INTER-LEVEL CATEGORY OF THE GRAMMATICAL MOOD OF VERB HYBRID FORMS IN SLAVIC LANGUAGES

*Nataliia Scherbii**

*Corresponding author: natalia.shcherbii@pnu.edu.ua

Abstract. The article dwells on the characteristics of the interlevel category of the grammatical mood of verb hybrid forms; it describes the inter-category status of this category as well as various approaches to its interpretation. The article considers four forms of the verbal grammatical mood (conditional, imperative, jussive, and desirative). The article analyses ways of expressing the category of grammatical mood by means of hybrid forms of a verb – verbal adjectives, infinitives, verbal nouns, which share some of the grammatical properties of several parts of speech. It also introduces the classification of the morphological means of expression of different grammatical moods in various hybrid forms of the, taking into account peculiarities of morphological and semantic-syntactic levels of the language; some common and different features of their implementation in Slavic languages.

The practical material is selected from the national corpus of the Ukrainian and Polish languages. Modern literary and journalistic texts serve as sources of illustrative material of the functional expression category of grammatical mood.

Keywords: category of grammatical mood, hybridity, indicative mood, conditional mood, imperative mood, jussive mood, desirative mood, Slavic languages.

1. INTRODUCTION

Modern linguistics focuses on the study of inter-category relations against the background of several related languages. Different verbal forms are viewed as a multifaceted linguistic phenomenon, as there are so-called "hybrid forms of the verb" (adjectives, adjectives, verbal nouns, forms ending with -но, -то), which border on several parts of speech, demonstrating syncretism at the morphological and semantic-syntactic levels (Szczerbij, 2022).

Grammatical categories serve to describe course of actions, processes and different states. Studies of the nature of verb hybrid forms contribute to the better understanding of their role the grammatical categories fulfilment, taking into account semantic-syntactic, morphological, and transformational pecularities. It is the presence of certain category features that speaks for either verbal or nominal nature of these forms. Compared to the noun, the verb has a more developed system of grammatical categories.

Semantic categories of the verb (tense, mood and aspect), working within their internal limits, are aimed at the description of extralinguistic reality. Tense and mood categories are among the central categories characteristic of the verb, since they most fully reflect its semantic-grammatical nature, while

the category of aspect serves as a starting point. Non-verbal syntactic categories (person, number, and gender) are dependent on the corresponding categories of the noun since their functions are heavily influenced by connections and relationships with other words (Vykhovanets, 1988, p. 89). The category of person is a mixed category, a semantic-syntactic one, since the 1 and 2 singular and plural persons are reflected in the form of the verb itself. The category of state is transformational-semantic, since switching a subject and a direct object does not affect the general meaning of an utterance.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The issue of functions of the mood category grammemes is connected to other issues of communicative linguistics and has been a subject of research in a number of studies (Zahnitko, 1996; Mirchenko, 2004; Skab, 2003; Daskaliuk, 2005). The category of the mood has been a subject of research in the works of N. Kostusiak (Kostusiak, 2008), M. Vintoniv, K. Bortun (Vintoniv, Bortun, 2020), O. Daskaliuk (Daskaliuk, 2005), Gębka-Wolak (Gębka-Wolak, 2017), Gołąb (Gołąb, 1964), Tomaszewicz (Tomaszewicz, 2009).

3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE, METHODOLOGY

The objective of the article is to carry out a comprehensive system analysis of the category of the mood in hybrid forms of the verb. To achieve this objective the following tasks should be resolved: to characterize the heterogeneous nature of the analyzed category; to describe semantic peculiarities of the given unit; to analyse the morphology of the grammatical forms of the imperative, conditional, jussive, and desirative moods in the hybrid forms of the verb, taking into account not only the morphological but also syntactic levels of the language; to distinguish common and different features of these forms in the Slavic languages.

Research methods. The main method of the article is descriptive, it helps to categorise, group and sort out features within the category. The article uses means of classification and systematization along with the transformational method. Modern artistic and journalistic texts from the national corpus of the Ukrainian and Polish languages serve as the illustrative material (ГРАК; NKJP).

4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The category of mood is a complex inter-level category that requires analysis at the semantic, morphological and syntactic levels (Vykhovanets, 1988 p. 95-99; Vykhovanets, 2004, p. 256-263; Zahnitko, 1996, p. 240-249; Skab, 2002).

The semantic category of mood reveals itself in the opposition of real actions (indicative mood) to improbable and unreal modal actions (conditional mood) (Bezpoiasko, 1993, p. 266). In linguistics, it is customary to distinguish the three-component mood paradigm of the verb (indicative, conditional and imperative moods) or the five-component paradigm, which also include jussive and desirative moods. I. Vykhovanets views the category of grammatical mood as a four-component system, distinguishing "the conditional mood that conveys the meaning of a hypothetical process or state, as well as the imperative, jussitive or desirite moods, which express meanings of a desired action, process or state with varying degrees of appeal" (Vykhovanets, 2004, p. 257).

