

РОЗДІЛ 5

ПОРІВНЯЛЬНО-ІСТОРИЧНЕ І ТИПОЛОГІЧНЕ МОВОЗНАВСТВО

УДК 811.111'06'373+811.161.2'06'373

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2025.42.3.44>

BETWEEN STRUCTURE AND MEANING: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN PAREMIAS

МІЖ СТРУКТУРОЮ ТА ЗНАЧЕННЯМ: ПОРІВНЯЛЬНЕ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ АНГЛІЙСЬКИХ ТА УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ПАРЕМІЙ

Bodyk O.P.,

orcid.org/0000-0003-4642-8371*Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Philology
Ukrainian Catholic University*

The article presents a comparative analysis of structural and semantic types of English and Ukrainian paremias, focusing on their grammatical organisation, expressive means, and emotional-evaluative ambivalence. Proverbs and sayings are treated as linguistic units that integrate lexeme, sentence, idiom, and text-like features. A central focus is emotional-evaluative enantiosemy, when the same expression conveys opposing meanings depending on context, speaker's stance, or irony. Phraseologisms show greater ambivalence than individual words due to their figurative and associative basis. The study distinguishes separated and non-separated types of enantiosemy and traces their diachronic development. A structural survey shows that English and Ukrainian paremias correspond by about 70%, but also reveal divergences, particularly in negative and impersonal constructions. The material is classified into narrative, imperative, interrogative, and motivational types, with attention to simple, compound, and complex sentence structures. Ukrainian counterparts often lack the expressiveness of emphatic English forms, though they use other stylistic devices. Expressive means such as repetition, rhyme, alliteration, and comparison enhance memorability and rhetorical effect [18; 21]. Ukrainian examples rely more on repetition and tautology, whereas English ones are marked by conciseness, parallelism, and rhythm. Figurative devices – metaphor, personification, hyperbole – contribute to aphoristic impact and encode cultural stereotypes [19; 21]. The findings highlight both universal and culture-specific aspects of paremias, confirming their role in the interplay of language, cognition, and culture, as well as in translation and intercultural communication.

Key words: paremias, enantiosemy, phraseology, structural types, expressive means, cross-linguistic comparison.

У статті представлено порівняльний аналіз структурних і семантичних типів англійських та українських паремій, зосереджено увагу на їхній граматичній організації, засобах вираження та емоційно-оціночній амбівалентності. Прислів'я та приказки розглядаються як мовні одиниці, що поєднують лексеми, речення, ідіоми та текстоподібні особливості. Центральною темою є емоційно-оціночна енантіосемія, коли один і той самий вираз має протилежні значення залежно від контексту, позиції мовця або іронії. Фразеологізми виявляють більшу амбівалентність, ніж окремі слова, через їхню образну та асоціативну основу. У дослідженні розрізняються роздільні та нероздільні типи енантіосемії та простежується їхній діахронічний розвиток. Структурний аналіз показує, що англійські та українські паремії відповідають одна одній приблизно на 70 %, але також виявляють розбіжності, особливо в заперечних та безособових конструкціях. Матеріал класифіковано за наративними, імперативними, питальними та мотиваційними типами, з увагою до простих, складнопідрядних та складносурядних реченевих структур. Українські відповідники часто не мають виразності емпатичних англійських форм, хоча вони використовують інші стилістичні засоби. Такі виразні засоби, як повторення, рима, алітерація та порівняння, підвищують запам'ятовуваність і риторичний ефект [18; 21]. Українські приклади більше покладаються на повторення та тавтологію, тоді як англійські характеризуються лаконічністю, паралелізмом та ритмом. Образні засоби – метафора, персоніфікація, гіпербола – сприяють афористичному впливу та кодують культурні стереотипи [19; 21]. Результати дослідження підкреслюють як універсальні, так і культурно-специфічні аспекти паремій, підтверджуючи їхню роль у взаємодії мови, когнітивних процесів і культури, а також у перекладі та міжкультурній комунікації.

Ключові слова: паремії, енантіосемія, фразеологія, структурні типи, засоби вираження, міжмовне порівняння.

Problem statement. The study addresses the insufficiently explored phenomenon of structural and semantic organisation of paremias, particularly the emotional-evaluative ambivalence (enantiosemy) characteristic of many phraseological units. While lexical enantiosemy has been examined in linguis-

tics, its manifestation in proverbs and sayings has not received systematic analysis [9; 13; 15; 17]. The problem is scientifically relevant because paremias occupy an intermediate position between lexicon, idiom, and text, serving as carriers of collective experience and cultural stereotypes [11; 18; 19; 21; 22].

Their semantic complexity and figurative nature make them an important object for understanding how language encodes contradictory evaluations, irony, and cultural imagery.

From a practical standpoint, comparative analysis of English and Ukrainian paremias contributes to lexicography, phraseology, and translation studies, as it clarifies structural correspondences and semantic divergences. It also supports intercultural communication and language pedagogy, since paremias are widely used in discourse, teaching, and literary translation. Thus, the research connects fundamental linguistic theory with applied tasks of cross-linguistic equivalence, interpretation, and cultural transfer.

Analysis of recent research and publications.

Recent research on paremias and enantiosemic developments along two major lines. Classical works in lexical semantics [9; 13; 15; 17] laid the theoretical foundations for studying polysemy and semantic opposition. More recent studies [5; 16; 20] have expanded the analysis of enantiosemic, exploring its cognitive and structural mechanisms.

In paremiology, Norrick [21], Mieder [18; 19], Bellis [11], and Park & Milică [22], who emphasize their role as carriers of traditional wisdom and rhetorical miniatures have examined proverbs as cultural and stylistic units. Ukrainian scholars [1; 2; 3; 4; 6; 8] have studied the emotive component of phraseological meaning, the nominative and communicative functions of paremias, and their classification.

Lexicographic resources such as *Slovnyk frazeologizmiv ukrainskoi movy* [7] and online idiom dictionaries [12; 14; 24] provide empirical material for structural and semantic analysis.

