

Флорій Бацевич

ORCID: 0000-002-6141-8318

Ярослава Сазонова

ORCID: 0000-0001-9249-448X

UDC 811.161.2'42

DOI: 10.31558/1815-3070.2023.45.6

**CONTEXTS OF THE REALIZATION OF DISCURSIVE WORDS  
COMMUNICATIVE SENSES (AS EVIDENCED BY THE LEXEME ЯКОСЬ)**

*Розглядаються проблеми залежності вияву комунікативних смислів дискурсивних слів (ДС) від типів контекстів їх реалізації в дискурсі й наративі. На матеріалі прикладів уживань лексеми 'якось' у текстах художньої літератури виділені контексти її втілення, пов'язані з домінантами модусів сприйняття і представлення світу наратором, функційно-комунікативними аспектами мовлення, власне змістовим представленням у наративній історії або дискурсі, а також модальності розгортання наративу як опису події. Врахування цих контекстів дозволило уточнити смислове наповнення лексеми 'якось' та специфіку її полісемної організації.*

**Ключові слова:** текст, дискурс, наратив, дискурсивні слова, дискурсивні звороти, комунікативний смисл.

**Setting of the problem and its relevance.** Recent studies of discursive words (DW) within the scope of communicative and functional approaches analyze them as the elements of a language code that unites the content of the narration (a narrative story) and the means of its textual representation (a narrative discourse). DWs are metalanguage components of a narration (a text, a discourse), to some extent. Unlike words, which are usually considered notional and are defined in dictionaries declaratively, i.e., via a proposition, the semantic-pragmatic volume of a DW and a discursive construction (DC) is explicated in a formalized way, which means it is a complex of operations (procedures) on the plane of content of utterances that model discourses, texts and their constituents – narrations, dialogues, reflections, descriptions, etc.<sup>1</sup> DWs, which are usually used in texts of different functional styles, belong to various word classes such as particles, adverbs, some types of pronouns, conjunctions and prepositions; with regard to their functional-syntactic features, DWs mostly serve as adverbial modifiers of different types, parenthetical constructions as well as phraseologized complexes (for more detail see (Ситар 2017)). Despite the importance of DWs and DCs in the functioning of a narrative story discourse, their content organization remains mainly unclear, first, because of the indistinct concord of their semantic and pragmatic elements. The article aims at analyzing these aspects of the general problem.

**Theoretical background. The aim and tasks.** It has been proved that DWs and DCs have a highly specific content organization and the semantic-pragmatic potency that significantly depends on the functional-communicative and contextual-situational

<sup>1</sup> For more information about the nature of DWs see (Бацевич 2010, 2014).

factors. However, in lexicographic practice, they are usually defined as if they were notional words, whose content organization depends on the propositive constituents of the communicative units, which means it coordinates with the narrative story. Moreover, the pragmatic features of these language code units often remain inexplicit<sup>2</sup>, which influences the practical realization of the problem of their polysemous or homonymous representation in dictionaries (see more about this in (Глібчук, Добосевич 2016; Добосевич 2012; Кушлик 2000)). It is mainly explained by the fact that the researchers do not take into account the series of factors of the textual-discursive link “addresser – addressee” and, in particular, the lack of a complete typology of the contexts of DWs and DCs realization. A set of contextual factors that influence the realization of DWs semantic-pragmatic potency is analyzed in one of our earlier works (Бацевич 2014). These factors belong to the contexts of a historical epoch, culture, functional styles and genres, the structure of the narrative story, the directions of the narration unfolding, the personality of the narrative instance and its representation / non-representation in the diegesis, moduses and modalities of the author’s (narrator’s) perception of the world. Besides, the analysis shows that the content textual (discursive, narrative) unfolding of DWs also depends on the series of other contexts, first of all, of the inter-narrative nature. We will try to explicate some of them later in this research accounting for the textual-discursive objectivation of the lexeme *якось*. To detail the specificity of the content organization of this lexeme of discursive character we will compare its explicated semantic-pragmatic objectivations that, on the one hand, are detected in oral speech and appear in texts in The Ukrainian Language Corpus; on the other hand, are defined in dictionaries, firstly, in Great Explanatory Dictionary of Modern Ukrainian Language (GEDMUL) and in The Ukrainian Language Dictionary in 11 volumes (ULD).

