REPRESENTATION OF REALITY AND IRREALITY IN POLISH AND UKRAINIAN LANGUAGES: COMPARATIVE STUDY

Nataliya Magas[1]
Oleksii Vorobets[2]

Abstract. The topicality of the research is in detailed comparative analysis of the features of reality and irreality representation in both Slavic languages at the semantic-syntactic level, that is relevant today and haven't been worked out before. Relevance of reality-irreality opposition is comprehensively discussed in modern linguistics. This lack of indicators of irreality at the grammatical level in some languages prevents from the assertion of irreality as a separate semantic category. Irrealis as a component of the grammatical category "status of reality" is characterized in terms of actualization / non-actualization of the state of affairs. As it is well known, our lingual-deterministic world of thinking directly correlates with our cultures and guidelines, that is, the linguistic-minded models serve not only as a source of knowledge about a particular nation or culture, but also in a certain way affect the consciousness of their native speakers. Although Polish and Ukrainian languages share common Slavic roots, the ways of reality and irreality representations differ on both functional-semantic and structural-syntactical levels. The methods of comparison and linguistic reconstruction are used to confirm or to refute hypothesised relationships between the languages. Sentences that denote real / irreal propositions in Polish and Ukrainian languages are the object of the research, semantic and syntactic expressions of reality and irreality in propositions in both languages are to be the subject. The article presents semantic structure of a sentence with verbs and their actants denoting realized or unrealized state of affairs. Both logical and functional analysis of the correlation specificity

---

[1] Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages,
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ukraine
[2] Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of General and German Linguistics,
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ukraine

in these constructions are based on their predicative nature. Verbs as central elements of propositional structure are observed in the light of semantic theory. The aim of the paper is to analyze sentences from the standpoint of semantic syntax and to identify common and distinctive features of reality and irreality verbalization in propositional structures in modern Polish and Ukrainian. The visual materials of the research are sentences denoting real / irreal propositions chosen from fictional, journalistic, scientific and colloquial texts of the National Corpus of Polish (NKJP), the Great Polish Dictionary of Polish (WSJP), the Corpus of Ukrainian [8], as well as the Corpus WORTSCATZ of Leipzig University [23].

1. Introduction

Language as a means of reproducing consciousness describes the complex process of reality perception by human beings. Traditionally, objective reality is observed as the matter in the whole set of concrete forms of its existence and subjective reality – as the phenomena of consciousness. And since this reality is complex and multifaceted, and even constantly changing in time, the subject of knowledge is "not all-valued," he can not always give true testimony, which is due to the incompleteness of knowledge of reality. According to N. Arutiunova "the perception of the changing world, turns it into a visibility / conscience" [13, p. 73]. The ratio of real-irreal is based on knowledge, reflection of reality. And although there is a significant revival in the development of functional-semantic categories by linguists, the peculiarities of their representation, the category of irreality in T. Nikulishyna's works is identified with the irreal modality [14].

Relevance of reality-irreality opposition is comprehensively discussed in modern linguistics. This lack of indicators of irreality at the grammatical level in some languages prevents from the assertion of irreality as a separate semantic category. Irrealis as a component of the grammatical category "status of reality" is characterized in terms of actualization / non-actualization of the state of affairs. The realis proposition assumes that the state of affairs is actualized and is a fact of reality, while the irrealis proposition indicates that the state of affairs belongs to the real or hypothetical realm and states the potential or possibility of an event, but it is an invisible fact of reality [1, p. 58]. Markers of irreality are predictive modifiers, the scope of which is non-actualized proposition, as opposed to propositional modifiers

that influence the proposition. The delimitation of irreality and epistemic modality as propositional modifiers is based on this feature [17, p. 188].

According to J. Bybee, "lack of reality" is too abstract concept and therefore is not widely used. Taking into account uncertainty in determining the status of reality, the researcher observes irreality in terms of modal attitude expression [3, p. 267]. Although the parallel interpretation of the concepts of irreality and modality is not unique in the scientific literature [16; 15], there are some significant differences between these concepts. Both sentences

1. *Ввечері я зазвичай читаю або дивлюсь телевізор.*

2. *Zazwyczaj wieczorem czytam lub oglondam televizia,*

verbalize two propositions – *I read something, I watch TV*, one of which in certain circumstances represents non-actualized state of affairs. The subject either reads, or watches the TV, doing one we mutually exclude the possibility of another. In this type of alternative propositional structures, propositions belong to category of irreality, because they nether convey the attitude of the speaker to the message, nor verbalize the feelings and the psycho-emotional states of the subject, etc.

In connection with ignoring the complexity of the concept of irreality, hypothesis, orders, acknowledgements, desires, etc. as logically irreal situational types characterized by semantic operators of irreality, have not been observed in detail that reveals possibilities for further research.

