуры, 1995. – Т. 2: Интегральное описание языка и системная лексикография. – С. 538–553.

4.   *Булыгина Т. В.* К построению типологии предикатов в русском языке / Т. В. Булыгина // Семантические типы предикатов / отв. редактор О. Н. Селиверстова. – Москва : Наука, 1982. – С. 7–85.

5.   *Васильев Л. М.* Предикаты состояния в русском языке / Л. М. Васильев // Исследования по семантике (Семантика языка и речи) : сб. статей. – Уфа : БГУ, 1991. – С. 32–49.

6.   *Вихованець І. Р.* Граматика української мови. Синтаксис : підручник / І. Р. Вихованець. – Київ : Либідь, 1993. – 368 с.

7.   *Вінтонів М.* Семантичні вияви предикатів процесу в сучасній українській мові / М. Вінтонів // Наукові записки. – Вінниця : ВПУ. – 2001. – С. 23–28. – (Серія філологічна; № 3).

8.   *Володина Г. И.* Описание семантических классов предикатов в целях преподавания русского языка как неродного: Научное пособие / Г. И. Володина. – Москва : МГУ, 1989. – 127 с.

9.   *Загнітко А. П.* Дієслівні категорії в синтагматиці і парадигматиці : монографія / А. П. Загнітко. – Київ : НКМ ВО, 1990. – 129 с.

10.   *Зализняк А. А.* Исследование по семантике предикатов внутреннего состояния : монография / А. А. Зализняк // Slavistiche Beitrage. – Мюнхен, 1992. – Band 298. – 201 с.

11.   *Золотова Г. А.* Коммуникативные аспекты русского синтаксиса : монография / Г. А. Золотова. – Москва : Наука, 1982. – 368 с.

12.   *Кузнецов А. М.* Структурно-семантические параметры в лексике : монография / А. М. Кузнецов. – Москва: Наука, 1980. – 160 с.

13.   *Кульбабська О. В.* Вторинна предикація у простому реченні : монографія / О. В. Кульбабська. – Чернівці : Чернівецький нац. у-т, 2011. – 672 с.

14.   *Кутня Г.* 'Активність / пасивність суб'єкта' в контексті структурно-семантичного аналізу предиката / Г. Кутня // Вісник Львівського університету. – Львів, 2003. – С. 11–21. – (Серія філологічна ; вип. 30).

15.   *Кутня Г.* Аспектуальна характеристика предикатів процесу в сучасній українській мові / Г. Кутня // Філологічні студії. Науковий часопис. – Луцьк, 2002. – №1. – С. 59–66.

16.   *Кутня Г.* Віддієслівні іменники як вторинні предикати процесу: структурно-семантичні, словотвірні та граматичні особливості / Г. Кутня // Вісник Львівського університету. – Львів, 2018. – С. 77–87. – (Серія філологічна ; вип. 68).

17.   *Кутня Г.* Онтологічні параметри часової локалізованості та фазовості в канві структурно-семантичного аналізу предикатів / Г. Кутня // Лінгвістичні студії: зб. наук. праць. – Донецьк : Дон НУ, 2008. – Вип. 16. – С. 119–124.

18.   *Кучеренко І.* Дієслово // Кучеренко І. Теоретичні питання граматики української мови: Морфологія. – Вид. 2. – Вінниця : Поділля-2000, 2003. – С. 303–330.

_____

19. *Леута О. І.* Дієслівні речення в українській літературній мові: структура, семантика, моделі : автореф. дис. на здобуття ... д-ра філол. наук: 10.02.01. – українська мова / О. І. Леута ; Ін-т укр. мови НАН України. – Київ, 2009. – 35 с.

20. *Масицька Т. Є.* Граматична структура дієслівної валентності : монографія / Т. Є. Масицька. – Луцьк : ВДУ ім. Лесі Українки, 1998. – 208 с.

21. *Маслов Ю. С.* Очерки по аспектологии : монография / Ю. С. Маслов. – Ленинград: ЛГУ, 1984. – 264 с.

22. *Матвеева Т. В.* Лексико-семантические группы русских глаголов: Словарь-справочник / Т. В. Матвеева. – Свердловск : Изд. Уральского ун-та, 1988. – 152 с.

23. *Москальская О. И.* Проблемы системного описания синтаксиса (на материале немецкого языка) : монография / О. И. Москальская. – Москва : Высшая школа, 1981. – 175 с.

24. *Пірус Г. О.* Предикати відношення в українській мові: семантико-граматичний аспект : автореф. дис. на здобуття ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.01. – українська мова / Г. О. Пірус ; НАНУ Ін-т мовознавства. – Київ, 2004. – 15 с.

25. *Пітінов В. М.* Дієслова дії, стану і процесу як одиниці класифікації дієслів у сучасній німецькій мові / В. М. Пітінов // Мовознавство. – 1976. – №6. – С. 65–71.

