

CONJUNCTIONLESS PHRASES: FORMAL AND GRAMMATICAL BACKGROUND

Nataliia Komlyk

Postgraduate Student, Poltava V. G. Korolenko National Pedagogical University, Ukraine

e-mail: nataly-off@i.ua, orcid.org/0000-0002-3083-8328

Summary

The article is dedicated to the analysis of the problem of expediency of allocating conjunctionless phrases as an independent type of co-ordinate constructions. The main approaches to the consideration of conjunctionless units at the syntactic level of language are outlined. The specifics of the expression of the asyndetic connection in the plane of the phrase compared to the sentence are considered. The main means of connection between the components of a co-ordinate conjunctionless phrase – intonation and the order of constituents are described. Co-ordinate conjunctionless phrases include those that correlate with co-ordinate conjunctive phrases, the components of which are connected with co-ordinating conjunctions «і», «й», «та» or opposite «а». It is found out that at the formal-grammatical level, such asyndetic and syndetic syntaxemes are synonymous, but semantically differ in expressiveness. In addition, extended (polycomponent) and narrowed (two-component) series with homogeneous and heterogeneous constituents are typical for conjunctionless phrases, which in most cases tend to interchange positions. A distinctive feature of the extended series is that the last component can be connected with cumulative conjunction, thus imposing a shade of limitation of the series. Therefore, the set of such specific features represents the highest level of independence and equality between words, which form a co-ordinate conjunctionless phrase.

Keywords: phrase, co-ordination, conjunctionless phrase, conjunctive phrase, formal-grammatical level, semantic-syntactic level, copulative phrase, independent coordination, predicative.

DOI <https://doi.org/10.23856/5008>

1. Introduction

The problem of the expediency of distinguishing conjunctionless phrases as a kind of co-ordinate phrases requires a revision of traditional views on the specifics of the syntactic relationship between syntaxemes of different levels in general and between the components of the phrase in particular. In modern domestic linguistics, which began to develop independently since the beginning of the XXI century, there are many fresh ideas about the nature of the phrase, which go beyond the limited framework of the traditional conception, commonly called Vinogradov's. Many linguists (I. Vykhoanets, P. Dudyk, O. Melnychuk, M. Stepanenko, K. Shulzhuk, etc.), who deny the monopoly of subordinate phrases and appeal to the distinguishing of co-ordinate ones, substantiate the expediency of considering the conjunctive and conjunctionless connection between the constituents of co-ordinate phrases. However, there are no works in linguistics, that would comprehensively cover the specifics of formal and grammatical organization of conjunctionless phrases, so the novelty of our research is to try to argue the expediency of granting the status of conjunctionless phrases as a separate type of co-ordinate ones.

The aim of the research is to find out the peculiarity of the formal-grammatical organization of conjunctionless co-ordinate phrases. Achieving this goal necessitates the solution of the following tasks: 1) to justify the advisability of allocating conjunctionless co-ordinate phrases; 2) analyze the specifics of the formal-grammatical level of these phrases; 3) determine their differential features.

In order to implement the goals and objectives, general scientific and special linguistic methods were used: the method of comparison – to prove the expediency of distinguishing the conjunctionless type of connection in the phrase; method of analysis and synthesis, descriptive method – to characterize the nature of the asyndetic connection between the components of the co-ordinate phrase; distributive, component analyzes, as well as analysis by direct components – to determine the classification parameters of conjunctionless co-ordinate phrases.

2. Expediency of distinction co-ordinate conjunctionless phrases

Conjunctionless phrases were outside the research areas for a long time because the main discussions in linguistics were holding on around the nature of conjunctionless sentences as one of the means of communication.