Having observed works on the markers of irreality in the Polish language (M. Załęska), the peculiarities of reality representation in models with perceptive verbs in Polish and English languages (B. Gurajek), hypothetical character, irreality, and opacity in the Bulgarian and Polish languages (W Małdżiewa), contrastive grammar of Ukrainian and Polish languages (I. Kononenko) we intent to prove the importance of comparative analysis of sentences with the propositions of realis and irrealis in both Slavic languages at the semantic-syntactic level.

The significance of the research is primarily in scientific analysis of the markers of reality and irreality representation, and the peculiarities of their functioning in sentences in modern Polish and Ukrainian languages.

2. Irreality and positive / negative modality

The markers of irreality in both Ukrainian and Polish languages are the modal verbs or verbal constructs, thus, they are the representatives of

modality that can be either desired for the subject (the proposition is irreal, but the subject tends to actualize it) or undesired (the proposition is irreal, the subject does not want its actualization). In the classification of modal categories proposed by Claire Bowern, "the positive modality includes potential, imperative / obligatory, desired, to negative – counter-factual, prohibitive, fear / worry/ anxiety" [4].

Consider the verbalization of irreality markers through the prism of desirability / unwillingness or positive and negative modality in Polish and Ukrainian languages (Table 1).

Table 1

Verbalisation of the irreal situational types by the modal operators

Modality	Ukrainian	Polish
Potential	*Можливо, Іван прийде.*	*Może Ivan przyjdzie.*
Imperative / obligatory	*Іване, прийди! / Іване, мусиш прийти.*	*Ivan, przyjdź! / Ivan, musisz przyjść.*
Desired	*Приходь, Іване!*	*Ivan, przychodź!*
Counter-factual	*Не знаю, чи Іван прийде.*	*Nie wiem, czy Ivan przyjdzie.*
Prohibitive	*Іване, не приходь!*	*Ivan, nie przychodź!*
Fear / worry/ anxiety	*Боюсь, що Іван прийде.*	*Boję się, że Ivan przyjdzie.*

However, in the process of analysis the illustrative material, it was found out that in orders, calls for action both non-actualized and actualized propositions may be verbalized. Thus, in the examples

3. *Наливаймо, браття, кришталеві чаші, Щоб шаблі не брали, щоб кулі минали, Голівоньки наші!* (Українська народна пісня) proposition *налиті чаші* is irreal, as well as proposition *było spotkanie* in

4. *Zróbmy spotkanie waszych ludzi z moimi ludźmi i przedyskutujmy tę sprawę* (www.newsweek.pl, *gecrawlt am 20.04.2012*).

But in the sentence

5. *Біжи, біжи, струмочку,*

Стрімко ставай рікою,

Вийду я до місточку.

Тай стрінуся з тобою (О. Кварта)

call for action *Біжи, біжи, струмочку* is not characterized by the irreality marker, that is due to a metaphorical description of the natural phe-

nomenon as an irrefutable truth in the propositional framework of the statement, so, the proposition *струмочок біжить* is real, and subject can not affect its status of reality / irreality.

In the example

6. *Швидше... Біжімо швидше... – Я не можу швидше, – сказала дівчина…* (А. Сапковський)

proposition *діти біжать* is real, the speaker with adverb *швидше* enforces the girl to change not the type of activity, but its quality with the adverb distributor. However, similar stimulative construction in the text

7. *– Він обернувся до Петікантропа. – Біжімо швидше! Пустіть! Пустіть, бабо! І, скориставшись миттєвою бабиною розгубленістю, хлопці гайнули з двору. Біжімо швидше! Пустіть! Пустіть, бабо! І, скориставшись миттєвою бабиною розгубленістю, хлопці гайнули з двору* (В. Нестайко)

denotes proposition of irreal type *діти бігли*, only from the context we find out, that at first the children were busy searching for something in the courtyard, and then instantly decided to run.

Unlike the Polish language, in Ukrainian, orders, calls for action, as explicators of non-actualized state of affairs, are expressed with verbs of perfective aspect in the past-time, such as:

8. *"І ВІН СКАЗАВ: "МАМ, ПОБІГЛИ ЗІ МНОЮ", – так вона згадує, як старший син Андрій уперше запропонував їй зайнятися бігом* (Інформаційний патруль V 24. https://www.volyn24.com/14/09/2017).

S. Myasoyedova proves that, "in the form of perfective aspect in the past time besides verbs of motion and verbs denoting the initial phase of the unidirectional motion, verbs belonging to other semantic groups in the imperative expressions may also nominate imperative meanings. They enforce the interlocutor to the urgent actions which illustrate lexeme-intensifiers *швидко, швиденько, зараз же, скоренько, скоріше* etc.

9. *Швиденько відкрили зошити і записали тему!*

10. *Зараз же надів шапку!"* [10, p. 84].

In Ukrainian and Polish languages, combination of the verb in the past tense with irreal particles *щоб, żeby* affects the intensity of the imperatives, for example:

11. *Завтра щоб я вас тут не бачив* (Гр. Тютюнник).