Overall, previous scholarship shows that paremias occupy an intermediate position between word, idiom, and text, combining semantic, pragmatic, and cultural dimensions [1; 2; 3; 4; 6; 8; 11; 18; 19; 21; 22]. This article builds on these findings by linking enantiosemic with the structural and semantic typology of English and Ukrainian paremias in a comparative perspective.

Although enantiosemic has been studied at the lexical level, its manifestation in proverbs and sayings remains insufficiently explored. Previous research has focused primarily on the semantic opposition of individual words, while the emotional-evaluative ambivalence of phraseological units has not been systematically analysed [9; 13; 15; 17]. The structural parallels and divergences between English and Ukrainian paremias, particularly in negative and impersonal constructions, also require deeper investigation. Moreover, the role of expressive devices – repetition, rhyme, alliteration, and metaphor – in shaping semantic variability has not been

adequately addressed in cross-linguistic studies. Thus, the unresolved aspects concern the interplay between structural patterns, semantic ambivalence, and cultural imagery in paremias, which this article seeks to clarify.

The aim of the study is to provide a comparative analysis of English and Ukrainian paremias, with particular attention to their structural and semantic types and the phenomenon of emotional-evaluative enantiosemic. The study seeks to establish the main grammatical patterns of proverbs and sayings, trace the mechanisms of semantic ambivalence within phraseological units, and identify both shared and divergent features across the two languages. Special emphasis is placed on the role of expressive devices in shaping meaning and on the cultural and cognitive dimensions of paremias, which determine their significance for translation, intercultural communication, and linguistic theory.

The research employs a combination of structural, semantic, and comparative **methods**. Structural analysis is applied to identify grammatical patterns of English and Ukrainian paremias, while semantic analysis focuses on the phenomenon of emotional-evaluative enantiosemic. The comparative method enables the detection of similarities and divergences between the two languages. Elements of contrastive phraseology, contextual interpretation, and descriptive analysis are also used to trace functional and cultural dimensions of proverbs and sayings.

Presentation of the main material.

1. Emotional-evaluative enantiosemic in proverbs and sayings.

The phenomenon of emotional-evaluative enantiosemic refers to the existence of a polysemous meaning characterised by opposing emotional-evaluative components within its semantic structure [3]. Emotional-evaluative components (positive and negative) are mostly examined concerning lexical units.

Phraseological units, namely idiomatic expressions, have not yet been examined in this regard. Upon examining the existing research, we wish to highlight a phenomenon that has not received systematic scrutiny from either phraseologists or lexicologists; it is aptly termed emotional polysemy, referring to a divergence in the meaning of an idiom due to fluctuations in emotional modality.

We are discussing instances such as: *He is the fox who is not taken twice in the same snare* – *Vin – striliany horobets: yoho na polovi ne obdurysh*, – with approval; *He is the fox who won't take a risk* – *Vin – striliany horobets: na ryzyk ne pide*, – with disapproval, where the ambivalence of the idiom “striliany horobets” regarding emotionality manifests as enantiosemic.

Observations indicate that the phenomenon of emotional-evaluative ambiguity and the diversity of phraseological units, which often culminate in complete opposites, is as prevalent as lexical emotional-evaluative enantiosemy. Nonetheless, it possesses distinct characteristics, primarily related to the intricacies of phraseological meaning and its more complicated structure.

A comparative examination reveals that the linguistic phenomena in question possesses both shared and unique characteristics at the lexical and phraseological levels. Researchers indicate that enantiosemy, particularly emotional-evaluative enantiosemy, illustrates two contrasting trajectories in linguistic evolution, highlighting the dynamic essence of human cognition [13; 16; 20]. This is evident in the manner in which the same reality can be assessed variably, eliciting diverse emotions and attitudes from the talking individual.

Phraseologisms possess a greater capacity for emotional-evaluative ambivalence than individual words, attributable to the distinctive nature of phraseological meaning, wherein the emotional and evaluative components take precedence, as well as their functional role in characterising and assessing objects, phenomena, actions, and states.

The phraseological meaning derived from the associative-figurative reinterpretation of the full phrase possesses the capacity to alter its emotional-evaluative content based on the perspective about the typical circumstance it represents. The phraseologism *“He is lifeless that is faultless”* – *“Ne pomyliaetsia toi, khto nichoho ne robyt”* possesses two contradictory interpretations regarding evaluative connotation.

1. Only the indolent is infallible /-/.

2. It is intrinsic to human nature to err; diligence serves as a commendable criterion /+/.

The emotional-evaluative enantiosemy of this phrase arises from the general seme “fallibility is inherent in a person”, which is derived from the prototype image of the situation “learning something entails making mistakes”. The differential outcomes of this transformation are “the absence of errors as an indicator of laziness” in one instance and “as an indicator of hard work” in the other, leading to variations in emotional perception.

The emotional-evaluative enantiosemy of phraseological units is partly attributable to the eurysemic characteristics of their semantics. The great clarity of the phraseological unit and the intricate relationships among its lexical components enhance its connotative and nominative potential, rendering its meaning eurysemic.

The phraseological unit *“holymy rukamy ne vizmesh”* (“a hard nut to crack/a tough nut to crack”),

denoting “someone exceptionally clever, cunning, or experienced”, is characterised by eurysemy, as it provides a comprehensive characterisation of such an individual, encompassing various attributes: self-assertion, cunningness, dexterity, and the presence of protection and advocacy.

The expansive definition of the nominative character results in emotional-evaluative ambiguity, which may be non-differentiated and syncretic, or manifest as emotional-evaluative enantiosemy, distinctly separated at opposing ends of emotional-evaluative meanings.

In this context, two categories of phraseologisms can be identified based on the nature of the link between antonymic emotional-evaluative components in their meaning structure:

– phraseologisms exhibiting separated enantiosemy;

– phraseologisms exhibiting non-separated enantiosemy.

The initial category comprises polysemous (often ambiguous) phraseological components, whose meanings exhibit a distinct emotional-evaluative dichotomy, such as: *„perestupaty mezhu”* – “to cross the line”.