Nowadays, similar to compound and complex sentences, linguists distinguish between co-ordinate and subordinate phrases. If the opinion about the appropriateness of separating conjunctionless sentences is acknowledged, then we have every reason to consider the combination of full words *оптимістичний, життєстверджуючий* in the sentence *Визволений народ вимагає оптимістичного, життєстверджуючого мистецтва* (Honchar, 2012: 13) as a phrase. Since every phrase is a component of a sentence and realizes its differential parameters within it, it is worth comparing the nature of these conjunctionless syntactic units.

In the study of conjunctionless type of connection and conjunctionless composite sentence I. Sviatobachenko identifies several main approaches (Sviatobachenko, 2011). According to the first approach, an asyndetic sentence is a contextually dependent unit of speech with text-forming functions. N. Shvedova and the authors of “Russian Grammar” do not oppose conjunctionless sentences with conjunctive and use the term “conjunctionless combination of sentences” (Shvedova, 1980). At the same time, L. Bulakhovskyi talks about the existence of only two types of asyndetic sentences – conjunctionless compound and conjunctionless complex (Bulakhovskyi, 1951), which forms an approach to this type of sentence through the triad opposition “asyndeticity – co-ordination – subordination”. Another view is declared in S. Doroshenko’s works, who defends the independent status of conjunctionless sentences and denies the separation of conjunctionless compound and complex varieties of it: “asyndeticity is a way of formal-syntactic connection of components, according to which the organization of the whole syntactic structure is based not on conjunctions and connecting words but on grammatical elements that perform important constructive functions in the grammatical design of a composite sentence” (Doroshenko, 2019: 538). According to this linguist, the lack of a material means of communication deprives the constructions in question of the opportunity to oppose the conjunctive ones and therefore gives all non-conjunctive structures “grammatical independence”. A. Zahnitko considers asyndetic constructions as a kind of periphery, noting that “conjunctionless composite sentence differs from isometric conjunctive compound and complex sentences as in combining its parts are used both common for asyndetic and syndetic types of connection means and purely specific” (Zahnitko, 2011: 733). In our opinion, the most relevant approach is the one according to which the conjunctionless connection is

formally opposed to the conjunctive one, however, co-ordinate and subordinate sentences, as well as sentences with undifferentiated syntactic connection, are distinguished within the conjunctionless connection in general. As I. Vykhovanets notes, “formally and grammatically asyndetic sentences should be contrasted not with compound and complex sentences but with conjunctive sentences in their entirety, while from the point of view of differentiation of syntactic connections and semantic-syntactic relations conjunctionless and conjunctive sentences can be intersected, embracing identical syntactic connections and semantic-syntactic relations” (Vykhovanets, 1993: 347). In fact, three sentences *Ви розгортаєте сіно, простеляєте плаца, лягаєте горілиць, дивитесь на чорно-синє, глибоке зоряне небо і відпочиваєте* (Ostap Vyshnia, 1989: 212), *Ліс стоїть задумливий: йому ось-ось треба своє пишне вбрання скидати* (Ostap Vyshnia, 1989: 253), *У всякого своя доля і свій шлях широкий: той мурує, той руйнує...* (Shevchenko, 2002: 206) have a similar structure at the formal-grammatical level: parts are connected asyndetically, but at the semantic level the first sentence conveys the meaning of the sequence of events, which co-ordinating copulative conjunctions can also represent, so this sentence correlates with the similar co-ordinate conjunctive sentence: *Ви розгортаєте сіно, (і) простеляєте плаца, (і) лягаєте горілиць, (і) дивитесь на чорно-синє, глибоке зоряне небо і відпочиваєте*; there are causal relations between the parts of the second sentence, which can be correlated with a complex causal sentence: *Ліс стоїть задумливий,, (бо) йому ось-ось треба своє пишне вбрання скидати*; with regard to the third construction, it has no conjunctive counterpart, ie, according to I. Vykhovanets, it belongs to non-differential conjunctionless constructions.