12. *Te studia, ten okropny egzamin! Żeby jeszcze szedł na inny wydział, nie na rolnictwo* (WSJP).

In Polish language predicates *biegać, biegnąć* as in Ukrainian *бігати, бігти* in the imperative mood are used in three word forms: the second person singular *biegaj* and *biegnij*, the first person plural *biegajmy* and *biegnijmy*, and the third person plural *biegajcie* and respectively *biegnijcie*. In the national corpus of Polish, there are only three examples with the word *biegajmy* representing non-actualized propositions, in contrast to the functional-semantic potentials of the corresponding predicates in Ukrainian language. In sentences with predicates of motion *biegać, biegnąć*

13. *Biegaj z nami w każdą niedzielę – to stała akcja Wrocławskiego Klubu* (NKJP),

14. *Bigajmy z psem, sami, ze znajomymi* (NKJP),

15. *Pewnie się połamał! Biegnijcie po nosze! – słyszałem podniecone głosy* (WSJP),

16. *To chodźmy, szybko, biegnijmy, nim zbudzą się strażnicy* (NKJP),

17. *Biegnijcie do ludzi. Decyzja komitetu strajkowego: tylko bierny opór* (NKJP)

means of positive modality mark irreal and only irreal propositios.

Considering reality and irreality peculiarities as incompatible alternatives within one proposition, V. Kasevych identified two varieties of ireality – "positive" and "negative". In the case of "positive" irreality, "the emphasis is on the potential of a situation that is perceived as possible, desirable, etc.," while the "negative" irreality "usually implies negation" as a feature that has not been realized and can not be realized [7, p. 67]. Sentences

18. *Молюся нашій пресвятій Покрові, благослови і пера, і шаблі! Бо лиш народи, явлені у Слові, достойно жити можуть на землі* (Л. Костенко);

19. *– Зараз ти ростеш, все в тобі грає, але в твоєму підлітковому віці людина вже повинна і замислюватись над собою, над своїми вчинками* (О. Гончар).

prove that meaning of the necessity can go along with potentiality of the situation, since the sentence models *Х може Р* and *Х повинен Р* equally mark that P is non-actualized proposition. In this case, the actualization of both propositions may or may not occur, and what should happen will definitely

happen. Thus, "the difference between possibility and necessity is connected with one or another degree of the situation determination" [2, p. 124].

Desire plays the crucial role in the sentence meaning where irreality is interlaced with evaluation: *X хоче P* means that, first, *P* does not belong to the real world (a person, as you know, can only want something that does not exist at the time of desire), and, second, that *X* positively evaluates *P* (a person wants what he thinks is good), compare:

20. *Якби Ти встав, прийшов у Київ, – О скільки Ти про нього мріяв В степу, над Каспієм широким!* (Дмитро Павличко).

As for desire, its object can be both achievable (controlled), and un-achievable (uncontrolled) state of affairs confirming its neutrality in oppo-sition to the possibility / impossibility. At the same time, "desire, it is both a whip and a carrot that pushes forward man and humanity, makes their minds sharp, strains their will – and the previously uncontrollable becomes controlled, and impossible – possible" [18, c. 298]. The utterance

21. *О, хтів би я всі мови знать, Усі країни облітать* (М. Рильський)

proves hypothesis that the desire nevertheless tends to "positive" irrea-lity. However, sentences

22. *"Якби Шевченко подивився, як ремонтують "хату чумака», то він би назад у могилу ліг"* (Газ. «Дзвін», 25.10.2013);

23. *– А що, вашого наймита ще нема? – спитала вона Чабана. – Чому ж досі не йде він? Адже ж ви погодилися із ним, казали учора ввечері: він буде. Чому ж не прийшов?* (Марко Вовчок)

denote the impossibility to actualize state of affairs, the inability to real-ize the author's desire, therefore, this type of statements is conveys negative irreality.

Thus, the meanings of desirability, possibility, necessity and impossibil-ity can be considered as different specific types of irreality, where the first three of them can be regarded as "positive" irreality, and the meaning of impossibility – ase "negative" irreality. Proverb

24. *Якби молодість знала, а старість могла, краща б доля була*

shows that all three propositions *молодість знала, старість могла, доля була краща* are not actualized although they explain the irreality of the public desire – a better fate.

Speaking about positive and negative types of desire in classical Ukrainian literature, positive desire comes with the speaker's support and

is even marked with the author's approving assessment and attitude of God to the information contained in the non-actualized proposition, for example:

25. *Борітеся – поборете, Вам Бог помагає!* (Т. Шевченко).

Propositions *суб'єкт бореться, суб'єкт перемагає are* irreal, but desirable, and the clarification-distributor *Вам Бог помагає* is suggestive and marked with perlocutive potencies which are spread on the whole sentence, enforcing the implicit subject *лицарі великі* to act.

In Vasyl Symonenko's poem, negative desire denotes irreal proposition and is used in conditional sentence of irreal condition:

26. *Коли б тобі бажав я сліз і муки,*

І кари найстрашнішої бажав,

Я б не викручував твої тендітні руки

І в хмурім підземеллі не держав (В. Симоненко).