Other scientists single out indicative, imperative, and conditional moods, supplementing them with two other moods – the optative and the connective ones, while the latter is seen as a combination of conditional and imperative moods (Bezpoyasko, 1993, p. 232), they, however, do not fully reflect the semantics of the Latin *modus* coniunctivus and *modus subiunctivus*.

According to I. Vykhovanets, the semantics of the conditional mood is expressed by "a complex, analytical-flexitive morpheme, the main component or a sub-morpheme, of which is the element *би (б)*, while the second part is the flexion of the past tense, that is, a synthetic form that is an inseparable part of the element" (Vykhovanets, 1988, p. 97). The Slavic verbal form with the particle *б(u) // by* is characterized by a pronounced polysemantic nature, that is, it can acquire different grammatical meanings under different syntactic surroundings. If we consider this form out of context, in an isolated environment, we may notice it brings out general grammatical and modal meanings of the conditional mood – hypotheticality.

Thus, Ya. Puzynina provides the following understanding of conditionals and subconjunctive (Puzynina, 1969, p. 82):

1. with a movable particle *б(u) // by* (conditionalis), which works:

    1) in subordinate conditional sentences (except for the ones with *gdyby, jakby, choćby*)

    2) in hidden implications

a) with the same verb in both the subordinate and following sentence, such as: *Szedłbym tam dwie godziny;*

b) expressing agreement to perform an action, e.g. *Z tobą bym poszła;*

c) indicating the ability to perform an action: *Tomek zrobiłby to zadanie;*

d) which indicates a weakening of the meaning of modal verbs: *Chciałbym zobaczyć Rzym;*

3) in optative sentences that do not start with particles and have different connotations: *Wzięlibyście Wojtka ze sobą.*

2. with a fixed particle *б(u) // by (subconjunctivus)* that can be linked to the connectives or particles.

1) in subordinate sentences of purpose or in sentences

a) after verbs that convey the lack of realisation of another action, for example: *proszę was, żebyście mówili prawdę;*

б) after the verbs of with the connotative meaning of speaking and the conjunctive *jakby;*

2) in subordinate conditional sentences with *gdyby, jakby, choćby;*

3) in independent sentences with *czyżby*, which express surprise or lack of trust to some facts, e.g.: *Czyżbyś zgubiła te pieniądze?*

4) in independent optative sentences with particles: *Oby wyjechał.*

Ya. Puzynina provides the following list of conjunctions with *by* in the Polish language: *aniby, byleby, choćby, gdyby, iżby, jakby, jakoby, niżby, niżeliby, niechby, niechnoby, niechżeby, żeby, ażeby, by, aby, oby, bodajby*. In the Ukrainian language we find: *якби, мовби, мовбито, немовбито, начеб, начебто ніби, нібито, щоб, щоби, аби.*

In modern Slavic languages, one can create conditionals in the following ways:

• with an unchanging particle *би* (Ukrainian, Belarusian, Russian, Lower Sluzhytsia, Kashubian, Macedonian);

• with an unchanging particle *би* + a personal form of the verb *to be* (Slovak, some dialects of Macedonian, some recorded forms in the books in Great Russian Church Slavonic);

- using particle *би* with personal endings (Polish) (польська);
- with the help of an aorist auxiliary verb (Bulgarian, Upper Sorbian, Serbian, most dialects of Croatian, Czech);
- with the help of a special declinable bi-form (Chakavian dialects of the Croatian language) (Moszyński, 2006).

In the Ukrainian language as well as in other Eastern Slavic languages (Belarusian and Russian) conditionalis is formed by the particle *би*, which can be put before the main (semantic) verb or after it:

Я б зробив (або я зробив би), я б зробила (або я зробила б).

Ти б зробив (або ти зробив би), ти б зробила (або ти зробила б).

Він би зробив (або він зробив би), вона б зробила (або вона зробила б).

Another particular characteristic feature is that the particle *би* I contracted to *б* of used after vowels. In the introductory subordinate sentences of conditional constructions, *би* merges with the connector as in *якби*: "*Якби в мене був настрій, я б проспівав.*"

In some Ukrainian dialects (Lemko, Hutsul), there exist different forms of conditionals in which the particle *би* can conjugate depending on the categories of person and number, like the conditionalis in Polish. For example: «*Янчик, Янчик, што би'с зробив*», «*Зробив бим-ся сивим пташком*» *(пісня)*, «*Полетів бим на край світа*»*"* (Lemko song "American land") (Gołąb, p. 3-4; Durovič, p. 103-104).