1. To contravene a regulation, behavioural norm, law, etc.; to dissent from what was conventional or acceptable /-/.

2. Transitioning from one quality to another in pursuit of perfection /+/.

The second group comprises polyemotive phraseological components, distinguished by emotional and/or evaluative ambiguity and the capacity to express varying emotional states. For instance: *“Nu i nu!”* – “Well, well, well!” conveys astonishment, irony, appreciation, censure, or disapproval regarding a scenario, among other sentiments.

When categorising enantiosemic phraseologisms in this manner, it is important to note that each category comprises phraseological units of varying functional types: connotative and connotative-nominative. The initial category comprises phraseologisms characterised by exclamatory and modal semantics.

Connotative-nominative phraseologisms exhibiting disconnected emotional-evaluative enantiosemy encompass idioms such as *„perestupaty mezhu”* – “cross the line”, *“ruky cheshutsia”* – “get itchy feet”, *“sertse zavmyraie”* – “someone’s heart sinks / heart skips a beat”, and *“pidlyvaty oliiu u vohon”* – “add fuel to the fire”, among others. The idiomatic term “add fuel to the fire” possesses the following meanings:

1. To exacerbate relations; to intensify emotions /-/.

2. To augment, to stimulate interest and attention towards a topic or subject /+/-.

Phraseologisms exhibiting undivided emotional-evaluative enantiosemy encompass units of two functional categories: connotative and connotative-nominative. These are predominantly exclamatory statements.

Such phraseologisms encompass phraseological units like “*Presviata Bohorodytsia!*” – “*Jesus Christ! / Holy mackerel!*”, “*Z rozumu ziity!*” – “*It’s nuts! / I can’t believe!*”. Due to the essence of semantics, idioms imbued with emotional significance that originated as verbal representations of paralinguistic emotional expressions – such as kinetics, facial expressions, and gestures – are closely aligned with exclamatory phraseologisms. The expression “*potyraty ruky*” – “*to rub one’s hands (with glee)*” signifies a) excitement, joy and satisfaction, and b) expresses glee.

A distinct category is characterised by phraseologisms of a connotative-nominative nature, whose meanings exhibit emotional ambivalence that may vary according to the empathy of the speaker or listener.

The potential for a dual emotional-evaluative interpretation is amplified by the ironic quality, as ridicule inherently possesses two opposing meanings. The ironic modality can overlay the overall meaning, influence the potential for an emotional-evaluative tone, or alter the interpretation of the phrase, shifting it from a positive to a negative connotation.

Regarding the two structural categories of emotional-evaluative enantiosemy in phraseological units (dissected and undissected), it is important to note that this phenomenon is dynamic, with transitional instances existing between these categories. Furthermore, in a diachronic perspective, one can observe the evolution from inseparability and diffuseness to a distinct opposition of emotional-evaluative enantiosemy within the semantic framework of phraseological units.

In the context of evaluative sign change, lexical enantiosemy differentiates between melioration and pejoration, which exhibit a relative quantitative balance, unlike the lexicon where pejoration predominates.

The underlying cause is likely rooted in the semantics of phraseological units (eurysemicity) and the language’s inclination towards internal equilibrium.

Examples of melioration and pejoration can be illustrated through the enantiosemy of the following phraseological units:

a) melioration: “*sertse zavmyraie*” – “*someone’s heart sinks / heart skips a beat*”:

- to experience profound sorrow, dread, or an ominous foreboding /-/;

- to experience euphoria, tranquilly, or a sense of elation /+ /.

b) pejoration: “*rozduvaty kadylo*” – “*raise the wind*”:

- to effectively cultivate an endeavour /+/-;
- to create a commotion, to instigate a controversy (sarcastically) /-/.

In contrast to lexical emotional-evaluative enantiosemy, which is frequently stylistic, phraseological enantiosems lack stylistic distinctions, even when they belong to various style levels. For instance, the enantiosemy of the expression “*perestupaty mezhu*” – “*cross the line*” possesses a neutral connotation, “*anhel u ploti*” – “*a paragon of virtue*” exhibits a literary quality, and “*rozduvaty kadylo*” – “*raise the wind*” is colloquial, among others.

The emotional-evaluative enantiosemy of phraseologisms is categorised as intrinsic (linguistic) and phraseological fusions (pure idioms) based on the degree of language consolidation [23, p. 24–31].

The absence of the original living image, from which the idiom’s meaning originated, typically results in the entrenchment of evaluative semantics, thereby precluding its enantiosemic variation. For instance, the term “*sharashkina kontora*” – “*all show and no go*” conveys a lack of trust and denotes a worthless institution, consistently characterised by a negative assessment.

The study performed in this manner enables us to ascertain that the emotional-evaluative enantiosemy of phraseological units is an intriguing and intricate language phenomena, the objective existence of which is influenced by non-linguistic factors. In accordance with the overarching patterns in language evolution, phraseological enantiosemy possesses distinct traits linked to the structural and semantic distinctiveness of the phraseological unit as a linguistic entity. Idiomaticity and consistency enable the examination of the semantic, stylistic, and structural elements of proverbs and sayings.

2. Grammatical structure of proverbs and sayings.

Proverbs are narrative, motivational, and interrogative statements. Exclamatory words are absent in proverbs [1, p. 56; 21, p. 21–22].

Narrative sentences affirm or deny something. The quantity of proverbs – concise affirmative statements – is considerable. In the vast majority of instances, the subject is a noun, in contrast to proverbs, which are complex phrases where a personal pronoun frequently serves as the subject.

The subject of proverbs – concise affirmative statements – is encountered without explicit definition, such as: “*Appetite comes with eating*” – “*Apetyt prykhodyt pid chas yizhi*”; “*Homer sometimes*

nods” – “*Kozhen mozhe pomylytysia / Na kozhnoho mudretsia dostatno prostoty*”; “*Pride precedes a downfall*” – “*Hordist do dobra ne dovodyt*”, indicating that excess does not yield positive outcomes, among others.

A considerable number of proverbs present the subject with varying interpretations: “*Hungry bellies have no ears*” – “*U holodnoho chereva nemaie yushky / Solovia baikamy ne hoduut*”; “*A fool’s bolt is soon shot*” – “*U durnia hroshi dovho ne trymaiut-sia*”; “*Birds of a feather flock together*” – “*Rybalka rybalku bachyt zdaleka*”; “*Too many cooks spoil the broth*” – “*U simokh nianok dytia bez nahliadu / De dvi hospodyn, tam khata nemetena*”.