Therefore, the desire for tears, torture or punishment in non-actualized counterfactual proposition reflects the author's fears of its hypothetical transition from irreal to real.

3. Reality, irreality, neutrality in conditional sentences

According to A. Urmanchiyeva, reality contrasts not only with irreality as counterfactibility but also neutrality: in the sentence there is no clear specification of the relation of the situation described in the proposition to the real world – the proposition is used without appeal to the truth [21]. As in the sentences

27. *Я думаю, що він приїхав*

28. *Він приїхав?,*

in which the neutral objective modality is identified with the temporarily suspended / suspended statement "suspended assertion" [6], "neveridiktal-nost" [10].

Speaking about 3 types of conditional sentences, the author states that in the real type of conditional sentences in the Russian language, which is represented in English in structures of the 1st Conditional, as well as in the conditional sentences of unreal type in Russian written in the 2nd Conditional in English, the proposition is neutral, as well as propositions of sentences with the mental predicate думати:

29. *Я думаю, ми підемо гуляти.*

30. *Якщо погода буде гарна, ми підемо гуляти.*

119

31. *Якщо б погода була гарна, ми б пішли гуляти.*

Three sentences (29, 30, 31) are marked by objective modality with neutral propositions *ми підемо, ми б пішли*. A. Urmanchiyeva states the difference of the real type of sentences from the unreal is that unreal type structures convey the desirability of the *if clause* [21]. However, having observed other sentence constructs of the same structural and semantic models (29, 30, 31), we noted that in Ukrainian both real and unreal sentence types verbalize the call for action or proposals (29, 30) or regret over the state of affairs (31), hence, describe the desirability of the *if clause* proposition. Sentence with predicate *думати* denotes uncertainty of the speaker that the interlocutors will support his plans or ideas. Obviously, it can be transformed into synonymous sentence *Якщо ви не проти, ми підемо в парк.* For example,

32. *Я думаю, що ми підемо в парк.* Outlining plans the speaker makes an assumption, proposal or promise to go to the park. And if he really wanted or had a need to go elsewhere, he would suggest those ideas. Although only the context will help to specify the type of modal propositional component in this type sentences.

33. *Якщо будете чемними, ми підемо в парк.* – The speaker expresses the probability of the event in proposal and focuses on the possibility of its realization / actualization, provided the interlocutors are polite. Synonymous transformation *Будьте чемними і ми підемо в парк* is marks positive modality, proposals *Будуть чемними, підемо в парк* – will be actualized in the future, therefore, irreal, but both are desirable for the speaker.

34. *Якщо б ви були чемними, ми б пішли в парк.* The implicit wishes of the speaker, so that the interlocutors were polite and that they together went to the park, verbalize the counterfactual modality, but at the same time regret about the irreality of the state of affairs, condemning the interlocutors.

In English, Polish, and Ukrainian languages hypothetical modality as a marker of irreality is explicated in conditional and suppositive constructions. However, in English grammar, there are 0 Conditional sentences written according to the conditional frame but without any reference to conditions in their propositions.

35. *If it is a triangle it has three sides*.

36. *When it is warm outside the snow melts* Propositions *It is a triangle, it has three sides* (35) and *it is warm outside, snow melts* (36) are real.

Similar type sentences, in which both condition and action are expressed in the present time, are found in the Slavic languages:

37. *Якщо це трикутник, то він має три сторони.*

38. *Коли на вулиці тепло, сніг тане*

39. *Jeśli jest to trójkąt, to ma trzy strony.*

40. *Kiedy jest ciepło na podwórzu, śnieg topnieje.*

All these sentences (37, 38, 39, 40) can be transformed into synonymous equivalents (41, 42, 43) that verbalize general knowledge, real propositions, rather than personal judgment of the speaker or any other person, without denoting attitude to the statement or its authenticity, for example,

41. *The triangle has three sides.*

42. *Трикутник має три сторони.*

43. *Trójkąt ma trzy boki.*

4. Semantic and syntactic potential of predicates *змусити/змушувати*, *zmusic/zmuszac* in the verbalization of irreal meanings

A sentence with the causative predicate nominates two situations: the caused and the causative, both of them are marked with implicit relations: the causative verb together with the subject-causative represent basic primary predication, whereas the caused subject and the objective infinitive secondary, implicated predication [9, p. 5].