The conjunctive exists in several Slavic languages (Smirnova, Mihaliček, 2010), although they lack special terminology for this category. For example, some authors see it as a part of the optative (desiritive mood) [Kagan], others see it a a separate way [Mędak].

Both Z. Gołąb and L. Durovič also mention two combinatorial variants of the conjunctive (Gołąb, 1964 p. 3-4; Durovič, 1956, p. 103-104), they point out that the form with the fixed particle *by* is characteristic of subordinate sentences, while the movable particle is used in independent sentences. However, having conducted our analysis, we have found examples defying the previous statement.

When it comes to verbal nouns, some of the categories undergo downgrading, in particular categories of tense, mood, and person. It is proven that verbal nouns formation is largely regulated by the syntactic position, in particular, by means of moving the "verb into the semantic position of a subject while sentence members perform their inherent functions" (Vykhovanets, Horodenska 2004, p. 116). At the same time, verbs can have different forms in terms of person-tense and person-mood, and it doesn't entail presence of tense-personal and personal-mood features in derivatives. Those implementations in terms of tense, mood and person categories are not represented in the formal structure of nouns with a subjected dynamic meaning (Kostusiak 2018).

Following the wider interpretation of the category of grammatical mood, verbal nouns cannot replace independent sentences, since they are paraphrases of subordinate sentences, although in some cases they become components of sentence equivalents (równoważniki zdań), in particular military orders and sports orders that compel people to move. According to A. Wierzbickiej, imperative mood is equivalent to the sentences with *chcę, żeby …*, and, therefore, may be perceived as its equivalent in the constructions *chcę* + verbal noun. For example*: Słuchaj, Diego, zostaw mnie teraz, nie chcę, żebyś mnie dotykał, już odejdź* (Jacek Bocheński)

 = *Chcę, żebyś zostawił mnie, nie dotykał, i odszedł.*

 = *Chcę twego zostawienia, niedotykania i odejścia.*

However, this method goes away from the appeal function, which is inherent to imperative sentences and is their essential feature (Topolińska, 1984, p.168). In analytical constructions with *żądać*, the appeal function is preserved, since both a requirement and an order differ from a wish or a desire: *Słuchaj, Diego, zostaw mnie teraz, nie chcę, żebyś mnie dotykał, już odejdź (Jacek Bocheński)*

= *Żądam, żebyś zostawił mnie, nie dotykał, i odszedł.*

= *Żądam twego zostawienia, niedotykania i odejścia.*

Therefore, when it come to verbal nouns, the category of grammatical mood is fullfilled only if subordinate sentences are transformed: *Nie wiemy, czy ich **szantażowano, straszono wyrzuceniem z roboty** (większość pracowała w miejscowych dużych zakładach pracy), przekupiono, a może wykorzystano poczucie odpowiedzialności za państwo i przywiązanie do socjalistycznej ojczyzny* (Piotr Skura) ⇐ jeżeli wyrzucą z roboty. За умов трансформації відбувається нейтралізація сполучного значення реального та можливого періодів. When there is a transformation, there comes into place neutralisation of the linking meaning of the real and probable periods.

An infinitive is commonly viewed as an impersonal or indefinite-personal form of a verb that does not express the categories of person, manner, or number. However, this approach does not take into account the transformational and semantic-syntactic approach to this category interpretation.

In the modern Ukrainian language it is fairly common to use an infinitive with an imperative function (as an order), for example: ***Голосувати!*** *– крикнули майже всі хором* (Н. Іванець). *Я тоді одним з перших виступив на засіданні фракції " Наша Україна " і запропонував, щоб цю Раду **розпустити** негайно* (Інтернет-газета «Високий замок») // "***Vote!***" *– almost all shouted in chorus* (N. Ivanets). *I was then one of the first to speak at a meeting of the "Nasha Ukraina" fraction and proposed this Rada **to be dissolved** immediately* (the Internet newspaper "Vysokyi Zamok"), given infinitives call for actions that must be carried out without fail (at the initiative of the speaker) or immediately after the sentences are uttered.

The meaning of an ultimate order or prohibition expressed by an infinitive can be enhanced by the semantics of duty, necessity: *А рухомий склад необхідно **використовувати** раціонально!* (the Internet newspaper "Firtka"), where it is the adverb ***необхідно (necessary)*** that strengthens the meaning.

The semantics of inducement, put forward by means of an infinitive, provides a special tone and context that express the modal connotations of inducement. The infinitive acquires a special expressive force in interrogative sentences. Contrary to the imperative mood, the urging infinitive is more expressive and emphatic (Vintonov, Bortun, 2020, p. 73).

According to the researchers, in the Serbian language, the very scope of the infinitive imperative sentences usage is much narrower than in Russian: *Дядечка с усами из нашего оцепления проорал: «Держать строй! Сынки! Если выживем, дам три дня на разграбление»."* In the Serbian language, a causative agent cannot be in the form of a dative case around an infinitive. Moreover, in the Serbian language, there is no chance of combining an urging infinitive with a vocative (Stashevych, 2017, p. 25).