26. *Теньер Л.* Валентность / Л. Теньер // Теньер Л. Основы структурного синтаксиса : монографія. – Москва : Прогресс, 1989. – С. 250–653.

27. *Тимкова В. А.* Двоскладні речення з предикатами якості в українській мові : дис. на здобуття ... канд. філол. наук: 10.02.01. – українська мова / В. А. Тимкова ; Нац. пед. ун-т. – Вінниця, 1997. – 175 с.

28. *Чейф У.* Значение и структура языка : монография / У. Чейф. – Москва : Прогресс, 1975. – 482 с.

29. *Lyons J.* Semantics and grammar / J. Lyons // Semantics. – Cambridge : Cambridge university press, 1979. – Vol. 2. – P. 373–597.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Alisova, T. B. (1971). *Ocherki sintaksisa sovremennogo italyanskogo yazyika (Semanticheskaya i grammaticheskaya struktura prostogo predlozheniya): monografiya.* Moskva: Izd. Moskovskogo un-ta.

2. Apresyan, Yu. D. (1974). *Leksicheskaya semantika. Sinonimicheskie sredstva yazyika: monografiya.* Moskva: Nauka.

3. Apresyan, Yu. D. (1995). Sintaksicheskaya obuslovlennost znacheniy. *Izbrannyie trudyi: v 2 t. T. 2: Integralnoe opisanie yazyika i sistemnaya leksikografiya: monografiya.* Moskva: Yazyiki russkoy kulturyi.

4. Bulyigina, T. V. (1982). K postroeniyu tipologii predikatov v russkom yazyike. *Semanticheskie tipyi predikatov.* Moskva: Nauka.

5. Vasilev, L. M. (1991). Predikatyi sostoyaniya v russkom yazyike. *Issledovaniya po semantike (Semantika yazyika i rechi): sb. statey.* Ufa: BGU.

6. Vykhovanets, I. R. (1993). *Hramatyka ukrainskoi movy. Syntaksys: pidruchnyk.* Kyiv: Lybid.

7. Vintoniv, M. (2001). Semantychni vyiavy predykativ protsesu v suchasnii ukrainskii movi. *Naukovi zapysky. Seriia filolohichna.* Vinnytsia: VPU, *№3,* 23–28.

_____

8.	Volodina, G. I. (1989). *Opisanie semanticheskih klassov predikatov v tselyah prepodavaniya russkogo yazyika kak nerodnogo: nauchnoe posobie.* Moskva: MGU.

9.	Zahnitko, A. P. (1990). *Diieslivni katehorii v syntahmatytsi i paradyhmatytsi: monohrafiia.* Kyiv: NKM VO.

10.	Zaliznyak, A. A. (1992). Issledovanie po semantike predikatov vnutrennego sostoyaniya: monografiya. *Slavistiche Beitrage.* Myunhen, *Band 298.*

11.	Zolotova, G. A. (1982). *Kommunikativnyie aspektyi russkogo sintaksisa: monografiya.* Moskva: Nauka.

12.	Kuznetsov, A. M. (1980). *Strukturno-semanticheskie parametryi v leksike: monografiya.* Moskva: Nauka.

13.	Kulbabska, O. V. (2011). *Vtorynna predykatsiia u prostomu rechenni: monohrafiia.* Chernivtsi: Chernivetskyi nats. u-t.

14.	Kutnia, H. (2003). 'Aktyvnist / pasyvnist subiekta' v konteksti strukturno-semantychnoho analizu predykata. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriia filolohichna.* Lviv, *Vyp. 30.*

15.	Kutnia, H. (2002). Aspektualna kharakterystyka predykativ protsesu v suchasnii ukrainskii movi. *Filolohichni studii. Naukovyi chasopys.* Lutsk, *№1.*

16.	Kutnia, H. (2018). Viddiieslivni imennyky yak vtorynni predykaty protsesu: strukturno-semantychni, slovotvirni ta hramatychni osoblyvosti. *Visnyk Lvivskoho universytetu. Seriia filolohichna.* Lviv, *Vyp. 68*

17.	Kutnia, H. (2008). Ontolohichni parametry chasovoi lokalizovanosti ta fazovosti v kanvi strukturno-semantychnoho analizu predykativ. *Linhvistychni studii: zb. nauk. prats.* Donetsk: Don NU, *Vyp. 16*

18.	Kucherenko, I. (2003). Dieslovo. *Kucherenko I. Teoretychni pytannya hramatyky ukrainskoi movy: Morfolohiya.* Vinnytsya: Podillya-2000, *Vyd. 2.*

19.	Leuta, O. I. (2009). *Diieslivni rechennia v ukrainskii literaturnii movi: struktura, semantyka, modeli: avtoref. dys. na zdobuttia … d-ra filol. nauk: 10.02.01. – ukrainska mova.* Kyiv.