**Object and subject of the research. Research methods.** The object of the study is fragments of texts collected from The Ukrainian Language Corpus as well as examples recorded by the authors in the oral spontaneous speech of Ukrainian native speakers. The subject of the study is the contexts of the use of the lexeme *якось* in the mentioned sources. The research is based on methods developed within various trends of structural linguistics, first of all, the method of the component analysis of the content of the analyzed lexeme in different contexts, transformational analysis of sentences that contain and do not contain the DW *якось*, as well as methods and techniques based on modern discourse-analysis and intent-analysis to study the means of the language code: taking into account the broad textual context, as well as the possible intentions of the text creators.

**Scientific novelty. Theoretical and practical significance of the study.** The scientific novelty and theoretical significance of the research lie in the explication of the contexts of objectivation of actual senses (communicative senses) of the lexeme *якось* as a typical representative of DWs. The identification and typology of such contexts will contribute to the creation of active dictionaries of the Ukrainian language, aimed at “living” discourses that serve modern society.

<sup>2</sup> Critical review of the problem is in [Бацевич 2014, с. 101-115].

**Discussion.** In ULD (11: 641), the lexeme *якось* is defined in two homonymous forms: (1) **Якось**<sup>1</sup> – ‘присл., неознач. Уживається при вираженні непевності, невизначеності способу дії; якимсь чином, не ясно, як саме’. Within this lexical-semantic variant, there are differentiated such uses as: (a) ‘те саме, що *чомусь*’ і (б) ‘ненароком, випадково’; (2) **Якось**<sup>2</sup> – ‘присл. часу. Одного разу’. GEDMUL contains similar definitions of *якось*.

Homonymy of the objectivations defined by the compilers of both dictionaries relies, in our opinion, on the unambiguous understanding of the lexeme *якось*<sup>2</sup> as a unit expressing the meaning ‘once’. In further considerations, we will try to undermine this conclusion via the analysis of various contexts where this lexeme is used. However, first, let us refer to the definitions of the lexeme *якось*, whose interpretation demands some detailed consideration of its sense in certain contexts of its use.

Firstly, let us analyze a humorous folk maxim, one of the variants of which sounds like **Якось** воно буде. *Не може так бути, щоб якось не було*. In the first sentence of this maxim, the use of the lexeme *якось* clearly represents the communicative sense defined in GEDMUL and ULD, which is uncertainty, lack of clarity in details or in what the specific circumstances will be like in the future. Unlike the first sentence, the second one persuasively objectifies the communicative sense of the pragmatic character that can be defined as ‘absence of necessity to detail what the circumstances will be like in the future’; it means that there appears the modality of the possibility for the narrator to accept any situation in the future, even more, to some extent, to reconcile with the lack of clarity of the future. The fact that there is no necessity to clearly define the features of what narrative story is about or what may happen in the future is obvious in contexts of the narrative proper and narrative-dialogical objectivation of the studied lexeme, where different moduses of the author’s world perception are realized, i.e.:

1. mental processes of considering the narrative story and its factors:

*Він [Степан Петрович] розумів, що згодом треба буде це якось обдумати* (В. Ілленко); *Євген мав рацію, але якось не так, якось убік і якось безсоромно мав рацію* (Ю. Герман); *Захоплений цим почуттям безпечності для свого конспіративного скарбу, я якось уже викинув із голови самий ... факт неминучої за мною стежі* (Ю. Шпол).

2. physical, physiological or mental states of those who are told about in the story:

*Він якось невпевнено почувався у цій веселій компанії* (А Кокотюха); *Було якось прикро це усвідомлювати* (І. Василець); – *Якось гірко на душі. – зітхнула вона [вчителька]* (А.Кокотюха); *Якось незручно нагадувати їй про це* (М. Руденко); ... *вона сьогодні була якось нервово жвава* (І. Василець); *І наче полегшало якось на серці* (О.Соколовський); *Працював якось мляво; Якось зле думалося*.