Thus in the sentence

44. *Він* **змусив** *капітана повернутися,* **примусив** *його відступити і* **загнав** *у куток* (Корпус української мови) the caused subject (causee) and the objective infinitive represent a number of realis propositions *Капітан повернувся; Капітан відступив; Капітан у кутку* implemented by verbal predicates of perfective aspect in the past time *змусив, примусив, загнав*. All other examples with this causative verb **змусити**, for instance, used in other grammatical forms, mark the irrealis propositions, that is, the state of affairs *Капітан повернувся* is not actualized:

45. *Він* **змушував** *капітана повернутися (the causative predicate is in the past tense, imperfective aspect).*

46. *Він* **змушує** *капітана повернутися (the causative predicate is in the present tense, imperfective aspect).*

47. *Він* **змусить** *капітана повернутися (the causative predicate is in the future tense, perfective aspect).*

48. *Він* **змушуватиме** *капітана повернутися (the causative predicate is in the future tense, imperfective aspect)*.

The same possibility of representing irreal situation is whether objective infinitive is of ether *imperfective or perfective aspect*, for example:

49. *Він* **змушував** *капітана повернутися (***повернутися** – objective infinitive of perfective aspect, proposition *Капітан повернувся* irreal).

50. *Він* **змушував** *капітана повертатися (***повертатися** – objective infinitive of imperfective aspect, proposition *Капітан повертався* irreal).

In the Ukrainian language, causatives **приму́сити**, **ви́мусити**, **приси́лувати**, **уси́лувати [всі́лувати]** dial.. **принево́лити**, **прикрути́ти**, **припе́рти**, **заста́вити** are the synonyms of the verb **змусити** [20], marking the event as the result of the impact of some situation (personal / impersonal) on the agent of action or state, that is, on a causer, but in causative structures, the actual state of affairs is implemented in the sentence by the predicate of imperfective aspect in the past tense. In its function of marking realis / irrealis propositions in the sentence models S1 + Vpread + S1 / S2 + Vinf, S1 + Vpread + S1 / S2 + to + N2 with the causative **змусити** and its synonyms **вимушувати, силувати, приневолювати, приневолювати, неволити, прикручувати** *розм.,* **припирати** *розм.,* **принукувати [принукати]** *розм.,* **заставляти** are similar to the sentences of the same shemes [20], for example:

51. ***Примусила*** *мене підписати відповідний документ* (Корпус української мови) – proposition *Я підписала документ* realis,

52. ***Примушувала*** *мене підписати відповідний документ* – proposition *Я підписала документ* irrealis, caused and causing subjects do not coincide, accordingly, there is a probability of non-coinciding of their desires, and therefore the causee hadn't sign the document and did not sign it then. If the causative subject fulfilled the will of the causer, then there would be no need to change anything and make the cause to perform the action again.

53. ***Примушує*** *мене підписати відповідний документ* – proposition *Я підписала документ* irrealis,

54. ***Примусить*** *мене підписати відповідний документ* – proposition *Я підписала документ* irrealis,

55. ***Примушуватиме*** *мене підписати відповідний документ* – proposition *Я підписала документ* irrealis.

In Polish ***zmusić – zmuszać*** stand for the equivalents of Ukrainian ***змусити – змушувати*** and also introduce the realis / irrealis propositions in the sentence model S1 + Vpread + S1 / S2 + Vinf. The Great Dictionary of Polish describes the following possible ways of combining the verb ***zmusić***:

___ + zmusić + KOGO/CO + do CZEGO

___ + zmusić + KOGO/CO + żeby ZDANIE

___ + zmusić + KOGO/CO + BEZOKOLICZNIK [8].

As in the Ukrainian language, the predicate of perfective aspect ***zmusić*** is used in sentences in past and future tenses, but at the syntactic level, its causative potentials is found in models: S1 + Vpread + S1/S2 + do + N_2

56. *W końcu Amerykanie zmusili słabą wówczas Hiszpanię do przekazania Florydy Stanom Zjednoczonym* (NKJP) and S1 + Vpread + S1/S2 + żeby + (S1/S2)+ $V_{past\ tense}$

57. *Ci, którzy podeszli do mnie na ulicy I zmusili, żebym wsiadł do samochodu – niczego mi nie proponowali* (NKJP). Although the possibility of combining the predicate ***zmusić*** with the infinitive is shown in the dictionary, in the national corpus of Polish the combination of this verb in the form of past tense, perfective aspect with the infinitive was not found. In contrast, the predicative causative model of the sentence in the past, which nominating actualized propositions in caused situations, denotes the possibility of combining the verb ***być*** with passive participle ***zmuszony*** and the infinitive or the verb ***być*** or ***zostać*** with passive participle of perfective aspect ***zmuszony***/ imperfective aspect ***zmuszany*** and verbal noun in the genitive case, such as:

$$S1 + \textbf{być} + \textbf{zmuszony} + V_{inf}$$

58. – *Stąd też Biały Dom **zmuszony** był odmówić prośbie nowego przywódcy państwa* (NKJP),

$$S1 + \textbf{być/zostać} + \textbf{zmuszony} + do + N_2$$

59. *Inwestor był **zmuszony** do zmiany projektu i przesunięcia trasy kabla energetycznego na drugą stronę drogi tak, aby był prowadzony jak najdalej od drzewa* (NKJP),

60. *Inna sprawa, że często problemem jest to, że świetni fachowcy zostali zmuszeni do odejścia z telewizji* (www.wspolczesna.pl, gecrawlt am 20.04.2012),

In the sentence model S1 + **być/zostać** + **zmuszany** + do + N_2 causative **być** or **zostać** with passive participle of imperfective aspect **zmuszany**, the verbal noun in the genitive case marks caused irreal event:

61. *Ponieważ był zmuszany przez władze okupacyjne do podpisanie volkslisty, w lutym 1942 r. wyjechał do Tarnowa* (NKJP).