The definition may include not just a subject but also an additional noun: “*Little pitchers have long ears*” – “*Dity liubliat slukhaty rozmovy doroslykh*”; “*A penny saved is a penny gained*” – “*Ne vytratyv penni – znachyt, zarobyv*”.

In certain proverbs, the second noun possesses a favourable connotation, although the subject does not: “*Hunger is the best sauce*” – “*Holod – nai-krashchy kukhar*”.

In Ukrainian, as in English, the grammatical subject can be either definite or indefinite. In this instance, there is nearly total similarity between the grammatical structures of the two languages.

Simple negative sentences. Not all methods of conveying negation in English are utilised in proverbs. An inquiry in a negative form is absent from proverbs. The particle **not** is also not employed in proverbs with the predicative form of the verb, merging instead into a singular negative form: doesn’t, didn’t, isn’t, aren’t, wasn’t, shan’t, won’t, etc. Only negative constructions **don’t** and infrequently **can’t** are present (“*You can’t eat your cake and have it*” / “*You can’t have your cake and eat it*” – “*Dvichi v odnu richku ne vviidesh*”).

The subject of proverbs – uncomplicated negative statements – might be articulated:

– by a pronoun: “*You cannot flay the same ox twice*” – “*Z odnoho vola dvokh shkir ne derut*”;

– by a noun without a qualifying word and with a qualifying word (adjective, participle, particle no or numeral): “*Plenty is no plague*” – “*Nadlyshok – ne lykho*” (compare “*Kashu maslom ne zipsuiesh*”); “*Great barkers are no biters*” – “*Ne biisia sobaky, shcho havkaie*”; “*A watched pot never boils*” – “*Chas yde povilno, koly za nym stezhysh*”; “*No man can serve two masters* (Gospels of Matthew (6:24) and Luke (16:13))” – “*Nikhto dvom panam sluzhyty ne mozhe*”.

Concerning negative constructions, there are specific disparities in the grammatical structures of

the English and Ukrainian equivalents: for instance, when a pronoun serves as the subject in the English version, it is entirely absent in the Ukrainian version, which employs an impersonal construction instead: “*You cannot flay the same ox twice*” – “*Z odnoho vola dvokh shkir ne derut*”.

Our analysis leads us to the understanding that, to some degree, negative constructions in English are expressed in Ukrainian through the use of impersonal sentences.

Compound sentences. Proverbs featuring compound sentence structures are the most prevalent in the English language. Compound sentences are defined by the causal conditionality of the main clause in relation to the subordinate clause.

1. Within proverbs featuring a compound sentence structure, a category of phrases including a restricted subordinate clause is identified, which is introduced by the relative pronoun **that** with **he** serving as the subject of the main clause. We observe analogous structural kinds when the subordinate sentence is initiated by the relative pronoun **who**, with the latter type being far more prevalent than the former.

1) “*He laughs best who laughs last*” – “*Dobre smiietsia toi, khto smiietsia ostannim*”;

2) “*He who pays the piper, calls the tune*” – “*Khto platyt, toi i zamovliaie muzyku*”;

3) “*He who pleased everybody died before he was born*” – “*Shche ne narodyvsia toi, khto by vsim dohodyv*”.

Consequently, it is evident that subordinate clauses in Ukrainian are similarly introduced by the relative pronoun **toi**, which is nearly entirely equal to English constructions.

2. We can also identify a category of compound sentences featuring a conditional subordinate clause, initiated by the conjunction **if** in the preceding main clause: “*If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch*” – “*Yakshcho slipyi vede slipoho, oboie zvaliatsia v kanavu*”; “*If you run after two hares, you will catch neither*” – “*Yakshcho za dvoma zaitsiamy pozhenshsia, to zhodnoho ne spiimaiesh*”. The construction utilising the conjunction **if** is similarly maintained in the Ukrainian form “*yakshcho..., to*”.

3. A prevalent structural category of proverbs consists of emphatic compound sentences featuring a restrictive denotative subordinate clause introduced by the pronoun **that**, accompanied by a preceding pronoun **it** serving as a formal subject with indicative significance. For instance: “*It is a good horse that never stumbles*” – “*Kin na chotyrokh nohakh, ta y toi spotykaietsia*”; “*It is the last straw that breaks the camel’s back*” – “*Ostannia solomyňa lamaie spynu verbliuda / Ostannia kraplia perepovniaie chashu terpinia*”.

The emphatic structure *it is... that...* in English is substituted with a simple statement in Ukrainian, which, in our view, lacks the same level of expressiveness as its English counterpart.

4. Among proverbs, there exist intricate phrases with subordinate clauses of time, initiated by the conjunction **when**: “*When guns speak it is too late to argue*” – “*Koly zbroia hovoryt, vzhe zapizno sperechatysia*”; “*When the cat’s away, the mice will play*” – “*Bez kota mysham rozdollia*”.

5. In subordinate sentences, subjects may be introduced by the pronouns **what** and **when**, as exemplified by: “*What is bred in the bone will not go out of the flesh*” – “*Horbatoho mohyla vypravyt*”; “*When a girl whistles, the angels cry*” – “*Koly divchyna svystyt, anhely plachut*”.

Alongside these primary categories, there exist specific proverbs and various structural forms.

Complex sentences. Among proverbs that are complex phrases, a limited number exhibit varying links between their components.

1. Opposite-permissive connection: “*It never rains, but it pours*” – “*Lykhoodne ne khodyt*”, “*Pishla bida – rozchyniai vorota! Budynku hospodar doma? Bida pryishla*”.

2. Opposite-restrictive connection: “*The pitcher goes often to the well, but is broken at last*” – “*Zanadyvsia hlechyk po vodu khodyty, otut yomu i holovu zlomyty*”.

3. Conjunctive-consequential relationship: “*As you sow, you shall mow*” – “*Shcho posiiesh, te y pozhnesh*”.

4. Conjunctive-relative connection: “*There is one good wife in the country, and every man thinks he has her*” – “*Kozhen cholovik dumaie, shcho krashchy za svoiu druzhynu*”.