In contexts where the narrator’s or heroes’ mental states are described, the lexemes *якось* and *чомусь* develop contextual synonymy mentioned in the dictionaries that we used; even more, the context does not include the explanation of the reasons why this mental state appeared, e.g., *Він якось (чомусь) знітився від цього запитання; Він якось (чомусь) злякався*.

3. physical actions (namely, speech and paralingual acts) of the subject or object of the narration:

... *говорили **якось** недоладно* (Б. Підгірний); ***Якось** я так підбігла вчасно, що бійки не сталося* (Б. Підгірний); ... *у нас на Русанівці не надто багато зручних місць, де можна хоч **якось** та посидіти за чашкою кави* (Ю. Покальчук); – *Правда, я падлець, добр ... товаришко? – вмить **якось** роблено сміливо промовив він ...* (В. Винниченко); ... *помовчавши трохи **якось** рівно промовила вона* (В. Винниченко); *Вона відповідала **якось** неясно* (М. Хвильовий); *Я реготала **якось** зовсім не до речі* (М. Хвильовий).

Lack of necessity to clearly identify what result of the subject's physical action is expected is very distinctive when the narrator uses a DP *хоч якось*:

– *Хоч **якось** відремонтуй цей клятий велосипед, – закипала вона [дружина]* (А. Кокотюха); *Хоч **якось** прореагує на образі; Хоч **якось** зупини його.*

4. inner textual modal unfolding of the narrative story, i.e., referring to stereotypical features designated to some significante (or a denotative class of objects) by the Ukrainian lingual culture. These subjects are viewed as dynamic and changeable in time:

– *Стань **уже** **якось** мужчиною нарешті, – зло кинула Дарина* (В. Роган); *Іван Світличний – це **вже** **якось** як, можна сказати, літературний наставник, чи що* (Б. Підгірний); – *Час **уже** стати **якось** батьком* (Ю. Покальчук).

5. close to the previous point of this classification are the sense objectivations of the lexeme that can be defined as ‘vagueness as for what is accepted in a society as normative, usual’. These are the phrases ***якось не так, як (треба, варто, прийнято, вимагається*** etc.):

*Все складалося **якось не так, як** планували ще в травні* (В. Медведєв); *Робота йшла повільно, **якось не так, як** мені хотілося* (О. Вишнівський).

Alongside with the contextual use of the analyzed lexeme described above and characterized as current to the narrative story, it is important to take into account another type of context that stands apart as retrospective in relation to the narrative story in general and influences the formation of the communicative sense of the analyzed lexeme. Let us consider the example from O. Honchar's “Tronka” which is provided as an example of actualizing the semantics of ‘accidentally, unintentionally’ in ULD:

*Старшокласники, хлопці й дівчата, розбрелись, позникали в зелених виноградних хащах. І, звісно, це ж була чистісінька випадковість, що Тоня з Віталіком женуть один рядок; дівчина сама **якось** опинилася в цьому рядку в останню мить.*

Taking into account a much wider retrospective context proves that Tonya and Vitalyk were not appointed to work in the same line unintentionally: this was arranged by a girl who liked Vitaliy, and therefore, the quoted paragraph with the lexeme *якось* is perceived as irony or a humorous allusion to the schoolchildren's relationship.

Regarding the form *якось*<sup>2</sup> detected both in ULD and in GEDMUL as a marker of the communicative sense ‘once’, we would note that in the majority of cases this use is relevant in contexts of narrative consideration-reasoning of what happened in the

past (the retrospective aspect of the narrative story). However, in the context of quantitative clarification of the previous events, this dictionary definition appears tautological. Consider the example from the quoted dictionary article of the lexeme *якось* in ULD: *Якось раз над містечком стояла тиха, місячна, літня ніч* (Н.-Левицький) (СУМ 11: 641). Its interpretation as ‘once’ and the phrase *якось раз* appear semantically redundant, e.g., *Якось одного разу ми вирішили піти на полювання* (Вишня). Such contexts, as well as the ones described above, explicate the semantic-pragmatic sense ‘lack of obligation for the addressee to determine (the time) precisely’. This delineation of the semantic-pragmatic facet of the lexeme *якось* undermines the thesis regarding the homonymy of forms *якось*<sup>1</sup> і *якось*<sup>2</sup>.

