

**THE FUNCTIONAL-SEMANTIC CATEGORY  
OF AFFIRMATION IN THE UKRAINIAN LITERARY LANGUAGE**

**Hurko Olena<sup>1</sup>**

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-571-78-7\\_27](https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-571-78-7_27)

**Abstract.** The research proves that affirmation is a functional-semantic category, which has a logical-psychological ground and modus character. This category is represented by its units on different language levels, which are linked by the same affirmative meaning. The diversion into direct and indirect affirmation is distinctive for functional-semantic category of affirmation. These kinds of affirmation verbalize lexico-grammatical, morphological and syntactical means. Direct affirmation is monosemantic and is expressed immediately. It is represented by lexico-grammatical, morphological and syntactic markers. Indirect affirmation is expressive, not related directly to affirmative meaning, actualized by indirect identifiers on the grammatical level of the Ukrainian literary language. It requires more complex, in-depth and mediate perceptual process. It depends on context and is also represented by auxiliary linguistic units. Activity of lexico-grammatical explicators of the direct affirmation in the Ukrainian literary language is determined by a great number of verb, adjective, noun, numeral and phraseological lexemes, which verbalize affirmative meaning without paying attention to context. Particle “yes” is a dominant of direct affirmation on morphological level. The usage of modal words as direct ways of explication of affirmation is determined by their semantic-grammatical features and stylistic-expressive peculiarities. Taking this into account, groups of modal lexemes have been established, which consist of ‘affirmation’ seme, representing speaker’s assurance in the verity of saying, establishment of positive or negative attitude of the speaker to what is being said, statement of existence of collocutor and information on consistent, generalized interpretation of thoughts. Within the means of affirmation transmission, the units of syntactic level are dominant. The most productive and multipurpose explicator of direct affirmation on syntactic level is

---

<sup>1</sup> Doctor of Philology Sciences, Professor of a Chair of Translation and Linguistic Training of Foreigners, Oles Honchar Dnipro National University, Ukraine

declarative sentences. They are characterized by establishment function, which is the basis of the explored category. Affirmative words-sentences are direct markers of affirmation realization, which independently, without help of other lexemes, affirm what they question. Affirmative function is most expressively verbalized by those words-sentences, which are used to agree with the previous saying, speaker's assurance in the saying, confirmation of the accuracy of collocutor's thoughts, consistence in expressing one's own thoughts, summarizing, detailing, explanation of the statement. Indirect affirmation is presented by implicit means of explication of the affirmation on the grammatical level of the language. The use of exclamation words for the sake of verbalization of indirect affirmation in the sentence is conditioned by their ability to realize the meaning of various human feelings, expressing certain positive or negative information, the basis of which lies within affirmation or confirmation of any fact, event, phenomenon. Particularly expressive affirmative sentences are denoted by negative rhetorical questions, which point out the falsity of the negative and prompt the listener to make a statement on their own. Indirect affirmation is also marked in the structure of rhetorical issues, which in most cases are statements, judgments, which do not need to be answered, since they reflect the speaker's thoughts in the form of a message. Incitement of affirmative semantics in rhetorical questions is assisted by particles, intonation, semantic contextuality and content conditionality.

### **1. Introduction**

Researches from various branches of scientific knowledge show keen interest in the question of status of the category of affirmation and its linguistic explication. The spectrum of problems connected with ascertaining the linguistic specificity of affirmation is still a point for discussion in linguistics.

The category of affirmation was qualified by researches as logical and grammatical that constitutes predicativity of a sentence, serves a form of human thinking, reflects real being and has morphological means of expression (O.I. Baharev [2]); as communicative pragmatic that provides implementation of a range of thought acts – affirmation, approval, consent, affection, gratitude, etc. (L.M. Vladymyrska [5], I.V. Museinyk [19]); as structural and semantic which is represented by different manifestations of affirmative meaning in functional types of sentences (V.F. Babaitseva [1],

A.A. Kalynina [14]); as syntactical, explicated at sentence communicative level (P.S. Dudyk [11], O.P. Kushch [16]); as semantic and syntactic, which is based on the connection between a subject and a phenomenon of extralingual reality (I.R. Vyhovanets [4]); as modus (cognitive-functional) that distinguishes main affirmative category unit, represents its features emphasizing their importance and necessity, particularly for classifying the cognitive elements of human experience (M.M. Boldyrev [3], O.L. Dotsenko [10]); as semantic and grammatical in the frames of which specialized and non-specialized means are distinguished and are systematized with the help of functional semantic field (I.Y. Kharytonova [35], Y.S. Stupak [29]). Though each of the mentioned approaches reflects only one of the aspects of the investigating category that renders impossible clarification of its integrated nature.

The tendency to study syntactic phenomenon is characteristic of modern linguistics not only in terms of formal structure, but also in terms of functional-semantic parameters which consist of linguistic categories. Taking into account this fact, the necessity to study the specificity of lingual categories thoroughly becomes important. The interpretation of such lingual categories is based on their consistent realization at different levels of language.

When studying the category of affirmation on the materials in English, German, Russian, French, linguists traditionally indicate its universality, outline the parameters of lexical, phraseological, morphological and syntactical representation of affirmative content (L.M. Vladymyrska [5], Y.S. Stupak [29], A.A. Kalynina [14]).

In Ukrainian linguistic studies certain aspects of the category of affirmation have already been a separate subject of investigation for linguists. For example, K.S. Symonova [26] noted an affirmative content of particles, I.Y. Kharytonova [35] substantiated affirmative semantics of verbs, nouns, adjectives, P.S. Dudyk, A.P. Zagnitko, O.P. Kushch [16] substantiated affirmative function of words-sentences, I.R. Vyhovanets analyzed affirmative sentence [4], N.K. Voitsekhivska [6] emphasized the connection between categories of affirmation and consent, I.V. Museynyk [19] investigated pragmatic and semantic features of evaluative utterances that include negation and explicate affirmation of different degree of categoricalness. Nevertheless, there is no study in modern Ukrainian linguistics that is dedicated to integrated study of functional-semantic category of affirmation.