In Ukrainian, the actualized proposition is represented by the only structural scheme of the sentence with the causative complex of an explicit verb *бути* in the past tense and passive participle of perfective aspect in which the infinitive verbalizes the caused event, for example, S1 + **бути** + **змушений** + V_{inf}

62. *Громадяни були змушені подати до суду, який, утім, їм також відмовив* (www.ut.net.ua, gecrawlt am 27.04.2012). Sentence

63. *Історія ж мучеників Маккавеїв, яка міститься у ІІ Маккавейській книзі, розповідає, що приведені на суд до нечестивого царя члени родини Маккавеїв були змушувані їсти ідоложертвенну їжу, але водмовилися це робити* (http://volyn.church.ua, від 13.08.2016) of structural type S1 + **бути** + **змушуваний** + V_{inf} verb *бути* in the past tense and passive participle of imperfective aspect via secondary predicative verbalizes caused irreal event, thus, proposition *їли ідоложертвенну їжу* is not actualized.

Irreal caused propositions in Ukrainian are represented in the infinitive complexes with implicit *бути* and passive participles *змушений* in present tense, explicit *бути* and passive participle *змушений* in the future tense, for instance,

64. *Тому журналісти змушені шукати мера закордоном* (www.telekritika.ua, gecrawlt am 13.06.2012),

65. *Австрійці будуть змушені повторно обирати президента* (https://zbruc.eu/node/53357 від 01.07.2016).

Analyzing sentences with causative *zmusić* in the Polish language, structures of the model S1 + Vpread + S1 / S2 + żeby + (S1 / S2) + Vpast tense + $Adv_{present / future}$ have been found, their secondary predictive center is distributed by adverbs of a definite or indefinite tense referring to the present or future. This type of distributors indicates the uncertainty of the actualization of the proposition or the possibility of the caused event implementing in the future, therefore, serves as a marker of irreality. So, if in a sentence the predicate of the perfective aspect *zmusić* is used in the past, and the statement is distributed by the adverbs referring to the present or the future, it nominates irreal propositions, in contrast to the models that do not contain these destributors and the causative predicate of perfective aspect in past tense denotes non-actualized state of affairs. In

66. *Zmusił mnie, żebym go jutro zabrał* (NKJP) – proposition *jego jutro zabrał* is irreal,

67. *Potem zmusili gwiazdy drużyny, by na koszt klubu dzwonili do co bardziej znaczących ludzi w Oregonie i namawiali do kupowania kart wstępu do Ogrodu Róż* (NKJP) – proposition *na koszt klubu dzwonili* is real. В українській мові каузовані ситуації, введені предикатом **змусити** доконаного виду минулого часу, не можуть бути поширеними обставинними прислівниками визначеного або невизначеного часу, що відносяться до теперішнього чи майбутнього, а тому вербалізують тільки реальні пропозиції. In the Ukrainian language, the causative situations implemented by the predicate **змусити** of perfective aspect in the past tense cannot be distributed by adverbs of a definite or indefinite tense referring to the present or future and therefore verbalize only real propositions.

In the following sentences of models S1 + Vpread + S1 / S2 + Vinf, S1 + + Vpread + S1 / S2 + do + N2 with the predicate of imperfective aspect **змушувати** and its synonyms in the past tense

68. *Чого ходиш чорна! – гримала Маланка на Гафійку і змушувала її мало не щодня міняти сорочку, сама чесала її голову і вплітала в коси нові кісники* (Михайло Коцюбинський),

69. *Вонапотай обурювалася на Бога, але острах перед його силою змушував до покори* (Я. Качура) the causative situation is represented as a multiple, repeated regular actualized at a certain time t0 event, and therefore propositions 1) *Гафійка мало не щодня міняла сорочку*, 2) *вона корилася* are real. In the Polish language, the propositions realis in the same model sentences implemented with predicates ***zmuszać*** and reflexive ***zmuszać się*** or their synonyms appear in models:

$$S1 + Vpread + S1/S2 + do + N_2$$

70. *Podobienstwo jest tu wyrazne, roznica polega na tym, ze Nixon staral sie ratowac swych wspolpracownikow, Clinton – zmuszal ich do klamstwa po to, aby ratowac wlasna skore* (www.kurierplus.com, *gecrawlt am 20.04.2012*).

$$S1 + Vpread + się + do + N_2$$

71. *Zmuszała się do uśmiechu, chociaż była bliska załamania z powodu upokorzenia* (Jane Green. Ocalić Grace).