In the phrase plane the conjunctionless connection may correlate with the conjunctive one. In the sentence *Прийшла весна, прийшла красна, / Розкішна, люба, чарівна!* (Voronyi, 2010: 20) combination of *розкішна, люба, чарівна* forms a number of homogeneous members combined with intonation. The components of a co-ordinate conjunctive phrase are arranged linearly, subordinate to the same word in the sentence and being at the same level of syntactic dependence also form a series of homogeneous members: *В ці часи ви чуєте і над собою, і перед собою, і за собою, і праворуч, і ліворуч шум – свист качиних крил* (Ostap Vyshnia, 1989: 212). Co-ordinate conjunctive phrases are characterized by the relative grammatical equality of components and the lack of formal and grammatical dependence between them. This specificity is provided with co-ordinating conjunctions, but as we see from the examples, conjunctionless combination of equal constituents is also possible.

The main means of connection is intonation and word order in conjunctionless constructions. Phrases outside the context of a sentence are deprived of a clear intonation pattern, but intonation should be understood not only as an element of speech. O. Peshkovskij once emphasized this considering intonation as a separate section of grammar. According to A. Bagmut, intonation performs three main functions: constructive, cognitive (identifying), and distinctive (Bagmut, 1980). The latter two are directly related to communication, and the constructive manifests itself at the level of language and participates in the creation of sentences and phrases as well. O. Peshkovskij argues that intonation becomes a grammatical tool when the meaning of a particular type of intonation is identified with the meaning of the certain group of conjunctions (Peshkovskij, 1956). At the level of the phrase, this statement proves that the co-ordinate conjunctionless phrase differs from the co-ordinate conjunctive one only by syntactic means, not by meaning: *І пада сніг лапатий, волохатий / Спокійно й величаво над селом* (Rylskiy, 1976: 61) – *І пада сніг лапатий, (і / й / та) волохатий / Спокійно й величаво над селом*. Conjunctionless phrases are not an arbitrary combination of any words, as firstly, the set of components is determined by the communication situation, and secondly, they

have a logical linear arrangement chosen by the communicant for this act of communication. The most vividly it is illustrated with sentences in which conjunctionless phrases express the semantics of the sequence of events: *На паниціні пишеницю жала, / Втомилася; не спочивать / Пішла в снопи, пошкандибала Івана сина годувать* (Shevchenko, 2002: 559); *Влетіла ластівка, защebetала і вилетіла* (Vupnyuchenko, 2005: 70).

A. Zahnitko's remark that in the process of historical development of language new variants of syntactic constructions are constantly emerging is fair, and O. Potebnia once proved that asyndeticity is older than syndeticity. This fact gives every reason to hypothesize that conjunctionless phrases with co-ordinate nature originated earlier, and conjunctive phrases are derived from them. Conjunctions, which act as connectors of two or more constituents, appear as a kind of compilers, which are superimposed on the intonation and together with it convey the formal-grammatical relations within the phrase.

3. Differential features of co-ordinate conjunctionless phrases

The absence of conjunctions, intonation, and word order as a means of connection between components are the classification features of co-ordinate conjunctionless phrases, which are the basis for the manifestation of other specific features of these syntaxemes.