The relevance of the theme is based on the necessity to study the category of affirmation in Ukrainian literary language. That's the reason of our aim to investigate the category of affirmation in Ukrainian literary language. The set aim implies the need to accomplish the following tasks: 1) to characterize the main scientific approaches to studying the problems of affirmation in linguistics, logic, philosophy and psychology; 2) to substantiate a multistatus nature of the category of affirmation; 3) to differentiate direct and indirect affirmation; 4) to define the means of direct affirmation expression at morphological and syntactical levels of Ukrainian literary language; 5) to systematize the means of indirect affirmation expression.

The object of the investigation is language means at different levels as explicators of the category of affirmation in the Ukrainian literary language.

The subject of the analysis is the hierarchization of means of direct and indirect expression in the frames of functional-semantic category of affirmation.

## **2. The ancient and today's studying of affirmation**

The spectrum of problems connected with affirmation attracts the researchers' attention from long ago and has a long history. The first attempts of explaining this category took place in ancient Greek and Indian philosophy (vaisheshika and nyaya schools). The basis of these schools' concept is recognition of a real being as ontological object of affirmative judgements.

In the works of ancient thinkers, the studying of affirmation was based on the theory proposed by Aristotle of two opposite forms of human thinking activity – affirmation and negation. According to his observations, everything that is negated by anybody can be affirmed, and an affirmation is anybody's utterance about anything. Nevertheless, such approach is not holistic and unambiguous, because it renders impossible interpretation of all linguistic manifestations of affirmation.

Modern characterization of affirmation includes functional-semantic features in studying language units. In this regard, traditional definition of the category of affirmation as logical-grammatical or semantically-grammatical limits its functional capacity and implies the necessity of further versatile investigation drawing on the newest approaches in linguistics.

The category of affirmation belongs to the group of modus categories. It closely interrelates and intersects with such modus categories as modality,

epistemicism, persuasiveness, evidentiality, reality / irreality, evaluation, the units of which transferring the information reflect subjective speaker's attitude toward given information and take part in forming affirmative utterances. For example, According to M. Forbes, success comes to those who do the things that he or she likes the most [33, p. 10].

The category of affirmation belongs to the group of modus categories. It closely interrelates and intersects with such modus categories as modality, epistemicism, persuasiveness, evidentiality, reality / irreality, evaluation, the units of which transferring the information reflect subjective speaker's attitude toward given information and take part in forming affirmative utterances. For example, *According to M. Forbes, success comes to those who do the things that he or she likes the most* [33, p. 10].

The category of affirmation is an important method of cognitive-communicative sphere of human consciousness, as it constitutes the base of many speech acts of positive reaction – consent, admission, approval, statement, gratitude, congratulation, acceptance, awareness and serves for informative interpretation of the world. For example, *Oh, how strange your images are! My God, what a beauty!, Harytin wondered making the sign of the cross in front of each new image* [21, p. 100].

The concepts *affirmativeness, affirmation, assertion, positiveness* function in linguistic literature in parallel. It demonstrates a wide vocabulary for nomination of the category of affirmation in modern linguistics.

Drawing on the previous scientific achievements in classification of affirmative units according to the method of speech implementation (L.M. Vladymyrska [5], N.V. Voitsekhivska [6], A.A. Kalynina [14], O.P. Kushch [16], Y.S. Stupak [29], etc.), we consider it's logical to distinguish direct and indirect affirmation. We define direct affirmation as unambiguous, apparent, directly expressed, the one that doesn't depend on contextual and situational prerequisites, especially the form reflects the content, which was formed at the level of thinking. Indirect affirmation is the one that doesn't have a clear link with affirmative content, because it includes such language units that don't highlight the affirmation directly. Indirect affirmation often results from the content of a sentence and mostly depend on the context.

The system of functional-semantic implementations of direct affirmation in Ukrainian literary language is formed by explicit means. Among the markers of realization of direct affirmation there are, first of all,

lexical-grammatical (*to claim, fact, true, some*), morphological (*yes, all, it's necessary, I, first of all*) and syntactical units (***Small river Rastavytsia calmly flows between two ranges of steep mountains down the wide valley***) [21, p. 6].

In addition to the markers of direct expression of affirmation, there are means in the Ukrainian literary language that update the affirmation indirectly. Sentences with implicit content are largely built on the semantic and grammatical laws of language, that is, they have certain systematically conditioned features. In particular, functional words can execute the role of indirect confirmation markers explaining the affirmation with a shade of sequence, simultaneity, completeness and accuracy of the message, etc. The interlocutor interprets the indirect assertive content not directly but on the basis of rethinking, for example: *I had enough time to learn both Turkish and Arabic, said Hurrem. **And the Persian*** [33, p. 83].

### 3. The representation of direct affirmation

The criteria for specification the direct affirmation include the following: the presence of lexical units that independently explicate the meaning of the statement or its shade; formation of sentences without negative means and interrogative intonation; operation of sentences expressing the pragmatic meaning of the affirmation, in particular confirmation, approval, permission, promise, agreement, assignment, assumption; active repetition of elements for enhancing the communicative-pragmatic affirmation potential; use of stable combinations of words specializing in confirmation of presence, significance, expediency with shades of capture, joy, satisfaction; the use of constructions implementing the affirmative semantics of the expression of will for further realization or statement of a certain fact, event, action, etc.