Among proverbs structured as complex sentences, there exist unconjunctive complex sentences that indicate the causal relationship between their components. A distinct subset among them consists of elliptical turns of diverse varieties, characterised by utmost conciseness: “*In for a penny, in for a pound*” – “*Nazvavsia hrybom – lizukuzov / Vziavsia za huzh, ne kazhy, shcho ne duzh*”; “*No cross, no crown*” – “*Bez truda nema ploda / Neshchastia boiatysia – shchastia ne bachyty*”; “*Out of sight, out of mind*” – “*Znykne z ochei, ziide z dumky (z mysli, z hadky) / Choho ochi ne bachat, toho sertsiu ne zhal*”; “*Nothing venture, nothing gain/have*” – “*Vovkiv boiatysia – v lis ne khodyty / Ryzkyk – blahorodna sprava / Khto ne ryzkykuie, toi ne pie sham-panske*”; “*Once bitten, twice shy*” – “*Obpikshys na molotsi, budesh duty i na vodu*”, “*Liakana vorona i kushcha boitsia*”.

While these phrases cannot be augmented with absent sentence components, as is possible in incomplete variable sentences, they remain predicative phraseological units, semantically identical to a complete sentence. In such formulations, there is no omission of any sentence component; rather, its inherent absence occurs.

Imperative sentences, namely, statements that convey a motivation for action. Such sentences may be classified as either simple or complex. For instance:

- with negation: “*Don’t teach your grandmother to suck eggs*” – “*Yaitsia kurku ne vchat*”; “*Don’t/never look a gift horse in the mouth*” – “*Darovanomu konevi v zuby ne zahliadaiut*”;

- without negation: “*Do in Rome as the Romans do*” – “*U chuzhyi monastyr zi svoim ustavom ne khodiat*”; “*Make hay while the sun shines*” – “*Kosy kosa, poky rosa*”.

Interrogative sentences are exceedingly uncommon in English proverbs. These encompass the subsequent proverb: “*Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?*” (Jeremiah 13:23) – “*Chy mozhe bars zminyty svoi pliamy?*”, meaning “*Chy mozhe liudyna zminyty svii kharakter?*”, “*When Adam delved and Eve span who was then a (the) Gentleman?*” – “*Koly Adam orav i priala Yeva, de rodovidne derevo stoialo?*” (uttered sarcastically to an individual who takes pride in their ancestry).

These lines, although interrogative in structure, convey narrative meaning; they are rhetorical questions. This is substantiated, particularly by the observation that proverbs in interrogative form can be transformed into declarative sentences, such as: “*Can the leopard change his spots?*” or “*The leopard cannot change alter his spots*” – “*Chy mozhe bars zminyty svoi pliamy? / Chy mozhe liudyna zminyty svii kharakter?*”.

We believe that the grammatical structures of Ukrainian proverbs correspond to around 70% of those in their English counterparts.

Sayings can be classified as narrative, motivational, exclamatory, and interrogative sentences based on their grammatical structure. These indicators exhibit minimal divergence from proverbs. Sayings function as autonomous clauses inside a compound phrase.

Simple affirmative-narrative sentences. Numerous sayings exist as straightforward affirmative-narrative sentences in both English and Ukrainian. “*The coast is clear*” – “*Shliakh vilnyi, nebezpeky nemaie*”; “*That’s another pair of shoes*” – “*Tse zovsim insha sprava*”; “*The tail wags the dog*” – “*Khvyst krutyt sobakoiu / Yaitsia kurku*”.

vchat”, that is, the subordinate dictates to the superior; “*The world is a small place*” – “*Svit tisnyi*”, etc.

In several sayings, the pronoun *one's* serves as the initial element: “*One's days are numbered*” – “*Yoho dni policheni*”; “*One's fingers are all thumbs*” – “*U noho vse z ruk valytsia, u noho ruky yak haky*”; “*One's hair stands on end*” – “*Volossia storch / dybky stalo*”; “*One's number is up*” – “*Sprava pohana, kaiuk / Yoho pisenka prospivana*” and more.

Several sayings commencing with the pronoun *one's* are comparative expressions: “*One's bark is worse than his bite*” – “*Vid noho bilshe shumy, nizh shkody*”; “*One's eye is bigger than his belly*” – “*Cherevo syte, tak ochi holodni / Ochi zavydiushchi*”; “*One's word is as good as his bond*” – “*Na yoho slovo mozna poklastysia / Vin khaziain svoho slova*”.

In contrast to proverbs, sayings are translated into Ukrainian more liberal, without consistent grammatical structure alignment, with only sporadic instances of coincidence.

Certain sayings possess an open structure, meaning they are augmented by a subordinate predicative unit: “*All the world knows that...*” – “*Usomu svi-tovi vidomo, shcho...*”; “*It/that goes without saying that...*” – “*Same soboiu, shcho...*”; “*It stands to reason that...*” – “*Zovsim ochevydno, shcho...*”, etc.

Simple negative sentences with the structure of a simple negative sentence are much less common than sayings with the structure of a simple affirmative sentence: “*Our withers are unwrung*” – “*Zvynuvachennia nas ne khvyliuie*”; “*That cat won't jump*” – “*Tsei nomer ne proide*”, among others.

The sole instance of a saying that constitutes a compound sentence is the expression “*All is fish that comes to his net*” – “*Vin nichym ne hyduie, vin z usoho maie zysk*” (in contrast to – “*Dobromu zlo-diievi vse vporu*”).

The quantity of imperative sentences is limited: “*May your shadow never grow less!*” – “*Bazhaiu vam mnohaia lita*”; “*More power to your elbow*” – “*Bazhaiu uspiyku, bazhaiu udachi!*”. In the second turn, there is a clear elliptical omission of the subject and predicate – *I wish*.

An illustration of a saying structured as an exclamatory sentence is the phrase “*Woe betide you*”, which conveys the meaning “*Budte vy prokliati!*”. This saying conveys a distinctly unfavourable sentiment about an individual.

Many sentences are, in essence, affirmations or denials, functioning as rhetorical questions that do not necessitate a response.