However, if the caused event is characterized by some degree of regularity or frequency, even when the causative predicate is expressed in the

present tense, imperfective aspect, in both Polish and Ukrainian state of affairs is actualized either in the past, or in the past and present, or only in the present moment when the event is being caused, for example:

72. *Praca zmusza mnie do ciągłego przemieszczania się samochodem po kraju* (www.emetro.pl, gecrawlt am 20.04.2012), тобто а) їздив в країні машиною, б) їздив в країні машиною і їздить у країні машиною в t_0, коли його змушують, в) їздить у країні машиною в t_0, коли його змушують. So, subject a) traveled in the country by car, b) traveled in the country by car and is travelling in the country by car in t0, when he/she is made, c) is travelling in the country by car in t_0, when he/she is made.

73. *В Google Classroom додали функцію, яка змушує дітей відповідати на питання вчителів* (https://ms.detector.media/web/online_media/v_google_classroom_dodali_funktsiyu_yaka_zmushue_ditey_vidpovidati_na_pitannya_vchiteliv/ від 10.10.2018), – a) the children answered in the past; b) the children answered in the past and answer at the time t0 when they are made; c) the children answer at the time t_0, when they are made

The same tendency of marking a real proposition, indicating a regular event, is realized in predicate causative models with the verb **бути/ być** in the present tense and the passive participle **змушений/zmuszony**, Sentence

74. *In the Ternopil region, part of the students are forced to study without textbooks* (https://zz.te.ua / na-ternopilschyni-chastyna-shkolyariv-zmusheni-vchytysya-bez-pidruchnykiv / dated 09/29/2018) denots a number of actualized propositions: a) children were studying without textbooks, b) children were studying without textbooks and children are studying without textbooks at time t0, when they are made; c) children are studying without textbooks at time t0, when they are made;

75. *Kobiety nie ukrywają, że **są zmuszone** jakoś sobie radzić* (www.pomorska.pl, gecrawlt am 20.04.2012): a) women coped; b) women coped and cope at time t0, when they are made; c) women cope at the moment of time t0 when they are made.

5. Conclusions

Analyzing sentences denoting real and irreal propositions in Polish and Ukrainian, the paculiarities of their semantic and syntactic verbalization in propositional constructions are described.

In Ukrainian and Polish, the irreality markers in the form of modal verbs or verb constructions, but at the same time they are an expression of modality that can be conventionally divided into the desired for the subject (the proposition is irreal, so the subject wants it to be actualized) or undesired (the proposition is irreal, the subject doesn't want it to be actualized).

In the Ukrainian and Polish languages, the degree of expression and stimulation intensity is also influenced by the combination of the past tense verb with the irreal particle щоб – 'żeby'.

It was found that reality contrasts not only with irreality as counterfactivity, but also with neutrality: the sentence does not clearly define the relation of the situation described in the proposition to the real world – the proposition is used without referring to the truth.

In English, Polish and Ukrainian, the hypothetical modality is verbalized in conditional and suppositive sentences as a representative of irreality. However, in English grammar, 0 Conditionals structures are isolated, in which only the conditionality frame is preserved, although this type of sentence doesn't express any condition. In Slavic languages we may see a similar construction in which both the state of affairs and the action that will take place under this condition are expressed at present.

All these sentences can be transformed into synonymous equivalents that verbalize general knowledge, rather than the personal assessment of the speaker or any other person, without reference to their probability / authenticity.

In Ukrainian, the relationship between cause and effect in sentences with the predicates *змусити* and *змушувати* and their synonyms at the semantic-syntactic level is verbalized with the infinitive, less with verbal nouns representing real / actualized or non-actualized states. In Polish, causal predicates ***zmusić/zmuszać*** are used in sentences with verbal nouns and in propositional structures with subordinate aim conjunctions *aby/żeby*.

Analyzing sentences with causative ***zmusić*** in Polish, there were found constructions of the model $S1 + Vpread + S1/S2 + żeby + (S1/S2) + V_{past\ tense} + Adv_{present/future}$, in which the secondary prediction core is expanded with the help of adverb of time – specified or indefinite, referring to the present or future. This indicates the uncertainty in the actualization of its proposition or the possibility of actualizing the causal event in future, therefore the exponents of irreality are used.

In Ukrainian, causative sentences are verbalized in models with predicate *змусити* in the form of the past tense, cannot be used with adverbs of a definite or indefinite time, referring to the present or future, and therefore verbalize only real propositions.

In the article sentences are described from the point of view of syntax and semantics and the distinction of common and different features of reality and irreality representation in Polish and Ukrainian. The proper semantic models are shown, which makes it possible to distinguish relative truth – in relation to some hypothetical models of reality – from the 'absolute' truth, the truth about the real world.

The work is an introduction to the research on key means of reality / irreality representation in Polish and Ukrainian. Further research, taking into account the interpretation of sample sentences by native speakers of these languages, will allow to study this interesting phenomenon in more detail.