In Serbian, a prohibitive construction with an infinitive can be expressed by means of an analytical negation with a particle *nemoj (- te; -mo): Što god radili samo nemojte kliknuti crveni gumb.*

Polish linguists believe that an imperative method is not characteristic of the infinitive, since it does not combine with a particle *нехай / niech*, which accounts for an imperative mood (Gębka-Wolak, 2017), and it cannot be expressed by means of personal synthetic forms. The exist only rare cases of an

infinitive usage with *niech* in an impersonal function, such as: *I oby tak było, bo jeśli mamy ponosić wysokie koszty samorządności, to przynajmniej **niech widać** efekty lokalnej* demokracji (Gazeta Wrocławska).

However, following the transformational approach, one can find examples of an infinitive use in imperative sentences, such as:

Wyjdź stąd - powiedział mężczyzna łamaną polszczyzną (Stanisław Dygat);

Wyjść stąd - powiedział mężczyzna łamaną polszczyzną;

Musisz wyjść stąd - powiedział mężczyzna łamaną polszczyzną.

In the last two transformations, the imperative function, that is the urge to incentivize an addressee to act in a certain way, is lost. In addition, infinitive forms contribute to constructions with components that exclude compatibility with personal forms in imperative mood, as in *czy*: *Czy pchać się dalej, czy rezygnować i wracać?* (Adam Bahdaj). **Czy pchaj się dalej, czy zrezygnuj i wracaj?*

The official and business style does not entail much emotional expression that is inherent to imperative statements, since the language of documents has a generally descriptive, ascertaining, and neutral character. An order, a call, a resolution and an instruction are conveyed with the help of other structural and grammatical means aimed at communicating inducement. According to V. Rusanivskyi, the jussive and desirative moods are close to the imperative, since all three of them revolve around the urge modality, though they differ when it comes to different levels of intensity (Bezpoiasko, 1993, p. 266–233). The jussive mood conveys the weakened appeal meaning: an addressee can act only on their free will. Thus, requests are conveyed not by means of imperatives, but by some cliches with performative verbs, for example: instead of «*надайте мені відпустку*», there is «*прошу надати мені відпустку*»; instead of «*надішліть нам*», there is «*просимо надіслати нам*» (Vintoniv, Bortun, 2020, p. 99).

Analytical forms of common actions inducement, where lexical meanings do not overlap with grammatical ones, have several kinds (Vintonov, Bortun, 2020, p. 55), however, some linguists argue that "the categorical meaning of the imperative overlaps with the shades of the lexical meaning of the verb *давати*":

1) analytical forms with a particle *давай (те) + inf* or *давай (те) + будемо +inf*, which denote causal actions. Such forms are considered colloquial, but they are actively used in a journalistic style: *Давай переходити до конкретних справ* (the Internet newspaper "Den'"), where the analytical form is used in order to denote an invitation or a call for common action performed by more than one person, as the common action presupposes that the speaker is near the addressee or addressees (Vintonov, Bortun, 2020, p. 57). Forms of common action include singular (if there are two people – a speaker and a listener) and plural (where there are more than two doers). This type is primarily characteristic of the Russian language, while in Ukrainian it is considered colloquial and non-normative: Russian. *Давай уже что-нибудь делать!; Давай завтра весь день будем спать и никуда не пойдем.*

2) *щоб + any form*. Semantically this type corresponds to the third person imperative, however compared to the forms with the particle *нехай*, the structure *щоб + any form* does not entail the category of person while *щоб* emphasizes the categorical meaning and heightened expressiveness, as well as the status of the causer, their involvement in the action and the ability to control it;

3) analytical forms with the *пойдем* + infinitive in Russian: *Пойдем писать первую часть «Мертвой невесты»!; Калашников и Крупнов предлагают сделать экономику России неуничтожимой за счет ее распределенности. Интересно? Тогда пой- дем читать весь выпуск...* In the Ukrainian language, there exist forms with *ходімо / підемо* + infinitive, in which there sometimes takes place semantic loss of the

form *підемо* and the imperative form of *піти* becomes a particle that is used together with the lexemes *давай / давайте* in order to create analytical forms of a common action (Vintonov, Bortun, 2020, p. 59): *Ходімо обідати* (Serhiy Abramov); *Ходімо краще бичків ловити* (Dmytro Tkach), where the loss of the semantic meaning is caused by the movement direction elimination and by the emphasis on the result;