Words of different language classes explain the affirmation by their lexical meaning. In modern grammar science, as N.L. Ivanytska [31] notices, the role and place of every notional part of the speech is clearly outlined in the perspective of its centrality and peripherality. In particular, the noun and the verb possess the central role in the grammatical structure of the language. Given this, typical lexico-grammatical verbalizers of affirmative meaning include, first of all, verbs such as *to affirm, to confirm, to state, to approve, to report, to inform, to point out, to sum up, to declare, and to testify*. The use of such verbs in the sentence structure makes it possible to transfer a mental affirmative act: *He is pleased to note that the work has*

*been completed* [33, p. 100]. In the explored material, verbs that explicate the modular meanings of the reciprocity, statement, affirmation, reporting, assurance, informing implement the language needs.

The affirmative meaning is also characteristic of nouns, by which they reproduce the internal state of the speaker, indicate the presence of elements of human being and nature, and express the identity of someone or something. That is why those groups of noun tokens, which explain the idea through affirmation, are singled out, because direct lexical meaning does not contain in its structure negative components, and therefore, formed on the basis of affirmation. For example, *the truth is what really exists; analogue is those that show similarity, resemblance to another subject*.

There are many words in the Ukrainian literary language with attributive meanings that are used to affirm certain attributes (*plump, sighted, long*), value, significance (*rich, basic, meaningful*), authenticity, truthfulness (*honest, objective, frank*), being, presence (*available, valid, permanent*), similarity, typicality (*similar, typical, monotonous*), as well as to define completely opposite concepts (*healthy – ill, individual – collective, respectable – frivolous, early – late, natural – artificial*).

The least productive in the implementation of affirmative meaning are numerals, but they also contribute to the expressiveness of quantitative semantics, indicating the presence of a definite or indefinite number of someone or something. For example: *This poor girl is only ten years old. I will take her for the daughter. Hlib is twelve* [30, p. 130].

Phraseological units, in comparison with other lexical-grammatical means of explication of direct affirmation, appear more capacious and pragmatically brighter. The generalization of phraseological affirmation units made it possible to distinguish ten most productive semantic varieties of expressive affirmation: 1) phraseological units, informing about work, activity of someone; 2) phraseological units formed on the basis of the statement of success, the effectiveness of a sign, action or circumstance of action; 3) phraseological units that claim someone's interest in someone or something; 4) phraseological units that help figuratively indicate the appearance of someone or something; 5) phraseological units affirming the similarity of someone or something to someone or something; 6) phraseological units that correlate with the expression of the affirmation of the necessity of someone, the appropriateness of something; 7) phraseological units that claim importance, the value of someone or

something; 8) phraseological units that state the truth, the probability of something; 9) phraseological units, indicating prosperity, including the availability of money; 10) phraseological units that convey a sense of aesthetics, beauty.

The dominant in the system of morphological means of expression of the affirmation is affirmative particle *yes*. This particle, besides the main meaning, represents many various additional shades in the sentence, in particular: conclusion, agreement, confirmation, statement, belief, categorical assurance, approval, request, invitation, wish, and motive.

Sufficiently representative in the transmission of affirmative meaning are particles such as *aha, avzhezh, atozh, ayakzhe, otozh, ehe, uhu, umhu*, which serves primarily for the creation of the modality of the statement and more expressive description of the events in the sentence.

Among the morphological means of expressing direct affirmation in the Ukrainian literary language, pronoun tokens are marked by high productivity. These words do not simply localize and identify a person, an object, a being, a quantity, a place, a time, a cause, they are the typical bearers of affirmative semantics, since they state the presence of a potential subject, a probable sign, circumstance, and can also pass affirmation with a shade of generalization, isolation, identity of a sign of action or state. For example, *Everyone aspires for happiness* [32, p. 62].

In view of the fact that in the system of markers of direct affirmation a prominent place belongs to modal words, in our study, depending on the semantic content, the following groups of tokens containing the following 'affirmation' are singled out: 1) words expressing the speaker's confidence in the reality of the message; 2) words that reflect the author's personal opinion on a particular situation; 3) words representing a re-modality, confirm the source of the opinion or message and appeal to the previously acquired knowledge of the addressee; 4) lexemes transmitting emotional and evaluative semantics, in particular the negative emotional attitude of the speaker to the content of the statement, for example, saying dissatisfaction, annoyance, neglect, anger, distrust, rage, reprobation; 5) words expressing the positive attitude of the speaker to certain phenomena, events, objects, affirming, in particular, admiration, astonishment, satisfaction, joy; 6) words used mainly for informing about the presence of the interlocutor; 7) words like *first(ly), second(ly), further, finally, and the last, in conclusion*, indicate a sequence of thoughts; 8) words, for example, *actually, in particular,*



for example, used for the transmission of logical streamlining of speech, the highlighting the basic information, the identification of the result; 9) words that verbalize affirmation with a tint of consequence, concreteness, generalization.

The meaning of affirmation also passes the affirming-modal predicate words as *it is required, worth, desirable, possible, necessary, essential*, which, combined mostly with the infinitive, explicit the modal modification of the state, for example, indicate the possibility of realizing something (*It is necessary to live*) and realize the meaning of the permission (*It is possible to read there*). In addition, predicative modal words with affirmative meanings can verbalize the categorical will expressions, in particular: categorical demand, persistent recommendation, advice, and wish.

The main means of explication of direct affirmation in the modern Ukrainian language include narrative sentences that distinguish primarily by their function, which they perform in the process of communication: transmit messages of the speaker, description of certain phenomena and facts of reality. Taking into account, that intonation plays an important role in the formation of affirmative meaning in such sentences, we distinguish four types of narrative sentences: *the actual narrative, message-sentence, explanation-sentence, and statement-sentence*.