Co-ordinate phrases include those asyndetic constructions that correlate with the corresponding conjunctive ones. Some conjunctionless phrases can be related to those in which the means of connection are co-ordinating cumulative conjunctions *і, й, та (і)*. At the semantic level, both types of phrases convey a touch of simultaneity or sequence of actions: *Треться, мнеться – думає минеться* (Ророва, 2011: 252) – *Треться (і / й / та) мнеться – думає минеться; Сон та й да ніколи не обрида* (Ророва, 2011: 128) – *Сон, й да ніколи не обрида; Круг мене кохалося поле, шепотіло, цілувалось* (Vupnyuchenko, 2005: 76) – *Круг мене кохалося поле, (і / й / та) шепотіло, (і / й / та) цілувалось*. Another group is formed by conjunctionless phrases that are identical to those in which the means of coherence is the adversative conjunction *а*. The following syndetic and asyndetic phrases display the semantics of opposition / comparison: *Ріж нитку довгу, слово кажи коротке* (Ророва, 2011: 63) – *Ріж нитку довгу, (а) слово кажи коротке; Лихоманка – не матка: трясе, не жаліє* (Ророва, 2011: 132) – *Лихоманка – не матка: трясе, (а) не жаліє; Серце старого запорожця не сумує з того, а радіє – Серце старого запорожця не сумує з того, радіє* (Kashchenko, 2006: 419). It is noticeable that in such constructions the negative particle *не* functions near one of the components. Of particular note are co-ordinate phrases in which the presence / absence of a material means of connection changes the meaning of the whole syntaxeme: in the texts of different discourses there are a significant number of phrases with cumulative conjunctions of negative semantics *ні, ані* and their repetitive variants *ані ... ані, ні ... ні*. The transformation of these units into the conjunctionless ones changes the semantics of the negation to the affirmation: *Сьогодні він ні читає, ні пише – Сьогодні він читає, пише; У неї на кухні ні хліба, ні пирогів – У неї на кухні хліб, пироги*. However, in the part of such phrases the presence / absence of the conjunction only strengthens / weakens the expressiveness of the construction: *Не вір ні старостам, ні свахам, бо всі вони брешуть* (Ророва, 2011: 318) – *Не вір старостам, свахам, бо всі вони брешуть; Ні докорів, ні балачок про те вже більше не було* (Vupnyuchenko, 2005:30) – *Докорів, балачок про те вже більше не було*.

In co-ordinate asyndetic phrases, intonation is the main means of realizing the semantic-grammatical connection of components. It can impose a marker of enumeration or comparison on the constituents, giving the whole phrase more expression and dynamics

compared to the corresponding conjunctions, thus forming a kind of grammatical and stylistic constructions-synonyms: *А в нас яку не вдарии кайлом скелю – зівсюди рине кров, а не вода* (Kostenko, 2020: 270) – *А в нас яку не вдарии кайлом скелю – зівсюди рине кров, не вода; Може навіть не тижні, а цілі роки минуть* (Kostenko, 2020: 166) – *Може навіть не тижні, цілі роки минуть; Люблю чернігівську дорогу – весною, влітку, восени* (Kostenko, 2020: 302) – *Люблю чернігівську дорогу – весною, (і / й / та) влітку, (і / й / та) восени; Хай буде сніг, і музика, і вечір* (Kostenko, 2020: 363) – *Хай буде сніг, музика, вечір.*

Among conjunctionless composite sentences, there are sentences of open and closed structure. As A. Zahnitko notes, “all sentences of open structure of conjunctive and conjunctionless type are similar in structure, because regardless of the conjunctive or conjunctionless combination of predicative parts they can be classified as a separate structural variety of compound sentences, characterized by relative internal homogeneity within which the opposition of asyndetic and syndetic connection is not significant” (Zahnitko, 2011: 736). Similarly, in the phrase we distinguish conjunctionless constructions of extended and narrowed series, which correlates with the concept of open and closed structure. The relevance of using the terminology “extended series”, “narrowed series” is justified by the fact that, firstly, asyndetic phrases as components of the sentence form a series of homogeneous members within it. Secondly, openness makes it possible to add an unlimited number of constituents but in a speech act that occurs in a certain communicative situation there is a limit, and therefore the addition of new components has a limitation. So, the probability of involvement / removal of other components is explained more accurately by the concept of expansion / narrowing of the series. This specificity of these syntaxemes determines their non-binary nature as a manifestation of another differential feature. As O. Melnychuk rightly notes, “co-ordinate conjunctionless connection is used mainly in co-ordinate phrases that have more than two homogeneous members” (Melnychuk, 1972: 108): *Мій предковичний, / мій умитий росами, / космічний, вічний, / зоряний, барвінковий* (Kostenko, 2020: 211); *Заворушилось серце в Марини, забажала її душа щастя, волі, веселості* (Nechui-Levytskyi, 1997: 77). Frequently the last component of such a phrase is joined with the cumulative conjunction *і, й, та*. At the formal-grammatical level the series can be continued in such phrase, but semantically the presence of the conjunction near the last constituent seems to limit the list: *Хрести, лелеки, мальви і жоржини / були його єдині глядачі* (Kostenko, 2020: 214); *Страждаю, мислю, плачу і сміюсь* (Kostenko, 2020: 387). Attention is also drawn to the constructions, the members of which are able to group in pairs. In this case, there can be a conjunctive connection inside the pair, between the pairs – conjunctionless connection, or vice versa: the components are connected asyndetically, and their pairs – with a conjunction: *романи й повість, оповідання й казки; веселий, шасливий, але втомлений*. Such phrases are considered to be combined constructions with conjunctive-conjunctionless connection.