Phraseological units – “*Does your mother know you are out?*” – indeed, constitutes an affirmative – “*U tebe moloko na hubakh ne obsokhlo*”.

“*Do you see any green in my eye?*” – “*Nevzhe ya zdaiusia vam takym lehkovirnym, nedosvidchenym?*”.

Interrogative sayings are colloquial expressions utilised either as standalone sentences or as components of more intricate syntactic structures.

3. Expressive means in proverbs and sayings.

The syntactic characteristics of proverbs and sayings are reinforced by lexical and emotional euphonic elements. The creative expression of proverbs and sayings has evolved throughout centuries. Norrick put it very aptly on this subject [21, p. 7]:

“For folklorists, proverbs exist as items of folklore alongside riddles, proverbial phrases and jokes. They provide highly recognizable, (relatively) fixed textual building blocks with unique rhetorical potential. Proverbs are valued as folk wisdom and bearers of traditional lore. Their cultural salience renders proverbs interesting in cross-cultural comparison as well, including questions of intercultural transmission and translation. For linguists, proverbs unite features of the lexeme, sentence, set phrase, collocation, text and quote. They illustrate interesting patterns of prosody, parallelism, syntax, lexis and imagery. Because of their imagery, proverbs provide evidence of stereotypes and standard cultural metaphors.”

Notwithstanding the variations in their origins, proverbs are predominantly marked by brevity, articulated in a clear and succinct manner, which allows for “tight words but expansive thoughts”.

The pursuit of conciseness results, notably, in the creation of several elliptical proverbs. The extensive employment of lexical and euphonic devices in proverbs reflects their national character, enabling them to communicate their meanings more clearly.

The primary lexical figurative devices include repetitions and juxtapositions.

Repetitions serve to amplify. Repeated lexemes typically do not occur adjacent to one another. Various forms of repetition exist:

1. Repetition of a lexeme positioned in the primary rank. Both significant and insignificant lexemes are subject to repetition: “*First come, first served*” (an abbreviation of the archaic phrase – “*He who is first to come is first served*”) – “*Pepshoro pershym i obsluhovuiut*”. “*Nothing ventured, nothing gained*” – “*Bez ryzyku nemaie peremoh*”; “*Vovkiv boiatysia – u lis ne khodyty*” (compare: “*Ryzyk – shliakhetna sprava*”), etc.

In addition to the previously cited proverbs “*Like begets like*” and “*Like cures like*”, one may include “*Diamond cuts diamond*” – “*Naishla kosa na kamin*”.

2. Repetition of the lexeme positioned second: “*He laughs best who laughs last*” – “*Smiietsia dobre*”.

toi, khto smiietsia ostannim"; "One man's meat is another man's poison" – "Shcho korysno odnomu, te shkidlyvo inshomu".

3. Repetition of the lexeme, positioned in the third location: "He that serves God for money, will serve the devil for better wages" – "Toi, khto sluzhyt Bohu za hroshi, bude sluzhyty i dyiavolu, yakshcho dyiavol zaplatyt bilshе"; "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander" – "Mirka, zastosovana do odnogo, povynna zastosovuvatysia do inshoho / Shcho pidkhodyt odnomu, te y pidkhodyt inshomu".

4. Repetition of the lexeme positioned fourth. This form of repetition is exceedingly uncommon: "If two men ride on a horse, one must ride behind" – "Koly dvoie yidut na odnomu koni, to odnomu zavzhdy prykhodytsia sydyty pozadu" („Bahato shumu z nichoho").

5. Repetition of two lexemes. This form of repetition is uncommon: "So many men, so many minds" – "Skilky liudei, stilky y dumok".

The repetition of two initial inconsequential lexemes is feasible: "Out of sight, out of mind" – "Z ochei het – Iz sertsia het"; "In for a penny, in for a pound" – "Viddav peni, pryidetsia viddaty i funt".

6. Multiple repetition. This form of repetition is uncommon and humorous, as exemplified by the proverb "Don't trouble trouble until trouble troubles you" – "Ne budy lykho, poky tykho". An atypical form of repetition amplifies the humorous nature of the proverb, specifically: the recurrence of contiguous lexemes.

In contrast to the Ukrainian language, repetitions are not as expressive in English. The study indicates that repetitions in Ukrainian proverbs equate to tautology.

Comparisons can be categorised into two classifications:

1. Antonym comparisons, specifically the juxtaposition of lexemes that are antonyms and external to the specified proverb: "He that is full of himself is very empty" – "Toi porozhnii, khto povnyi sam soboiu"; "Small rain lays great dust" – "Malenkyi doshchyk prybyvaie hustyi pyl / Zoloto y u krapli blyshchyt / Mala tsiatsia, ta doroha / Male zerno – velyke derevo rodyt"; "Who has never tasted bitter, knows not what is sweet" – "He pokushtuvavshy hirkoho, ne diznaieshsia, yake solodke" among others.

Antonym comparisons are prevalent in comparative proverbs: "A living dog is better than a dead lion" (Ecclesiastes 9:4-11) – "Khto znakhodytsia pomizh zhyvykh, toi maie nadiiu, bo krashche sobatsi zhyvomu, nizh levovi mertvomu!"; "Better to reign in Hell, then serve in Heav'n" (Milton J. Paradise Lost, Book I, Lines 221–270) – "Krashche v Pekli pan, nizh v Nebi rab".

The final proverb employs antonymic pairings of lexemes: "reign in hell and serve in heaven".

2. Comparison of lexeme combinations that are not antonyms beyond these proverbs: "A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush" – "Krashche synytisia v rutsi, nizh zhuravel u nebi".

Comparable analogies are seen in comparative proverbs: "Better an egg today than a hen tomorrow" – "Krashche yaitse sohodni, nizh kurka zavtra" and "Half a loaf is better than no bread" – "Piv karavaia krashche, nizh zovsim bez khliba".

Equally significant modes of expression are euphonic techniques, encompassing rhymed consonance, alliteration, and assonance, which are crucial for the stability of proverbs and their enhanced memorisation.