20.	Masytska,T. Ye. (1998). *Hramatychna struktura diieslivnoi valentnosti: monohrafiia.* Lutsk: VDU im. Lesi Ukrainky.

21.	Maslov, Yu. S. (1984). *Ocherki po aspektologii: monografiya.* Leningrad: LGU.

22.	Matveyeva, T. V. (1988). *Leksiko-semanticheskie gruppyi russkih glagolov: slovar-spravochnik.* Sverdlovsk: Izd. Uralskogo un-ta.

23.	Moskalskaya, O. I. (1981). *Problemyi sistemnogo opisaniya sintaksisa (na materiale nemetskogo yazyika): monografiya.* Moskva: Vyisshaya shkola.

24.	Pirus, H. O. (2004). *Predykaty vidnoshennia v ukrainskii movi: semantyko-hramatychnyi aspekt: avtoref. dys. na zdobuttia … kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01. – ukrainska mova.* Kyiv.

25.	Pitinov, V. M. (1976). Diieslova dii, stanu i protsesu yak odynytsi klasyfikatsii diiesliv u suchasnii nimetskii movi. *Movoznavstvo, №6.*

26.	Tenier, L. (1989). Valentnost. *Tener L. Osnovyi strukturnogo sintaksisa: monografiya.* Moskva: Progress.

27.	Tymkova V. A. *Dvoskladni rechennia z predykatamy yakosti v ukrainskii movi.: dys. na zdobuttia … kand. filol. nauk: 10.02.01. – ukrainska mova.* Vinnytsia.

28.	Cheyf, U. (1975). *Znachenie i struktura yazyika: monografiya.* Moskva: Progress.

_____

29.   Lyons J. (1979). Semantics and grammar. *Semantics.* Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

ОНТОЛОГІЧНІ ВЛАСТИВОСТІ СТАТИЧНОСТІ / ДИНАМІЧНОСТІ ЯК ДИФЕРЕНЦІЙНІ СЕМАНТИЧНІ ОЗНАКИ ПРЕДИКАТІВ

Галина Кутня

Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка,
кафедра української мови,
вул. Університетська, 1/234, Львів, Україна, 79601
тел.: (80 322) 296 47 17
e-mail: kutnia@ukr.net

Розглянуто онтологічну бінарну опозицію статичності / динамічності як одну з основних диференційних ознак предикатної типології, яка охоплює такі основні семантичні типи предикатів, як дія, стан, процес та якість.

Динамічними можна вважати ті одиниці, що позначають дію в широкому розумінні, статичними – що мають стабільний, абсолютний часовий характер. Відтак, у контексті предикатної типології предикати дії (*Я читаю*) та процесу (*Чоловік мудрішає*) наділені властивостями динамічності, а стану (*Дівчата сумують*) та якості (*Дівчата вродливі*) – статичності. В українській мові дієслова лексикалізовані за аналізованою опозицією: позаяк вона не має морфологічних показників, носії мови здебільшого визначають динамічність чи статичність апріорно, на основі семантики одиниці, що дає підстави вважати її прихованою категорією. Аналізована ознака стосується не лише лексичних, а й граматичних значень: у канві дієслівного вираження предиката розглядаємо її в тісному зв'язку зі семантикою видових значень – аспектуальністю.

Ознака **статичності** як філософське розуміння спокою охоплює дві ознаки: 1) сталу властивість суб'єкта безвідносно до часу; 2) ознаку із часовими властивостями. Ознака статичності неоднорідна морфологічно: наприклад, предикати стану виражаються дієсловами, прислівниками, прикметниками, іменниками. Статичні предикати можуть мати різні ознаки у функціонально-семантичному аспекті: залежати чи ні від волі суб'єкта; бути часовими чи незворотними; вони не наділені ознакою внутрішнього порогу.

Ознака **динамічності**, властива діям і процесам, перцептивна ознака: вона пов'язана з часовою перспективою предиката, а також із можливостями діяча-суб'єкта. Ознака динамічності для різних типів предикатів має свої особливості: предикати дії акціональні (суб'єкт – активний виконавець), каузативні, часто цілеспрямовані; для предикатів процесу динамізм помірний, некерований із боку суб'єкта, мотивований об'єктивними чинниками буття. Динамічність корелює із часовою тривалістю чи миттєвістю, відзначається реальним чи потенційним значенням часового порогу.

У встановленні прихованих значень динамічності / статичності застосовано та проілюстровано граматичні прийоми: 'правило закреслювання' (на основі логічної диз'юнкції), дистрибутивний метод (включення в контекст), метод трансформації.

Ключові слова: динамічність, статичність, предикат, стан, дія, процес, якість.