Examples of co-ordinate conjunctive phrases of a harmonic series, the components of which belong to one part of the language, are classic but the series can also be disharmonious: *Вона купила білу, з червоними макамаи сукню; У її майстерні можна помилуватися картинами, виконаними у різних техніках: випалені, вирізьблені, з піску та із стрічок; Вона стояла трохи схвильована, спантеличена, але щаслива*. In addition, it is possible for most of these phrases to rearrange the components: *І пада сніг лапатий, волохатий / Спокійно й величаво над селом* (Rylskyi, 1976: 61) – *І пада сніг волохатий, лапатий / Спокійно й величаво над селом; Дороги рівної не знати – / Зизаги, хвилі, блискавки, /*

Та завжди: хай горять магнати! / Хай квітом квітнуть бідняки! (Rylskyi, 1976: 90) – Дороги рівної не знати – / Хвилі, зигзаги, блискавки, / Та завжди: хай горять магнати! / Хай квітом квітнуть бідняки! Exceptions are those that express the semantics of sequence of events or oppositions, as in similar co-ordinate compound phrases with cumulative and adversative conjunctions, change the reordering is impossible: *Ченці наче по команді підвелися з місців, **перехрестились** до образів, **подякували** хазяїнові та хазяїці, **накинули** на голови клобуки, **забрязчали** чотками й ханком **вийшли** на вулицю (Nechui-Levytskyi, 1977: 311)* (sequence of actions); *На Бога **покладайся**, розуму ж **тримайся*** (Porova, 2011: 26) (comparative and opposite relations).

The question of the presence of predicativity within the conjunctionless co-ordinate phrase deserves special attention. Modern linguistics abounds in different views on the category of predicativity but common to all is the idea that the minimum syntactic unit that has predicativity is a sentence, and the phrase is devoid of it. We consider Mirchenko's view is appropriate, as he distinguishes predicativity as a complex category that expresses the relationship of the report in the sentence to the reality, forms a sentence as a communicative syntactic unit, and predicativity as a formal-syntactic category, which refers only to two-member simple sentences and indicates the syntactic connection between the subject and the predicate (Mirchenko, 2004: 194). G. Pochepcov considers predicativity even more globally, arguing that it is a way of actualizing extraverbal reality, a synthesis of the categories of "subjective" and "objective"; it is the primary and the most general human awareness of reality (Pochepcov, 1981). The interpretation of predicativity in the broadest sense as the correlation of the statement with reality makes it possible to reinterpret the phrase in general and the conjunctionless one in particular. Every phrase is a condensed communicative unit, as it denotes a combination of objects of extraverbal reality, which, on the one hand, become the subject of communication itself, and on the other hand – phrases are components of the sentence for which predicativity is essential. Similar to the philosophical interpretation of the relationship between a part and the whole, according to which the part has the characteristics of the whole, the phrase is characterized by hidden potential predicativeity. Co-ordinate conjunctionless phrases, like conjunctive units, form a series of homogeneous members in the sentence, not only secondary parts of the sentence, but also principal parts, ie, they can be elements of the core of predicativity positioning as homogeneous subjects and predicates: *Єремія **вмився**, **вбрався**, **вийшов** н алею (Nechui-Levytskyi, 1977: 320); Чекали **зйомки**, **зали**, **павільйони**, – / чекало все! Іван **косив** траву (Kostenko, 2020: 214).*