*Actually narrative sentences* in the process of communication serve to state, confirm the fact of reality, although the appeal to the interlocutor is not direct, but has an indirect character: *Somewhere in the dark the people called out, the dogs were barking plaintively and the bad weather rushed and blew* [9, p. 14]. *The message-sentence* is a direct appeal to an interlocutor for informing about an object, phenomenon or action that is interesting to him: *Look, a wife, as she proudly gazes through the glasses as far as at our findings, through the house* [22, p. 265]. The sentence-message differs from the actual narrative sentence with a more specific statement, in particular the statement of fact. *The explanation-sentence* is a communicative type of story, typical of both dialogical and monologue speech. Functioning of the explanation-sentence is possible only in connection with the previous statement, to explain what it is intended: *People began to avoid not only Motrya, but her mother as well. The place where they lived, it became somewhat terrible – they began to run over him* [17, p. 284]. Explaining the speaker specifies, senses the content of the report, accentuates the listener's attention at a certain moment. Explanation-sentences state the additional

information to a reported. Statement-sentences in their communicative direction are similar to the message-sentences. They turn their content to the direct listener and aim to not only inform him about the fact, action or phenomenon, but also cause the corresponding reaction of this listener. *The statement-sentence* is stating, specifying certain thoughts are a signal that leads to action: *Though you will not be a blossom of flower, / Levkoevoju fragrant-golden, / Though you went among the crowd swim / In the ocean of routine and stagnation, / Still, for me you are clear, and pure, / Will not stop being a saint, / As the color that the heat did not undergo any cold or heat, / As the ideal is all clear – because distant* [31, p. 141].

The affirmative meaning can be realized by every lexeme of the narrative sentence, which is distinguished by a logical accent, emphasizing the attention of the speakers on that word in the sentence, which is semantically and stylistically the most important for each separate speech situation. As a result, various functional-stylistic variants of sentences appear, let's compare: *Cossacks participated in many campaigns on the Turks* [8, p. 234] – due to the alternate logical allocation in this sentence, each of the full words can create its various stylistic variants, explicating the affirmation with the help of allocated lexemes: ***The Cossacks** (and not somebody else) participated in many campaigns on the Turks; The Cossacks participated in many campaigns on the **Turks** (and not on the Tatars), and so on.*

The affirmation in the induction sentence is represented by a categorical, softened and neutral motive. The main means of expressing affirmative meaning in the motive sentence include imperative method of the verb-predicate, the form of conditional and the actual method of verb-predicate with the motive particles *haj, nehaj*, intonation, elliptical motive constructions, complex sentences explicating the message, the explanation, etc. E. g: ***Glory to Ukraine! And to the heroes glory!*** [30, p. 50]; ***Yeah, here, here!*** [18, p. 34].

The affirmation, expressed with the help of affirmative words-sentences, we qualify as direct, we list them as typical markers of the category under study, since the function of constructs is like *Yes; So is it; Of course; Okay; For sure; Right; Shche b pak; Exactly; Ta vzhe zh; Otozh-bo* because of affirmation of something.

On the basis of the lexical-grammatical approach to the differentiation of vocabulary words developed in Ukrainian linguistics, the words-sentences with affirmative semantics are represented by four groups, in particular:

1) particles (*When tailored someone boots, then dropping them or putting on, they give a thank you. Ege* [15, p. 44]; 2) modal words (*It is easier to carry a barbell – Definitely!*) [20, p. 206]; 3) exclamations (*We will protest – Okay, to her God, bravo* [33, p. 83] and exclaiming phraseological connections (*Here you are! Here is your father! And what will our Onysya do?, asked Prokopovychka* [22, p. 70]; 4) etiquette forms (*Good afternoon to you, I said. Good afternoon* [23, p. 328].

Communicative forms, formed by different variations of lexemes, are quite common among the words-sentences in the function of the explicators of direct affirmation, for example: 1) exclamation + modal particle: **Oh yes, yes!** *He will be here! I heard how he spoke with your old, walking path* [34, p. 35]; 2) exclamation + modal word: **Oh, really,** *I say, I do not know where this bird will be for night, what did her in an evil hour in a strange land lead?* [18, p. 39]. Confirmation of the facts, indicated in the replica of the interlocutor (*which is true, it is true*), consent (*Yes! Of course!*), assessment of the phenomena (*Oh! It must be!*) are the main general meanings of affirmative words-sentences, the contents of which the specific content depends on the context, situations, conditions of expression, and sometimes even use of non-verbal means of communication. The words-sentences with affirmative semantics are an expressive means of explication of the category of affirmation in the Ukrainian literary language, because they help to establish the speaker's reaction to the expression of the interlocutor, the satisfaction of what he has seen and heard, inform the truth of the words of the author regarding a particular speech situation, and so on.

The statement of identity or similarity of positions, beliefs, views in the process of linguistic communication, informing of the absence of any contradictions gives grounds for counting sentences with the semantics of consent to those expressing affirmations, and distinguishing the following basic pragmatics of direct affirmation in the Ukrainian literary language: 1) affirmation-confirmation: *Is it about the feeling of Mr. Balzac? Yes, it is on this very occasion* [32, p. 143]; 2) affirmation-approval: *Well, that's all ... Cope ... What are we with you all the same good men ... Everything is done correctly, you see, the land is not wet, then there is no water, water retreated* [24, p. 203]; 3) affirmation-permission: *Do you know who I am and allow yourself to speak to me like that ?! I allow myself to speak even to the gods* [32]; 4) affirmation-promise: *Just promise that you will find the prince! I promise* [24, p. 138]; 5) affirmation-arrangement: *Kill me ...*

*Are you sure you want this? How? You're serious about going.. Yes! **OK! I'll kill you But under one condition ... You wait for three days** [24, p. 166]; 6) affirmation-subjection: **I would agree even for one thousand!** *All the same our mine will be closed in a month* [32, p. 428]; 7) partial affirmation: *It was necessary to gather me on the comforting words and to reassure my sad mother, but did not know what to say. Feeling only a slight surprise: I was hoping for this, but not now, when the summer, and somewhere in the autumn – obviously, **my son wanted to collect some money** for learning, because we always onerously with him.* [33, p. 57]; 8) uncertain affirmation: *Vasilivno, can you see with your third eye, if my husband had a mistress? Do you have any suspicions? **But it does not even exist*** [24, p. 139]; 9) affirmation-assumption: *And what makes you better? You give up to me, **and maybe ... and your child. My child?! Do not rush with such words, Messo*** [32, p. 162]; 10) polite affirmation: *For the lord! **Thank you!*** [32, p. 386]; 11) ironic affirmation: *And I beg Albino Romanivno to do without an image. So what then?! And even then, after all, maybe sometimes I won't be able to wait anymore. I am not waiting already. **And if you, my dear son-in-law, stayed with us, then keep silent in two trumpets and hear what they say*** [24, p. 213]; 12) false affirmation: *How do you think about yourself well? **Just like about you*** [32, p. 400].*

Relying on the fact that the grammatical statement of the affirmation in the sentence is the absence of a particle 'not' but the context and the particular speech situation are significant components of the affirmation, we distinguish the main types and subtypes of affirmations without the use of negative means.