4) analytical forms with the particle *айда + infinitive* and elliptical constructions in the Russian language. Analytical forms created by means of the particle *гайда* are used to soften the order, and ensure certain feeling of ease, etc., yet in the modern Ukrainian literary language these forms are usually on the usage periphery and are considered rather colloquial (Vintoniv, Bortun, 2020, p. 58). In the Ukrainian language, there exist colloquial forms with *гайда!*; theycome from the Turkish language (and they have got into Russian from Tatar) and have the meaning of Turkish *hayda, haydi* (exclamation of spurring) which is related to the Tatar. *найде* «go», Bashkirian. *әйдә* «sh-h.» and, apparently, it derives from the Turkish *ajda/hajda* "spur, drive": Ukr. *Дівчата беріть своїх партнерів та гайда джазувати* (the Internet newspaper "Versii"); *Якщо медики не заперечуватимуть, то гайда готуватися!* (the Internet newspaper "Firtka"); used in modern texts the forms are seen as productive, however, according to researchers, they are non-normative; Russian; *Айда делать добрые дела!*; *Айда делать заказ!*

In the Polish language, we find 76 constructions with *hajda* in NKJP, and only one of them is in a combination with an infinitive, but in an outdated version: *Nie strzymał, chyłkiem do dnia konika wyprowadził, zawiniątko pod pachę, pałasik do boku i hajda wojować (Wacław Gąsiorowski),* and this fact indicates the irrelevance of such constructions.

In Serbian there exists *hajdemo/ajmo* + infinitive: *Hajdemo se kupati u moru.*

The seme 'desirability' can be found on the periphery of the imperative semantics. It manifests itself in the fact that the imperative mood does not always convey the desired action (Daskaliuk, 2005; Zahnytko, 2001). The semantics of the desirative mood lies in the will of the speaker directed towards themselves or third parties (Bezpoyasko, 1993, p. 233). That is, the speaker is the initiator of the action, the addressee and its direct performer, therefore, in the analyzed sentences the appeal meaning is neutralized, for example: ***Сказати б*** *Іванкові все у вічі* (M. Hrymych); ***Лишити б*** *це місто і — якнайдалі , де ніхто ніколи не знайде* (M. Mednikova)

There exists a better developed hypothesis regarding the presence of a conditional method in infinitive constructions.

Analyzing the practical material, we find analytical constructs *inf + by*, which convey a number of different modal meanings:

1) an action or state that is desirable or undesirable for the speaker: Ukr. ***Натякнути б*** *про стосунки з чоловіками, попередити б про наслідки* (I. Rozdobudko); *Мені **б** ще хоч раз усе те **побачити** насправді…*(V.Shkliar); пол. ***Posłuchać bym*** *rada!* (Michał Witkowski); *W ten sposób **wyjaśniać by** można trwałość і skłonność do replikacji tzw. kultur przemocy* (B. Bolechów);

2) assessment of the interlocutor's abilities to perform certain actions, indicating the propensity of the speaker to certain actions (Shulzhuk, 2004, p. 127): *Взагалі найважче з російськими класиками – особливо тими, що, **сказати б**, середньої руки* (Yu. Andrukhovych);

3) a wish-suggestion or a wish-recommendation, which often acquires the form of a question: *Може, мені **б зібратися** й піти геть?* (V. Shkliar); *Я заради свята не проти **б** і чарочку-другу **перехилити** ...* (O.Vietrov).

In the Polish language, infinitive constructions with the particle *by* are rarely used (in the NKJP there are only a few dozen examples), and it is the reason why the particle is used together with the verb, but not separately, and the infinitive alone cannot form a conditional mood, as traditional grammars state. However, combinations of an infinitive with a *by* particle can be perceived as analytical infinitive forms of the conditional mood (Gębka-Wolak, 2017, pp. 25-26). One should differentiate such constructions from sentences with the particle *by*, such as: *Afisze informujące o kontakcie z dzielnicowym zawierają dane policjanta, numery telefonu pod jakie musimy **zadzwonić by porozmawiać** z dzielnicowym oraz wielkość rejonu jakim się zajmuje* (J. Kucharski).

One can trace the morphological parameters of the conjunctive in grammar constructions of the desiritive mood. In modern linguistics, scientists single out different amount of this mood forms. In the academic research under the editorship of I. Bilodid and V. Rusanivskyi there are singled out only the forms of the 1 person singular, and the 3 person singular and plural. In the collective work "*Grammar of the Ukrainian Language: Morphology*", the authors distinguish between personal and non-personal forms. Those forms of the imperative mood which are combined with morphemes *хай, нехай* are considered personal (Bezpoiasko, Horodenska, 1993, p. 232). According to I. Vykhovanets, "*an analytical impersonal form which combines an infinitive with the morpheme b is a typical expression of desirable modality*" (Vykhovanets, 2004, p. 262), e.g.: *Ось так сісти б на коня і поїхати до Києва* (P. Zahrebelnyi); *От би на став заглянути, може, тамки під кригою риби надушилось* (Ye. Hutsalo); *У Власівці ліс хороший, та тільки б нам не переплатити* (H. Tiutiunnyk).