References:

1. Arutjunova N.D. (1999). Jazyk i mir cheloveka. 2-e izd., ispr. v dopoln. Moskow: Jazyki russkoj kuljtury, 896 p.

2. Beliaeva E.Y., Tseitlyn S.N. (1990). Sootnoshenye znachenyi vozmozhnosty y neobkhodymosty v semantycheskoi sfere potentsyalnosty. *Teoryia funktsyonalnoi hrammatyky. Temporalnost. Modalnost*. Leningrad: Nauka, p. 123–126.

3. Bybee J. (1998). Irrealis as grammatical category. *Anthropological linguistics*, pp. 257–271.

4. Claire Bowern (1998). Towards a Typology of Irrealis Marking in Modality. *Australian Linguistic Society*. Available at: http://www.als.asn.au/proceedings/als1998/bower371.html (accessed 10 May 2019).

5. Elliott J.R. (2000). Realis and irrealis: Forms and concepts of grammaticalisation of reality. *Linguistic Typology*, vol. 4, pp. 55–90.

6. Giannakidou A. (2002). Licensing and sensitivity in polarity items: from downward entailment to nonveridicality. Proceedings of the *Chicago Linguistic Society 38: Papers from the 38th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Parasession on Polarity and Negation* (eds. M. Andronis, A. Pycha, Keiko Yoshimura). Chikago, pp. 21–23.

7. Kasevych V.B. (1988). Semantyka. Syntaksys. Morfolohyia. Moskwa: Nauka, 309 p.

8. Korpus ukrainskoi movy. Available at: http://korpus.org.ua/ (accessed 10 May 2019).

9. Kuljbabsjka O.V. (2007). Infinityv jak zasib predykaciji u strukturi prostogho rechennja. Available at: http://movoznavstvo.com.ua/ download/pdf/2007_2/23.pdf (accessed 10 May 2019).

10. Miasoiedova S.V., Tkach P.B. (2014). Hramatychna reprezentatsiia propozytyvnoho zmistu v strukturi preferentsiinykh konstruktsii. *Naukovi zapysky Natsionalnoho universytetu "Ostrozka akademiia". Seriia : Filolohichna*, vol. 49, pp. 113–115. Available at: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/Nznuoaf_2014_49_36 (accessed 10 May 2019).

11. Mikucionis Ugnius (2012). Modality and the Norwegian modal verbs, (Doctoral dissertation). Humanities, Philology. Vilnus, 232 p.

12. Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego 2008-2012 (NKJP). Available at: http://www.nkjp.pl/

13. Nedjalkov V.P., Syljnyckyj Gh.Gh. (1999). Typologhyja kauzatyvnыkh konstrukcyj. *Typologhyja kauzatyvnykh konstrukcyj. Morfologhycheskyj kauzatyv*. Leningrad: Nauka, pp. 5–18.

14. Nikulshyna T.M. (2009). Doslidzhennia irrealnoho v movoznavstvi: suchasni tendentsii. *Uchenye zapysky Tavrycheskoho natsyonalnoho unyversyteta ym. V.Y. Vernadskoho. Seryia filolohiia. Sotsyalnyie kommunykatsyi*, vol. 24, no. 2, part 2, pp. 447–451.

15. Nikulshyna T.M. (2010). Irrealnyi svit: filosofskyi ta linhvistychnyi aspekty (na materiali anhliiskoi ta ukrainskoi mov). *Visnyk LNU imeni Tarasa Shevchenka*, no. 13(200), part 2, pp. 167–173.

16. Palmer F.R. (2001). Mood and Modality. 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press, pp. i–xxii + 236 pp.

17. Pietrandrea P. (2012). The conceptual structure of irreality. A focus on non-exclusion-of-factuality as a conceptual and a linguistic category. *Language Sciences*, vol. 34, pp. 184–199.

18. Shatunovskyi Y. (1996). Semantyka predlozhenyia y nereferentnye slova. Moskwa: Shkola "Iazyki russkoi kultury", 395 p.

19. Slovnyk synonimiv Karavansjkogho. Available at: http://slovopedia.org.ua/ 41/53407/270198.html (accessed 10 May 2019).

20. Ukrajinsjkyj linhvistychnyj portal «Slovnyky Ukrajiny» on-line. Available at: http://lcorp.ulif.org.ua/dictua/ (accessed 10 May 2019).

21. Urmanchyeva A.Yu. (2004). Sedmoe dokazatelstvo realnosti irrealisa. *Irrealis i irrealnost*. Moskwa: Hnozis, vol. 3, pp. 28–74.

22. Wielki słownik języka polskiego. Available at: http://www.wsjp.pl/do_ druku.php?id_hasla=16811&id_znaczenia=5036174 (accessed 10 May 2019).

23. Wortschatz-Portal der Universität Leipzig. Available at: https://wortschatz.uni-leipzig.de/en (accessed 10 May 2019).