General affirmation is divided into two subaspects of direct affirmation. The first subaspect (non-fragmentary affirmation) forms any sentences without objectionable means and questioning intonations that do not have any special lexical units, which convey affirmation. For example, *Near the dam against the mill on a hill stood an old oak church with five domes, and around it, as if embedded in a thick cherry grove, stood even older than the church, squashed, a wide bell tower with columns around* [21, p. 6].

To the second subaspect (fragmentary affirmation) we list sentences that include lexical units of different parts of the language, which pass the affirmation to its lexical meaning: *And you, Grygoriy Petrovych, should I treat you? She asked firing an eye on Protsenko. **Everyone! Everyone!** said Dowbnya quietly* [18, p. 329].

The second kind of affirmation is an affirmation -confirmation, which includes fragmentary affirmation and non-fragmentary affirmation. In the Ukrainian literary language, depending on the nature of the first replica in the context of the dialogue, we distinguish two methods of realization of the non-fragmentary affirmation.

To the first subspect we include non-fragmentary affirmation-confirmations, which are mostly an answer-confirmation to the questions posed by the actual questions. E. g: *Again from Matviy? Surely from St. Matviy, solemnly says Dorohtey* [27, p. 334]. It is precisely because of the lack of negations and because of the repetition of the lexical units of the previous question the given sentences acquire an affirmative meaning.

The second subspect is represented by non-fragmentary affirmation, which repeats mainly the last components of the previous non-interrogative expression, E. g: *I can be happy only with you. I am – with you* [24, p. 92]. The focus on the re-component provides the implementation of expressive affirmation.

Among the means of fragmentary affirmation, two subspects are identified, namely: affirmation-confirmation in the answer to the actual question sentence, which requires a response-confirmation and affirmation-confirmation, which is a positive assessment of the previous non-interrogative sentence.

The system of links between referencing sentences and responses that explains the affirmation is illustrated by the scheme in which the letters A B C D are used. In the modern Ukrainian language, we have several ways of implementing the affirmative content in the questions and answers according to the presence or absence of one of the components of the sentence : 1) A – BCD; 2) A – BC; 3) A – BD; 4) A – B; 5) A – CD; 6) A – C; 7) A – D. Component A is a self-questionable message requiring a response-confirmation; component B – syntactically unclassified sentences; component C – a communicatively relevant member projected by the question; component D – an additional notification of the facts, the events presented in the sentence. This classification allows you to implicate affirmation meaning according to the first type of relationships between the components: 1) A – BCD: *–Are you able to embroider the canvas? (A) – Yes (B), I can (C), in my own way (D)*. The second remark of communicative unity is a structurally complete answer-sentence containing fragmentary affirmation-confirmation (with a special lexical means of expressing

affirmation in component B). Let's try to transform the mind by designing other variants of the links between the components: 2) A – BC: – *Can you embroider the canvas?* (A) – *Yes* (B), *I can* (C); 3) A – BD: – *Can you embroider the canvas?* (A) – *Yes* (B), *in my own way* (D); 4) A – B: – *Can you embroider the canvas?* (A) – *Yes* (B); 5) A – CD: – *Can you embroider canvas?* (A) – *I can* (C), *in my own way* (D); 6) A – C: – *Can you embroider the canvas?* (A) – *I can* (C); 7) A – D: – *Can you embroider the canvas?* (A) – *In my own way* (D). Consequently, in variants 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6, the syntactically divided, partially non-identical structure of the answer-sentence question is presented; in option 7 it is a syntactically unclassified, non-isomorphic structure of the question corresponding sentence; in option 4 – syntactically uncharted response-sentence. In texts of fiction, similar variants of sentences occur, representing affirmations with the help of different lexical units. Mostly, second type is prevailing A – BC: *Did you, Laro, said that you took away a wedding dress?* (A) – *Yes* (B), *took away* (C) [24, p. 96]. However, there are other structures of sentences: *And we went to the house together* (A). – *Yes* (B), *of course!* (D) [24, p. 101]; *So everyone agree?* (A) – *Everyone! Everyone...* (C) [17, p. 132]. The following illustrations are shown that special lexical-grammatical expressions of direct affirmation (particles, exclamations, and modal words) can be used in place of any of the components in the corresponding sentence.

In the second subspect of the fragmentary affirmation-confirmation of the expression of consent, confirmation or conviction is achieved through various parts of the language; the semantic structure of which implements affirmative meaning: *Well, good night to you all! Good night, girls, good night!* [34, p. 122].

We classify the third type of statement as a combined one, since it combines non-textual confirmation and fragmentary affirmation. For example, *Our state? Yes, our state of Ukraine* [24, p. 94]. This way of explication the affirmation, in our opinion, is the least productive in the Ukrainian language.