**Conclusion and perspectives.** The analysis proves that lexeme *якось*, which is a DW by its nature, is used in narrative proper and narrative-dialogic contexts of current and retrospective narrations and explicates communicative senses of mental and psychological uncertainty, indefiniteness of embodiment, as well as the lack of obligation of the exact definition of the essence and quantitative characteristics of what is being discussed in the discourse of a narrative story. Summarizing the observations on a number of lexemes functioning as DWs, we have identified several contexts of their use, namely, 1) as the dominants of moduses of a narrator’s world perception and cognition: a) perceptive, b) mental, c) psychological; 2) functional-communicative context: a) narrative (eventful), b) descriptive, c) considerations (with commentaries), d) dialogic; 3) content proper (story, plot of the story): a) dynamic / static, b) the nearest verbal, c) textual (current / retrospective), d) of modal unfolding of a narrator’s world perception. The study of functional-communicative varieties of DWs and DPs will allow identifying and taking into account the typology of contexts that influence the realization of the semantic potential of the means of the language code of texts, discourses, and narratives. The identification and analysis of the contexts of DWs and DPs use will also contribute to the formalization of their content structure description in explanatory dictionaries of the active type, to the solution of a number of problems related to the controversial issues of polysemous and homonymous realization of their meanings (communicative senses), first of all, in cases of migration within one and the same part of speech.

### References

1. Бацевич, Флорій. Нариси з лінгвістичної прагматики. Львів: ПАІС, 2010. 336 с. [Batsevych, Florij. *Narysy z lnhvistychnoyi prahmatyky*. L’viv: PAIS, 2010. 336 s.]
2. Бацевич, Флорій. Частки української мови як дискурсивні слова. Львів: ПАІС, 2014. 288 с. [Batsevych, Florij. *Chastky ukrayins’koyi movy yak dyskursyvni slova*. L’viv: PAIS, 2014. 288 s.]
3. Глібчук, Н., Добосевич, У. «Визначення міжчастиномовних омонімів та їх класифікація» [У:] Словник міжчастиномовних омонімів сучасної української мови. Львів: Априорі, 2016, 9–20. [Hlibchuk, N., Dobosevych, U. «*Vyznachennya mizhchastynomovnykh omonimiv ta yikh klasyfikatsiya*» [U:] *Slovyk mizhchastynomovnykh omonimiv suchasnoyi ukrayins’koyi movy*. L’viv: Apriori, 2016, 9–20.]
4. Добосевич, У. «Критерії та прийоми визначення частиномовного статусу морфологічних транспозитів». *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія філологічна* 57, 2012: 37–47.

- [Dobosevych, U. «Kryteriyi ta pryomy vyznachennya chastynomovnoho statusu morfolohichnykh transpozitiv». Visnyk L'vivs'koho universytetu. Seriyafilolohichna 57, 2012: 37–47.]
5. Кушлик, О. П. Омонімія незмінних класів слів: автореф. ... дис. канд. філол. наук.: 10.02.01. Львів, 2000. 16 с.  
[Кушлик, О. П. Омонімія незмінних класів слів: автореф. ... дис. канд. філол. наук.: 10.02.01. Львів, 2000. 16 с.]
6. Ситар, Г. Синтаксичні фразеологізми в розрізі конструкційної граматики. Вінниця: ТОВ «Нілан-ЛТД», 2017. 460 с.  
[Syta, H. Syntaksychni frazeolohizmy v rozrizi konstruktsiynoyi hramatyky. Vinnytsya: TOV «Nilan-LTD», 2017. 460 s.]