Ukrainian, as well as Polish, verb forms ending with *-но, -то* can denote a conditional or expected (desired) action, when they are used with a particle *б* or a conjunction *щоб*, however, such examples are scarce in the linguistic corpus: ***Бажано б*** *забезпечити мене конфіденційною розвідувальною інформацією, отриманою з владних джерел, щодо спроб впливових угруповань просувати своїх людей на вершину влади* (A. Sakhno); *А **щоб виправдано** було, то серед односельчан розповсюдили вони ту незаперечну доказовість, що в місті у мене є квартира* (A. Kondratiuk) (Kurylo, 1930, p. 11; Vykhovanets, 2004, p. 222).

In modern Polish, these forms are used not only with the meaning of indicative mood, but also the conditional one (with the particle *by* or with the conjunctions *aby, żeby*), that means, they can denote a conditional or expected action (Hinzburg, 2015, p. 6). The NKJP includes many examples, such as: *Dopiero jeśli nie mogłyby uzgodnić kandydata, przeprowadzano by konkurs* (Gazeta Wyborcza); *Ale taka myśl nie postała mu w głowie, nawet nie dlatego, że bał się, iż po powrocie do ojczyzny potraktowano by go jak zdrajcę* (Tomast Mirkowski). Consequently, the forms ending with *-no, -to* have acquired verbal categories of reversibility and mood (Scherbiy, 2022).

In some cases, predicative adjectival forms ending with *-no, -to*, created on the basis of direct-transitive verbs, are used in an indefinite-personal meaning in the same way both in Polish and Ukrainian. Primarily, those are verb forms with the meaning of convesing and command, used in the main sentence and connected with the following subordinate sentence by means of the conjunction *aby* (Ukrainian *щоб, аби*) or in a simple sentence, where instead of a subordinate sentence after the forms ending with *-no, -to* there is an infinitive. Another thing common to most Slavic languages is sentences that convey information about the amount of something extracted, produced, delivered, etc., where the forms ending with *-no, -to* are used with an object (word combination) that consists of a numeral in an accusative case and a noun in a genitive case. There exist other cases that use predicative adjectival

forms ending with *-no, -to* with a direct object realised through a noun of a specific material semantics (Kalenichenko, 2009, p. 147–148), but they are rather exceptions.

In the Macedonian language, tense forms consisting of an auxiliary verb *има* and an adjective ending with *-n- /-t* in the neutral gender with a result meaning create forms of the indicative, imperceptive and conditional moods:

> *сум имал дојдено*
>
> *ќе сум имал дојдено*
>
> *би имал дојдено*

Scientists argue that **transgressives** do not convey the grammar category of mood and they can appear only in the narrative mood constructions (Bojałkowska, 2010, p. 96), while I. Burkacka emphasizes that in the Polish language if there is a transgressive in a subordinate sentence one cannot use a predicate in a conditional mood (Burkacka, 1996, p. 26). School and academic grammars (Saloni, 2001; Bartnicka, Satkiewicz, 1990; Grzegorczykowa, 2001; Jaworski, 1995) argue that conditional and imperative moods leave the category of tense uncertain, this comes from semantic principles, since the events described cannot be localized in time. However, in modern texts there are numerous examples of sentences that are believed to be erroneous if we follow some scholars, for instance: *Jednak PO* **likwidując** *ministerstwo* **pozbyłoby się** *pewnej posady dla Elżbiety Radziszewskiej, lekarki i parlamentarzystki zaprawionej w bojach z ministrem Mariuszem Łapińskim* (Polityka); **Postępując** *w ten sposób, nie pozwolimy,* **by** *np. gniew nas* **„porwał"** *i wyraził się w postaci ataku furii* (Antoni Skowroński); they find their place even in linguistic guides and dictionaries, for example: **Pisząc** *do nas, nie obawiajcie się używać polskich liter* (strona internetowa http://slowniki.pwn.pl/poradnia/). In conditional and imperative sentences, transgressives have a typical ending -ąc rather than -wszy, which is also a possibility [Bojałkowska, p. 98]: *… nawet kosmici* **wylądowawszy** *na Ziemi od razu na boisku zorientowaliby się, w czym rzecz* (Korp IPI PAN); **Pokrajawszy** *surowe mięso zająca w cienkie paski, na- szpikuj je grubo krojoną słoniną…* (Korp IPI PAN); *…* **wróciwszy** *przed ekran dziennika, porównajcie obie rzeczywistości* (Korp IPI PAN).