#### 4. The means of verbalization of indirect affirmation

The main criteria for distinguishing indirect affirmation in the Ukrainian literary language are the following: the functioning of sentences, which by the form are negative, but semantically explicit affirmation; active transposition of the objection to the zone of affirmation, which enables the

implementation of a variety of assertive acts; the use of sentences, in which there are lexical units with word-forming formants, which uniquely represent the semantics of affirmation; the domination of questioning semantics in the implementation of a weakened, strengthened and strong affirmation; the presence of auxiliary parts of speech that, in certain contextual conditions, function as markers of affirmation.

A separate functional niche is filled with means expressing affirmation indirectly. They are represented by a group of exclamations that convey the affirmative character of the speaker's will. It includes following exclamations *Hayda!*; *Anumo (Anu)!*; *Numo!*; *Num!*, which are used to motivate for a quick, immediate action, claiming the need for its implementation: *Hayda with us, hayda soon*. The affirmation function in the sentence is also performed by such exclamations *Slava! Bravo!*, explaining approval, recognition, combat call, or *Hurray!* in the sense *Yes: Hurray! The next semester and academic year completed*.

In the interpretation of the category of affirmation, the issue of explication of affirmation with the use of negative means appears rather problematic and relevant. In our study, for the first time, sentences in which denials have been used are credited to implementers of indirect affirmation.

By the first type of verbalization of indirect affirmation, the affirmation is due to a negative rhetorical question. For example, *Do you think that without water, I no longer have strength?* [28, p. 45]. These sentences convey an affirmation through a controversial rhetorical question, point out the falsehood of a denial construction, and involve the reader / listener in reflection or experience, making him more active, as if forcing himself to decide.

The second kind is an affirmation through a double denial, which entails affirmation through a double one-hypothesized negation and affirmation through a double bipartite denial.

Affirmation through double one-hypothesized negation implements negative morphemes *without-*, *non-*, prefix *without* and negative particle *non*. There are several types of expression of a double denial in the Ukrainian literary language.

Given examples are a convincing proof that, when combined in sentences, these prefixes, particles and prepositions pass different modal shades of affirmation. For example, the shade of the affirmation, the stability of what is called a motivational word, is characteristic for lexemes with prefixes

*non-* and *without-*, and the limited, incomplete, weak affirmation expresses the negative particle *non-* and preposition *without*.

To the second subclass belongs the affirmation through a double bi-notion denial. Negative means functioning within the framework of affirmation due to bi-notion denial (preposition *without* and negative particle *not*) are between two words of a specific microtext: *But for some reason Alla has changed a lot recently ... I feel it does **not** happen **without** Marina* [24, p. 142]. This subclass is also represented by constructions in which the first objection relates to the auxiliary modal part of the compound verbal predicate, and the second is the infinitive as the main part of the predicate: *I **can't not** to wait for you. / You can believe me or not. / But my reality is helpless. / As a beast driven by hunters* [12, p. 100]. Although these constructions are bulky to implement the affirmative content, however, using them, the speaker is intended to express the meaning of affirmation and emphasize the importance of the information given in the sentence.

The third type of indirect affirmation is qualified as an affirmation through a single denial, which in the majority is represented by the negative prefixes *-without* or *-not*. In particular, word *not a deep river* means *shallow river*. In this case, an affirmation of the opposite meaning occurs. First, let's imagine *a deep river*, further – a denial of this concept, and then the affirmation of the notion of *shallow river* appears due to this denial. For example, *It's a sin to say so, but in fact we now have an **inactive** phase of fighting events. Without attacks, serious battles, etc.* [7]. The prefixes of *-in / un* and *-less* in such word forms as *fearless, inactive, unprotected* giving them the values opposite to the indicated words: *bold, passive, simple*, that is, the affirmed concept of a *bold person, a passive phase of events, simple music*. Consequently, the expression of indirect affirmation using negative means depends primarily on the semantic direction of the sentence and exploded additional modular shades.

Given the fact that the explication of affirmation in the interrogative-refinement sentences is due to the interaction of the categories of questions, modality and affirmation, three structural-semantic varieties of questioning-refinement sentences containing the following affirmation seme are singled out in the work: 1) questioning-refinement sentences without lexical and grammatical indicators of clarification, having narrative intonation in oral speech: *Suck up **my** blood?* [28, p. 24]. In these contexts, the refinement intention request is aimed at verifying or confirming the probability of what



is already known to the speaker, that is to reflect the relationship between the acquired knowledge (preliminary affirmation) and the incentive to expand it (a question); 2) questioning-refinement sentences, the structure of which has modal words and modal particles, which explicate the epistemic relation of the speaker to the expressed statement: *You'd better ride our horses, wouldn't you, dad?* [15, p. 7]. Interrogative sentences with the indicated modal words and particles convey probable meanings, state the information and are similar to the structure of narrative sentences. Compare: *Did she read the text, of course? – Of course, she read the text;* 3) questioning-refinement sentences in the structure of which there is a combination of particles *maybe* and *should*: *Maybe I should work? – Vasily thought, feeling in the body extraordinary lightness and joy of the spirit* [9, p. 23]; *Maybe we should do our homework?* [33, p.45]. A particle *maybe* in combination with a particle *should* form a series of communicative meanings that are opposite to what is noted in the proposal part of the speech act, namely the speaker politely encourages reading, work, homework, etc. Subjective-modal meanings of sentences explicating questions-refinements, in particular, refinement-conclusion and refinement-guess, correlate with narrative sentences-statements. The intonation, as well as the semantics of the context and the specifics of the situation, plays an important role in shaping the affirmative meaning in the questioning-refinement sentences. Modal words and their parts indicate the degree of confidence of the speaker in the content of the expressed statements and serve to convey an amplified or weakened affirmation.