4. Conclusion

The change of the human mode of thinking and worldview of the XXI century testifies to the need to go through the traditional postulates of linguistics, and the syntactic system is not an exception. That is why nowadays linguists say that co-ordination in the plane of a phrase can be manifested syndetically with means of co-ordinating conjunctions and asyndetically through prosodic means, in particular intonation. Conjunctionless co-ordinate phrases have all the parameters for their allocation to a separate class, like conjunctionless composite sentences in the language system. They are copulative syntaxemes, in which the means of connection between the components is their direct contact location in combination with a certain intonation pattern, which is indicated in the writing by the appropriate punctuation marks. A distinctive feature of this group of phrases is the absolute correlation at the formal-grammatical level with conjunctive phrases, where the means of connection

are either cumulative conjunctions *i / ŭ / ma*, or the adversative one *a*. As for the semantic-syntactic level, the corresponding asyndetic and syndetic co-ordinate phrases convey identical semantic relations, the only difference is stylistic: conjunctionless constructions are more expressive and dynamic. Also, asyndetic phrases have the highest level of independence between components compared to conjunctive ones, as the presence of a conjunction imposes restrictive semantics, which is vividly represented with constructions of the combined type: **розумний, добрий та успішний; красивий, розкішний, але дорогий**. Independent coordination as a form of interconnection of the conjunctionless phrase allows to expand or narrow the series of these phrases according to the communicative situation. These syntactic units are not devoid of predicativity, as most linguists claim because being components of the sentence, they are one of the means of creating its predicativity, forming a series of homogeneous subjects and predicates.

References

1. Bahmut, A. Y., Borysiuk, I. V., Oliinyk, H. P. (1980). *Intonatsiia yak zasib movnoi komunikatsii [Intonation as a means of verbal communication]*. Kyiv: «Naukova dumka». [in Ukrainian].
2. Vynnychenko, V. (2005). *Vybrani tvory [Selected works]*. O. M. Savchenko (Ed.). Kharkiv: Vesta : Vydavnytstvo «Ranok». [in Ukrainian]
3. Vykhovanets, I. (1993). *Hramatyka ukrainskoi movy. Syntaksys: Pidruchnyk [Grammar of the Ukrainian language. Syntax: Textbook]*. Kyiv : Lybid. [in Ukrainian].
4. Vyshnia, O. (Hubenko Pavlo Mykhailovych) (1989). *Tvory: V 4 t. T. 3: Usmishky, feiletony, humoresky, 1944 – 1950 [Works: In 4 vols. Vol. 3: Smiles, feuilletons, humoresques, 1944–1950]*. I. O. Dzeverin (Ed.). Kyiv: Dnipro. [in Ukrainian].
5. Voronyi, M. K. (2010). *Yevshan-zillia: Poema. Virshi: dlia sered. shk. viku [Yevshan-potion: Poem. Poems for middle school age]*. L. Slobodeniuk (Ed.) Kyiv : Natsionalnyi knyzhkovyi proekt. [in Ukrainian].
6. Honchar, O. I. (2012). *Tvory v dvanadtsiaty tomakh. T. 9. Kn. 1. Publitsystyka [Works in twelve volumes. V. 9. Book. 1. Journalism]*. Kyiv, Naukovo-vyrobnyche pidpriemstvo «Vydavnytstvo «Naukova dumka» NAN Ukraine». [in Ukrainian].
7. Doroshenko, S. I. (2019). *Bezspoluchnykovi skladni rechennia – okremyi typ skladnykh struktur [Conjunctionless composite sentences as a separate type of composite structures]*. In. A. Moisiienko, V. Chumak, S. Shevel (Eds.), *Syntaksys ukrainskoi movy: khrestomatiia: u 2 ch. – Syntax of the Ukrainian language: textbook: in 2 vols (Vol. 1)*, (pp. 537–543). Kyiv : Kyivskiy universytet. [in Ukrainian].
8. Ivanova, I. P., Burlakova, V. V., Pohepcov, G. G. (1981). *Teoreticheskaya grammatika sovremenogo anglijskogo yazyka: uchebnik [Theoretical Grammar of Modern English: Textbook]*. Moscow : Vyssh. shkola. [in Russian].
9. Zahnitko, A. P. (2011). *Teoretychna hramatyka suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy. Morfolohiia. Syntaksys [Theoretical grammar of the modern Ukrainian language. Morphology. Syntax]*. Donetsk : BAO. [in Ukrainian].
10. Kashchenko A. F. (2006). *Vybrani tvory [Selected works]*. L. S. Demianivskoi (Ed.). Kyiv: Hramota. [in Ukrainian].
11. Kostenko, L. (2020). *Trysta poezii. Vybrani virshi [Three hundred poems. Selected poems]*. Kyiv : A-BA-BA-HA-LA-MA-HA. [in Ukrainian].
12. Bulakhovskyi, L. A. (Ed.) (1951). *Kurs suchasnoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy [Course of modern Ukrainian literary language]*. Kyiv : Radianska shkola. [in Ukrainian].