5. CONCLUSIONS

The grammar mood of a verb is a complicated interlevel communicative category that has a four-faceted expression. When it comes to verbal nouns, the category of grammatical mood is practically lost and can occur only in transformations of subordinate sentences. Infinitive constructions with the particle *б (би)* can convey different modal meanings of necessity, inevitability, desirability, inducement or inability to perform an action, however, infinitive constructions with the particle *by* are rarely used in Polish, the reason being that the particle is used together with the verb, and not separately, also an infinitive cannot express conditional mood, as it is stated in traditional grammars. Analytical forms that induce to act together, where the lexical meaning is separated from the grammatical one, have several variants, and their majority is inherent to the Russian language. Both in Ukrainian and Polish, verbal forms ending with *-но, -мо* can convey conditional or expected (desired) action, when they are used with the particle *б* or with the conjunction *щоб*, however, such examples are not numerous in the corpus. In modern Polish, these forms are used not only in the indicative mood, but also in the conditional one (with the particle share *by* or with the conjunctions *aby, żeby*), that is, they can express both the conditional and expected action. Examples illustrate that although a transgressive does not morphologically express the grammatical category of mood, it can appear in conditional or imperative

sentences outside the narrative mood (albeit less often), despite the fact that this fact contradicts the linguistic tradition.

REFERENCES

[1] Bartnicka, B., & Satkiewicz, H. (1990). Gramatyka języka polskiego dla cudzoziemców. Wiedza Powszechna. (in Poland)

[2] Bezpoiasko, O.K., Horodenska, K.H., & Rusanivskyi, V.M. (1993). Hramatyka ukraiinskoii movy: Morfolohiia. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

[3] Bojałkowska., K. (2010). Opis składniowy imiesłowów przysłówkowych we współczesnym języku polskim. Toruń. (in Poland)

[4] Burkacka., I. (1996). Konstrukcje z imiesłowem przysłówkowym w ocenie użytkowników języka. Poradnik Językowy, 2, 12-31. (in Poland)

[5] Daskaliuk, O.L. (2005). Semantyko-hramatychna kharakterystyka imperatyva suchasnoii ukraiinskoii movy [Semantic and grammatical characteristics of the imperative of modern Ukrainian language] (Abstract of PhD dissertation). Chernivtsi. (in Ukrainian)

[6] Ďurovič, Ľ. (1956). Modálnosť: Lexikálno-syntaktické vyjadrovanie modálnych a hodnotiacich vzťahov v slovenčine a ruštine. Slovenská akadémia vied. (in Slovakia)

[7] Gębka-Wolak, M. (2017). Ile form bezokolicznikowych jest w paradygmacie czasownika? Problem trybu przypuszczającego bezokolicznika. *Poznańskie Studia Polonistyczne. Seria Językoznawcza*, 37, 25-39. https://doi.org/10.14746/pspsj.2010.17.2 (in Poland)

[8] Gołąb, Z. (1964). *Conditionalis typu bałkańskiego w językach południowosłowiańskich ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem macedońskiego*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków. (in Poland)

[9] Grzegorczykowa, R., Laskowski, R., & Wróbel, H. (Eds.). (1998). *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego: Morfologia* (Pt. 1). Warszawa. (in Poland)

[10] Hinzburh, M. (2015). Ukrainski konstruktsii z diieslivnymy formamy na -no, -to na tli susidnikh slovianskykh mov. *Visnyk Nats. un-tu «Lvivska politekhnika». Seriia «Problemy ukrainskoi terminolohii»*, 817, 3–21. (in Ukrainian)

[11] Jaworski, M. (1995). *Podręczna gramatyka języka polskiego*. Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne. (in Poland)

[12] Kalenychenko, M. (2009). Bezosobovi rechennia z diieslivnymy formamy na -no, -to u cheskii movi. *Komparatyvni doslidzhennia slovianskykh mov i literatur: Pamiati akademika Leonida Bulakhovskoho* (pp. 144–148). Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

[13] Kostusiak, N.M. (2008). Katehoriia sposobu yak mizhrivneva komunikatyvna katehoriia. *Naukovyi visnyk Volynskoho natsionalnoho universytetu im. Lesi Ukrainky. Filolohichni nauky. Movoznavstvo*, 10, 47–54. (in Ukrainian)

[14] Kurylo, O. (1930). Pro ukrainski bezpidmetovi konstruktsii z prysudkovymy diiepryslivnykamy na -no -to. In O. Kurylo (Ed.), *Zbirnyk sektsii hramatyky ukrainskoi movy* (Vol. 1). Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

[15] Mędak, S. (2003). *Praktyczny słownik łączliwości składniowej czasowników polskich*. Universitas. (in Poland)

[16] Milewski, T. (1976). *Problem części mowy w ujęciu lingwistyki strukturalnej*. Warszawa. (in Poland)

[17] Mirchenko, M.V. (2004). *Struktura syntaksychnykh katehorii* [Structure of syntactic categories]. Vezha. (in Ukrainian)