The affirmative function dominates in question-rhetorical sentences containing hidden affirmation, and according to its content specifics are assertions. A rhetorical question is an 'unreal' question, since the speaker knows what he asks. For example, the question-rhetorical sentence *Is it me, have I been living in terrible Polish prisons since the thirty-fourth year: the Citadel, the Swan Kshez, Vronka, Brest? Did I spend five and a half years in lonely cameras?* [30, p. 44] does not in fact express a question, but a statement-assertion that is perceived as a categorical statement of the fact that a person spent time in prison for a certain time. Taking into account the fact that the rhetorical question has two syntactical meanings simultaneously: a question and statement, and therefore a question-statement, we believe that the main task of this type of sentences is the message: *It turns out that a good company has gathered in this castle?*

[30, p. 67]. Quite often, rhetorical questions are a means of reproducing the author's thoughts: *Where is it seen that a worker pays thirty-five kopecks a day on beets?* [15, p. 9] or syncretizing affirmations with an emotional reaction to the message: *And what, Muscovites allowed the Germans without a population, and turns out that we, Ukrainians, won't get freedom? Does it mean that we are worse than the Germans?* [30, p. 19].

Among sentences with conditional modality, which convey indirect contention, the most frequent are admissible-conditional sentences related to reality. In their subordinate part a certain assumption is expressed, but the main thing is expressed by the prediction that is formed on such an assumption. In this case, the assumption is potential because it can be implemented or not realized. These sentences are mostly constructed according to a certain model: in them the first part is explanatory, and the second one is consequential, for example: *Even if our Earth is a swamp, then your birth is atonement to it* [9, p. 28]. In such sentences, it is stated and confirmed the reality of a certain action, it is transmitted a message explicit to the assertive conditional meaning.

Identifiers of indirect affirmation are also connecting structures that help create a complete, informative comprehensive message that reflects the views of the author or character, reproducing the thinking process with a large number of semantic and modal shades. For example, in the sentence *You will ascend to heaven, you will ascend!, he repeated feverishly. I'm after you!* [33, p. 282] the attached component can be qualified as having an affirmative modality, implements a positive affirmative meaning, and at the same time represents the evaluative-expressive attitude of the speaker to things, events, and actions of other persons. In view of the fact that the connecting units not only explain, but also indicate the reasons for what has already been mentioned, we consider the logical isolation of the components with the shades of conciseness, determinability, specification, which emphasize and reinforce the affirmative modus. For example, *I'm the most common watchmaker! In general, everyone rests at night, ladies! So good night!* [24, p. 12].

Indirect affirmations actualize coordinated and subordinate conjunctions. Its most prominent representatives are repeated conjunctions that explicate to the union-counting relationships, for example *There are labor and the distance of the campaign in songs, / And sorrow, and smile, and love, / And the anger of the great people, / And the blood was shed for the people*

[25, p. 321]. In the above example, a recurring conjunction *and ... and*, by combining the homogeneous members of a sentence, signals the presence of several simple sentences of ascertaining semantics in the structure of a simple complicated sentence, namely: *There is labor in songs + And there is distances of the campaign in songs + And there is sorrow in songs + And there is smile in songs + And there is love in songs + And there is anger of the great people + And there was shed blood for the people in songs*. The use of comparative subordinate conjunctives, like the languages, as if, in the function of indirect affirmation markers, is related to the comparative relation transmitted by them, in which there is a component of similarity, affinity, proximity of the one or the other, the total homogeneity, the determination of a qualitative or quantitative advantage over what with what or with whom are compared. For example, *An unhappy fate was waiting for the fugitive: he was given to a fugitive, sent to Siberia, drowned by lashes, stigmatized, like cattle, or with a bare half-head, beaten up, sent in shackles back to the master, again in captivity, to the bondhold* [33, p. 3].

The system of means of expressing indirect contention in present-day Ukrainian literary language is represented by prepositions, among which are the subgroups of prepositions themselves, which in certain contextual conditions, in combination with the autosemantisch words, serve as markers of sentences with affirmative semantics. In particular, in a sentence like *October 14 – Day of the Defender of Ukraine. The Day of the Protection of the Most Holy Mother of God, at the same time as the Day of the Ukrainian Cossacks*, the temporal preposition ‘*at the same time*’ in construction *noun + at the same time as + noun* takes part in the expression of the simultaneous flow of the two reported events and is a confirmatory explicator of indirect affirmation.

## 5. Conclusions

Research proves that affirmation is a functional-semantic category, which has a logical-psychological ground and modus character. This category is represented by its units on different language levels, which are connected by the same affirmative meaning. The diversion into direct and indirect affirmation is distinctive for functional-semantic category of affirmation. These kinds of affirmation verbalize lexico-grammatical, morphological and syntactical means. Direct affirmation is expressed immediately and is monosemantic. It is represented by lexico-grammatical,

morphological and syntactic markers. Indirect affirmation is expressive, not related directly to affirmative meaning, actualized by indirect identifiers on the grammatical level of the Ukrainian literary language. It requires more complex, in-depth and mediate perceptual process. It depends on context and is also represented by auxiliary linguistic units.

Further research could be performed in a more detailed interpretation of affirmation in the functional types of sentences, establishing the main features and parameters of the affirmation in the Germanic and Slovenian languages, implementation of affirmative content within the framework of the ethnolinguistic and linguocultural aspects.