Rhyme, the consonance of terminal sounds, is a crucial characteristic of proverbs. They convey the extent of individuals' musical sensibility and their unquenchable need for auditory fullness and beauty. Rhyme imparts a definitive structure to the proverb, rendering it reasonably stable and readily memorable.

Consonant rhyme is prevalent in English proverbs. Proverbs contain numerous forms of rhymes. The following are the most prevalent forms of rhymes:

1. Full masculine rhyme. In full masculine rhyme, repetition is established by a monosyllabic word when a vowel word rhymes in all succeeding phonetic elements. This form of rhyme is prevalent in English rhyming proverbs. The subsequent proverbs may act as illustrations: "A little pot is soon hot" – "Malenke, ta vazhkenke"; "Durnia lehko vyvesty iz sebe".

2. Exact or identical masculine rhyme. This form of rhyme contrasts with the preceding ones in that the consonant, vowel, and all other sounds align. In English rhyming proverbs, repeated phonemes constitute the sound structure of one lexeme while forming the complete sound structure of another lexeme, as exemplified by: "There's many a slip, twixt the cup and the lip"; "Ne kazhy "hop", poky ne pereskochysh"; "Blyzko likot, ta ne vkusysh / Yakby znattia, shcho v kuma pyttia, to b sam pishov i ditei zabrav".

3. Full feminine rhyme is significantly less prevalent in proverbs compared to masculine rhyme, although isolated instances do exist. In complete feminine rhyme, a stressed syllable and an unstressed syllable are reiterated when the vowel of the stressed syllable and all subsequent sounds align, as illustrated by: "Birds of a feather flock together" – "Chumak chumaka (kulyk kulyka) bachyt zdaleka / Chort chorta piznav i na pyvo pozvav".

Various forms of alliteration exist in English proverbs.

1. Alliteration: the repetition of a consonant sound in the initial and terminal words: *"Barking dogs seldom bite"* – *"Berezenoho Boh berezhe / Svii do svoho po svoie"*.

2. The recurrence of two sounds is infrequent in proverbs, as exemplified by: *"No paternoster, no penny"* – *"Khoto pratsiuie, toi pratsiu shanuie"*.

Assonance, defined as the repeating of vowel sounds, is infrequent in English proverbs: *"He lives long who lives well"* – *"Parochka – Semen ta Odarochka! / Na tobi, Havryle, shcho meni nemyle (Na tobi, nebozhe, shcho meni nehozhe)"*.

Lexical-euphonic means. Lexical and euphonic methods of expression might converge in the creation of proverbs. This encompasses alliterative repetitions, rhymed repetitions, and the juxtaposition of antonyms within rhyming consonances.

Alliterative repetitions are characteristic of elliptical proverbs, exemplified by: *"In for a penny, in for a pound"* – *"Yak Mykyta voly mav, to Mykyta y kumuvav"*.

The amalgamation of repetition and rhyme is evident in succinct proverbs such as: *"Fast bind, last find / Haste makes waste"* – *"Pospishysh – liudei nasmishysh"*; *"No pains, no gains"* – *"Shchob rybu yisty, treba v vodu lyzty / Doky ne vprity, doty ne vmity"*.

Some proverbs exhibit a combination of antonyms and rhyme, such as: *"A light purse is a heavy curse"* – *"Bidnyi – znachyt, neshchasnyi / Shcho posiiest, te y pozhnesh"*; *"Little strokes fell great oaks"* – *"Malymy krokamy – y do velykoho diidesh"* (cf. *"Terpinia i trud use peretrut"*).

Proverbs including the juxtaposition of non-antonymic lexemes and lexeme combinations can also be rhymed. *"East or West, home is best"* – *"U hostiakh dobre, a vdoma krashche"*; *"Better the foot slip than the tongue trip"* – *"Krashche ostupytsia, nizh obmovytsia / Krashche movchaty, nizh nepravdu kazaty / Slovo – sriblo, movchannia – zoloto* (cf. *"Slovo ne horobets, vylytyt – ne piimaiesh"*).

Among the euphonic figurative means in the phraseological expressions under examination, only alliteration is present: *"Dumb dogs are dangerous"* – *"U tykhomu boloti chorty (bisy) vodiatsia (plodiat-sia) / Tykha voda hreblu (berehy) rve / Zverkhu harno ta tykho, a vseredyni vorushytsia lykho"*; *"When doctors differ, who is to decide?"* – *"Na vsikh ne vhdysht / Dva likari – try dumky / Kozhen mudryi po-svoiemu"*; *"Put that in your pipe and smoke it"* – *"Namotaty / motaty sobi na vus / Zarubaite tse sobi na nosi"*; *"Live and let live"* – *"Zhyvy sam ta inshym zhyty ne zavazhai"*.

A significant element in establishing the aphoristic expressiveness of a statement is its imagery, manifested through personification, metaphors, metonymy, artistic comparisons, and hyperbole: *"No ear is deaf to the song that gold sings"* – *"Hroshi vsiudy khoroshi, ta ne na nykh sidai / Koly zh hroshi kazhut, to vsi musiat hubky postuliuvaty / U koho hroshi, toi i khoroshyi, a yak yikh nema, to vsim darma"*; *"Life is an onion which one peels crying"* – *"Zhyttia prozhyty – ne pole pereity / Zhyttia, yak sternia, ne proidesh, nohy, ne vkolovshy"*.

When rendering an image through another language, it is essential to maintain the artistic integrity of the image, the authenticity of the stable image, the gender implications of the central image of the proverb, and the integration of the image within a specific rhythmic-melodic framework.

Expressive means enhance the vibrancy of English proverbs and sayings – these nuggets of common wisdom that constitute an integral component of the phraseological structure of the English language.

While we have identified Ukrainian grammatical counterparts to comparative English constructions, we contend that they lack the expressiveness of their English equivalents. We believe that emphatic formulations are the most prevalent expressive means in the Ukrainian language.

The analysis led us to conclude that the study and translation of English proverbs and sayings with specific grammatical structures necessitate the understanding of the grammatical structures of their Ukrainian equivalents, which accounts for the variation in structural and semantic types of aphorisms in both languages.