### List of sources

1. Великий тлумачний словник сучасної української мови (з дод. і доповн.) (Уклад. і голов. ред. В.Т. Бусел). Т. 11. – К.: Ірпін': ВТФ «Перун», 2005. 1728 с.  
[Velykyutlumachnyy slovnyk suchasnoyi ukrayins'koyi movy (z dod. i dopovn.) (Uklad. i holov.red. V.T. Busel). T. 11. – K.: Irpin': VTF «Perun», 2005. 1728 s.]
2. Корпус української мови <<http://korpus.org.ua/>> 20.01.2023.  
[Korpus ukrayins'koyi movy <<http://korpus.org.ua/>>20.01.2023.]
3. Словник української мови: в 11 т. Т. 11. – Київ: Наукова думка, 1980: 641.  
[Slovnyk ukrayins'koyi movy: v 11 t. T. 11. – Kyiv: Naukovadumka, 1980: 641.]

## CONTEXTS OF THE REALIZATION OF DISCURSIVE WORDS COMMUNICATIVE SENSES (AS EVIDENCED BY THE LEXEME *ЯКОСЬ*)

### Florij Batsevych

The Department of General Linguistics, Ivan Franko Lviv National University, Lviv, Ukraine.

### Yarosalva Sazonova

The Department of English Phonetics and Grammar, Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University, Kharkiv, Ukraine.

### Abstract

**Background:** Recent studies of discursive words (DW) within the scope of communicative and functional approaches analyze them as the elements of a language code that unites the content of the narration and the means of its textual representation. However, their content organization remains mainly unclear, first, because of the indistinct concord of their semantic and pragmatic elements. Moreover, the pragmatic features of these language code units often remain inexplicit.

**Purpose:** The analysis shows that the content narrative unfolding of DWs depends on the series of other contexts, first, of the inter-narrative nature. The article aims at analyzing these aspects of the general problem.

**Methods:** To detail the specificity of the content organization of the lexeme of discursive character (*якось*) we compare its explicated semantic-pragmatic objectivations that, first, are detected in oral speech and appear in texts in The Ukrainian Language Corpus, second, are defined in dictionaries.

**Results:** Lexeme *якось* is used in narrative proper and narrative-dialogic contexts of current and retrospective narrations and explicates communicative senses of mental and psychological uncertainty, indefiniteness of embodiment, lack of obligation of the exact definition of the essence and quantitative characteristics of what is being discussed in the narrative story. Accounting for these contexts allows considering the absence of homonymous connections in the structure of communicative senses of the analyzed discursive word, which are postulated in explanatory dictionaries. We identify several contexts of the DW use: 1) as the dominants of moduses of a

narrator's world perception and cognition: perceptive, mental, psychological; 2) functional-communicative context: narrative, descriptive, considerations, dialogic; 3) content proper: dynamic / static, the nearest verbal, textual, modal unfolding of a narrator's world perception.

**Discussion:** The study of functional-communicative varieties of DWs and DPs will allow identifying and taking into account the typology of contexts that influence the realization of the semantic potential of the means of the language code of texts. It will also contribute to the formalization of their content structure description in explanatory dictionaries of the active type.

**Keywords:** text, discourse, narrative, discursive words, discursive phrases, communicative sense.

**Vitae**

Florij Batsevych is a Doctor of Philology, Professor, the Head of the Department of General Linguistics and the Honoured Professor of Ivan Franko Lviv National University. The scientific interests: general linguistics, theoretical semasiology and onomasiology, communicative linguistics, genology, linguistic pragmatics.

**Correspondence:** [batsevich.florij@gmail.com](mailto:batsevich.florij@gmail.com)

Yarosalva Sazonova is a Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor, the Head of the Department of English Phonetics and Grammar of Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University, Prof. Batsevych's mentee. The scientific interests: theory of language, text linguistics, communicative linguistics, linguistic pragmatics.

**Correspondence:** [sazonova.yaroslava.hnpu@gmail.com](mailto:sazonova.yaroslava.hnpu@gmail.com)

Надійшла до редакції 15 лютого 2023 року  
Рекомендована до друку 18 березня 2023 року