### References:

1. Babaytseva V. V. (1979). *Russkiy yazyk. Sintaksis i punktuatsiya*. Moskva : Prosveshcheniye: 269.
2. Bakharev A. I. (1980). *Otritsaniye v logike i grammatike*. Saratov : Izd-vo Sarat. un-ta: 77.
3. Boldyrev N. N. (2005) *Modusnyye kategorii v yazyke. Kognitivnaya ligvistika : Mentalnyye osnovy i yazykovaya realizatsiya. Leksikologiya i grammatika s kognitivnoy tochki zreniya*. Sankt-Peterburg : Trigon. T. : 31–46.
4. Vykhoanets I. R. (1992). *Narysy z funktsionalnoho syntaksysu ukrainskoi movy*. Kyiv : Nauk. dumka: 224.
5. Vladimirskaia L. M. (1999) *Status kategorii utverzhdeniya / otritsaniya v sovremennom nemetskom yazyke : dis. na soiskaniye uchen. step. d-ra filol. nauk: spets. 10.02.04 «Germanskiye yazyki»*. Sankt-Peterburg: 429.
6. Voitsekhivska N. K. (2009) *Katehoriia zghody v ukrainskomu literaturnomu dialohichnomu dyskursi : dys. na zdobuttia nauk. stupenia kand. filol. nauk: spets. 10.02.01 «Ukrainska mova»*. Kyiv : 289.
7. *Holos Ukrainy*. (2016). [Elektronnyi resurs]. URL: <http://www.golos.com.ua/> (data zvernennia 13.02.2016).
8. Honchar O. (1966). *Tvory v dvokh tomakh*. Kyiv : Vyd-vo khud. l-ry «Dnipro». T. 2: 750.
9. Dovzhenko O. P. (1980). *Vybrani tvory*. Lviv : Vyd-vo «Kameniar»: 302.
10. Dotsenko O. L. (2006). *Semantyko-prahmatychnyi syntaksys: osoblyvosti vyrazhennia modalnosti : monohrafiia*. Kyiv : Milenium: 226.
11. Dudyk P. S. (1973). *Syntaksys suchasnoho ukrainskoho rozmovnoho literaturnoho movlennia*. Kyiv : Nauk. dumka: 226.
12. Zhadan S. V. (2004). *Depesh Mod*. Kharkiv : Folio: 240.
13. Zahnitko A. P. (1991). *Osnovy funktsionalnoi morfolohii ukrainskoi movy : navch. posibnyk*. Kyiv : Vyshcha shk.: 77.
14. Kalinina A. A. (2011). *Kategoriya utverzhdeniya / otritsaniya v funktsionalnykh tipakh predlozheniy v sovremennom russkom yazyke : dis. na soiskaniye uchen. stepeni d-ra filol. nauk: spets. 10.02.01 «Russkiy yazyk»*. Moskva: 539.

15. Karpenko-Karyi Ivan. (2009). *Budushchyna v rukakh novoho pokolinnia. Vybrani tvory*. Kyiv : Kraina mrii: 414.
16. Kushch O. P. (2002). *Stverdzhennia I zaperecennia v u ukrainskii movi : avtoref. na zdobuttia nauk. stupenia kand. filol. nauk: spets. 10.02.01 «Ukrainska mova»*. Dnipropetrovsk: 16.
17. Myrnyi Panas. (1985). *Tvory v dvokh tomakh*. Kyiv : Vyd-vo khudozhnoi literatury «Dnipro», T. 1: 552 s.
18. Myrnyi Panas. (1985). *Tvory v dvokh tomakh*. Kyiv : Vyd-vo khudozhnoi literatury «Dnipro», T. 2: 563.
19. Muzeinyk I. V. (2003). *Semantychni, prahmatychni ta strukturni osoblyvosti vyslovliuvan iz zaperecenniam zaperecennia (na materiali suchasnoi frantsuzkoi movy) : avtoref. dys. na zdobuttia nauk. stupenia kand. filol. nauk: spets. 10.02.05 «Romanski movy»*. Kyiv: 19.
20. Nezhdana Neda (2008). *Provokatsiia inshosti : piesy*. Kyiv : Ukr. pysmennyk: 277.
21. Nechui-Levytskyi I. S. (1988). *Tvory v trokh tomakh*. Kyiv: Vyd-vo khudozhnoi literatury «Dnipro». T. 1: 643.
22. Nechui-Levytskyi I. S. (1988). *Tvory v trokh tomakh*. Kyiv : Vyd-vo khudozhnoi literatury «Dnipro». T. 3: 645.
23. Osmachka T. (2002). *Poezii. Povisti*. Kyiv : Nauk. dumka: 424.
24. Potoibichni pauzy (2005). *Almanakh molodykh pysmennykiv stolytsi*. Kyiv : Feniks: 512.
25. Rylskyi M. T. (2005). *Vybrani tvory*. Kyiv : Ukr. entsyklopediia: 608.
26. Symonova K. S. (1980). *Funktsii stverdzhivalnykh chastok v ukrainskii movi. Ukrainska mova i literatura v shkoli. № 11: 18–22*.
27. Stelmakh M. (1973). *Tvory v shesty tomakh*. Kyiv : Vyd-vo khud. l-ry «Dnipro», T. 1: 663.
28. Straik iliuzii: *Antolohiia suchasnoi ukrainskoi dramaturhii* (2004). Kyiv : Vyd-vo Solomii Pavlychko «Osnovy»: 370.
29. Stupak E. S. (2005). *Funktsionalno-semanticheskoye pole utverzhdeniya v sovremennom russkom yazyke : dis. na soiskaniye uchen. stepeni kand. filol. nauk : 10.02.01 «Russkiy yazyk»*. Taganrog: 164.
30. *Suchasna ukrainska dramaturhiia : almanakh* (2007). Kyiv : Feniks. Vyp. 4: 344.
31. *Ukrainska mova. Entsyklopediia*. Kyiv : Vyd-vo «Ukr. entsykl.» im. M. P. Bazhana: 824.
32. *U poshuku teatru : antolohiia molodoi dramaturhii* (2003). Kyiv : Smoloskyp: 545.
33. *Ukrainska literatura : Khrestomatii novovvedenykh tvoriv : u trokh chastynakh* (2003). Kyiv : Heneza: Ch. 3: 576.
34. Franko Ivan. (1977). *Poeziia ta dramatychni tvory*. Lviv : Vyd-vo «Kameniar»: 199.
35. Kharitonova I. Ya. (1982). *Voprosy vzaimodeystviya leksiki i grammatiki*. Kiyev : Vishcha shk.: 159.
36. Shabat-Savka S. T. (2014). *Kategoriia komunikativnoi intensii v ukrainskii movi: [monografiia]*. Chernivtsi : «Bukrek»: 412.