13. Melnychuk, O. S. (1972). Slovospoluchennia [Phrase]. In I. K. Bilodid (Ed.), *Suchasna ukrainska literaturna mova. Syntaksys – Modern Ukrainian literary language* (pp. 51–117). Kyiv : Naukova dumka. [in Ukrainian].
14. Mirchenko, M. V. (2004). *Struktura syntaksychnykh katehori: monohrafiia [The structure of syntactic categories: a monograph]*. Lutsk : RVV «Vezha». [in Ukrainian].
15. Nechui-Levytskyi, I. S. (1977). *Afonskyi proidysvit. Tvory v 2-kh tomakh. T. 2. [Athos rogue. Works in 2 volumes. V. 2]*. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
16. Nechui-Levytskyi, I. S. (1977). *Dvi moskovky. Tvory v 2-kh tomakh. T. 2. [Two Muscovites. Works in 2 volumes. V. 2]*. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
17. Peshkovskij, A. M. (2001). *Russkij sintaksis v nauchnom osvyashenii. 8-e izd. [Russian syntax in scientific consecration. 8th edition]*. Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskoj kultury. [in Russian].
18. Popova, O. A. (2011). *Zhyvliushche dzhereło. Krashchi pryslivia ta prykazky ukrainskoho narodu [Nourishing spring. The best proverbs and sayings of the Ukrainian people]*. Donetsk : TOV «VKF «BAO». [in Ukrainian].
19. Rylskyi, M. *Tvory v dvokh tomakh. T. 1. Liryka [Works in two volumes. Vol. 1. Lyrics]*. Kyiv : «Dnipro». [in Ukrainian].
20. Shvedova, N. Yu. (Ed.) (1980). *Russkaya grammatika: v 2-h t. T. 2 [Russian grammar: in 2 vols. V. 2]*. Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian].
21. Sviatobachenko, I. S. (2011). *Pytannia bezspoluchnykovoho skladnoho rechennia v ukrainskomu ta rosiiskomu movoznavstvi [Questions of conjunctionless composite sentences in Ukrainian and Russian linguistics]*. *Filolohichni studii. Naukovyi visnyk Kryvorizkoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu – Philological studies. Scientific Bulletin of Kryvyi Rih State Pedagogical University*, 6 (2). 99–106. [in Ukrainian].
22. Shevchenko, T. H. (2002). *Kobzar [Kobzar]*. Kharkiv : Shkola. [in Ukrainian].