Conclusions. This comparative study reveals that English and Ukrainian paremias show substantial structural and semantic convergence (approximately 70% correspondence) alongside important divergences – particularly in negative/impersonal constructions and preferred expressive devices. Central to these findings is emotional-evaluative enantiosem: phraseological units are especially prone to context-dependent ambivalence (separable or fused), which evolves diachronically. Expressive means (repetition, rhyme, alliteration, metaphor, personification, hyperbole, rhythm, tautology, parallelism) enhance memorability and encode cultural stereotypes; grammatically, paremias perform narrative, imperative, interrogative and motivational functions across simple, complex-subordinate and compound structures, with English favoring concision, parallelism and rhythm and Ukrainian tending toward repetition and tautology. Functionally, paremias occupy

a nexus of language, cognition and culture, with clear implications for lexicography, translation, language teaching and intercultural communication.

Prospects for further research: expand systematic typologies of phrasal enantiosemes; conduct diachronic studies tracing evaluative shifts; widen cross-linguistic comparisons and translation-focused

analyses; employ corpus-based quantitative methods to measure frequencies and co-occurrence of expressive devices; run psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic experiments on context, prosody and interpretation; and develop applied tools (annotation schemes, pedagogical materials, MT strategies) to preserve evaluative and expressive nuances.

REFERENCES:

1. Бодик О. П., Рудакова Т. М. Сучасна українська літературна мова. *Лексикологія. Фразеологія. Лексикографія* : навч. посібник. Київ : Центр учб. літ., 2011. 413 с. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0000867> (дата звернення: 20.09.2025).
2. Гаврилова В. В. Теоретичні засади вивчення паремій. *Наукові записки Бердянського державного педагогічного університету. Сер. : Філологічні науки*. 2015. Вип. 7. С. 11–20. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/nzbdpufn_2015_7_4 (дата звернення: 20.09.2025).
3. Гамзюк М. Емотивний компонент значення у процесі створення фразеологічних одиниць. Київ : КДЛУ, 2000. 256 с.
4. Дуденко О. В. Номінативна та комунікативна природа українських паремій : автореф дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.01. Київ, 2002. 25 с. URL: https://dspace.udpu.edu.ua/bitstream/6789/5129/1/AR_Dudenko.PDF (дата звернення: 20.09.2025).
5. Колісниченко Т. Синхронний та діахронний аспекти мовної енантіосемії. *Odessa Linguistic Journal*. 2019. № 13. С. 94–101. <https://doi.org/10.32837/2312-3192/13/9>.
6. Лещенко Г. В. Паремії як об'єкт лінгвістичного аналізу. *Modern Engineering and Innovative Technologies*. 2024. № 4(32-04). С. 79–84. <https://doi.org/10.30890/2567-5273.2024-32-00-087>.
7. Словник фразеологізмів української мови / відповід. ред. В. О. Винник. Київ : Наукова думка, 2003. 788 с. URL: <https://archive.org/details/slov557/mode/2up?view=theater> (дата звернення: 20.09.2025).
8. Ужченко В. Д., Ужченко Д. В. Фразеологія сучасної української мови : навч. посіб. Луганськ : Альма-матер, 2005. 400 с.
9. Abel K. Über den Gegensinn der Urworte. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1884. 78 p. URL: <https://archive.org/details/berdengegensinn00abel/page/n5/mode/2up> (дата звернення: 20.09.2025).
10. Alisoy H. Semantic Classification of Phraseological Units. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum*. 2024. Vol. 1(2). Pp. 43–55. <https://doi.org/10.69760/aghel.01024064>.
11. Bellis O. A. Proverbs in Recent Research. *Currents in Biblical Research*. 2022. № 20(2). Pp. 133–164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476993X211067160>.
12. Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus. URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/> (дата звернення: 20.09.2025).
13. Cruse D. A. Lexical semantics. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York : Cambridge University Press, 1986. 310 p.
14. Free Dictionary. URL: <https://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/> (дата звернення: 20.09.2025).
15. Jackson H., Amvela E. Z. Introduction to English Lexicology: Words, Meaning and Vocabulary. 3rd ed. London, New-York, Dublin: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. 274 p.
16. Klegr A. The limits of polysemy: enantiosemes. *Linguistica Pragensia*. 2013. № 23. Pp. 7–23. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292484494_The_limits_of_polysemy_Enantiosemes (дата звернення: 20.09.2025).
17. Lipka L. An outline of English lexicology : lexical structure, word semantics, and word-formation. 2 ed. Tübingen : Niemeyer, 1992. 212 p.
18. Mieder W. Proverbs as cultural units or items of folklore. *Phraseologie*. Volume 1 / ed. Harald Burger, Dmitrij Dobrovolskij, Peter Kühn and Neal R. Norrick. Berlin, Boston : De Gruyter Mouton, 2007. Pp. 394–414. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197136-038>.
19. Mieder W. The Politics of Proverbs: from Traditional Wisdom to Proverbial Stereotypes. Madison : The University of Wisconsin Press, 1997.
20. Murodova N. I., Djumabaeva J. Sh. Conceptual Enantiosemes. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT)*. 2019. № 2(7). Pp. 75–81. URL: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3521877>.
21. Norrick N. R. Subject Area, Terminology, Proverb Definitions, Proverb Features. Introduction to Paremiology: A Comprehensive Guide to Proverb Studies / Ed. by H. Hrisztova-Gotthardt and M. A. Varga. Warsaw & Berlin : DeGruyter Open, 2014. 368 p. <https://scispace.com/pdf/1-subject-area-terminology-proverb-definitions-proverb-3j6stkj28m.pdf> (дата звернення: 20.09.2025).
22. Park J. O., Milică I. Proverbs as Artistic Miniatures: A Stylistic Approach. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*. 2016. Vol. LXI(4). Pp. 379–403.
23. Phraseology. Theory, Analysis, and Applications / Ed. by A. P. Cowie. New York : Oxford University Press, 1998. 272 p. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198294252.001.0001>.
24. The idioms. Largest idioms dictionary. URL: <https://www.theidioms.com/> (дата звернення: 20.09.2025).

Дата першого надходження рукопису до видання: 23.09.2025

Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису після рецензування: 30.10.2025

Дата публікації: 28.11.2025