[18] Moszyński, L. (2006). *Wstęp do filologii słowiańskiej* (2nd ed.). Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe. (in Poland)

[19] Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego. (n.d.). *NKJP*. http://www.nkjp.pl

[20] Puzynina, J. (1969). *Nazwy czynności we współczesnym języku polskim (słowotwórstwo, semantyka, składnia)*. Warszawa. (in Poland)

[21] Saloni, Z. (2001). *Czasownik polski*. Warszawa. (in Poland)

[22] Shcherbii, N.O. (2022). Hibrydni diieslivni formy na -no, -to v ukrainskii movi (na tli slovianskykh mov). *Zeszyt naukowy prac Ukrainoznawczych*, 89-98. https://doi.org/10.33896/PorJ.2022.1.8 (in Ukrainian)

[23] Shulzhuk, K.F. (2004). *Syntaksys ukrainskoi movy* [Syntax of the Ukrainian language]. Vydavnychyi tsentr «Akademiia». (in Ukrainian)

[24] Skab, M.S. (2002). *Funktsionalna sfera apeliatsii v ukraiinskii movi (semantyka, hramatyka, prahmatyka, stylistyka)* [Functional sphere of appeal in the Ukrainian language] (Abstract of doctoral dissertation). Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

[25] Smirnova, A., Mihaliček, V., & Ressue, L. (2010). *Formal Studies in Slavic Linguistics*. Cambridge Scholar Publishing.

[26] Szczerbij, N. (2022). Hybrydalne formy czasownikowe w języku polskim i ukraińskim. *Poradnik Językowy* (Special Issue), 1, 147–163. (in Ukrainian)

[27] Tomaszewicz, B. (2009). Subjunctive mood in Polish and the clause typing hypothesis. In G. Zybatow, U. Junghanns, D. Lenertová, & P. Biskup (Eds.), *Studies in formal Slavic phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics and information structure* (pp. 221–234). Peter Lang.

[28] Topolińska, Z. (1984). Właściwości diatetyczne czasowników w języku polskim, macedońskim i serbsko-chorwackim (założenia opisu typologicznego). *Studia konfrontatywne polsko-południowosłowiańskie*, 103-134. (in Poland)

[29] Vintoniv, M., & Bortun, K. (2020). *Strukturno-semantychni typy ta funktsiii imperatyvnykh vyslovlen u publitsystychnomu ta ofitsiino-dilovomu styliakh* [Structural-semantic types and functions of imperative expressions in journalistic and official-business styles]. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

[30] Vykhovanets, I., Horodenska, K., Zahnitko, A., & Sokolova, S. (2017). *Hramatyka suchasnoi ukrainskoi literaturnoi movy. Morfolohiia* [Grammar of the modern Ukrainian literary language. Morphology]. Kyiv (in Ukrainian)

[31] Vykhovanets, I. (1988). *Chastyny movy v semantyko-hramatychnomu aspekti*. [Parts of speech in the semantic and grammatical aspect]. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

[32] Vykhovanets, I. (2004). *Teoretychna morfolohiia ukrainskoi movy*: *Akademichna hramatyka ukrainskoi movy* [Theoretical morphology of the Ukrainian language: Academic grammar of the Ukrainian language]. Kyiv. (in Ukrainian)

[33] Zahnitko, A. (1996). *Teoretychna hramatyka ukrainskoi movy: Morfolohiia*. [Theoretical grammar of the Ukrainian language: Morphology]. Donetsk (in Ukrainian)

Nataliia Scherbii, PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Slavic Languages of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine.
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1431-9595
Address: Nataliia Scherbii, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57 Shevchenko St., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76025 Ukraine.
E-mail: natalia.shcherbii@pnu.edu.ua

———————————————

У статті представлена характеристика міжрівневої категорію способу гібридних форм дієслова. Описано міжкатегорійний статус цієї категорії та різноманітні підходи до її трактування. Розглянуто чотириграмемний вияв дієслівного способу (умовний, наказовий, спонукальний та бажальний). Проаналізовано засоби вираження категорії способу гібридними формами дієслова – дієприкметниками, інфінітивами, віддієслівними іменниками, граматичні властивості яких знаходяться на межі кількох частин мови. Здійснено класифікацію морфологічного вираження граматичних форм різних способів у гібридних формах дієслова з урахуванням морфологічного, семантико-синтаксичного рівнів мови; виокремлено спільні та відмінні особливості їх реалізації у слов'янських мовах.

Ілюстративний матеріал дібрано з національних корпусів української та польської мов. На прикладі сучасних художніх та публіцистичних текстів розглянуто функціональне вираження категорії способу.

Ключові слова: категорія способу, гібридність, дійсний, умовний, наказовий (імператив), спонукальний, бажальний способи, слов'янські мови.