

SPECIFICS OF VERBAL VALENCE IN TERMS OF ITS PERCEPTION BY SPEAKERS (PSYCHOLINGUISTIC EXPERIMENT)

Olesia SULLYMA

National pedagogical Dragomanov University, Ukraine
E-mail: olesiasullyma@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: The article provides an in-depth study of the valence of verbal vocabulary in terms of selection of positions that are open to distributors. The purpose of the article is to outline the specifics of valence of actional and processual verbs in and out of context, to establish the minimum and maximum number of open verb positions in different contexts through a targeted associative experiment. The object of analysis are the verbs of actional and processual semantics, which appear in personal and impersonal meanings or combine these properties: *вурвату* (to eddy), *заливату* (to flood), *зацвітату* (to bloom), *укаму* (to hiccup), *казату* (to say), *клекотіту* (to roar), *котитися* (to roll), *переконувату* (to persuade), *ревіту* (to howl), *розливатися* (to spill), *свистіту* (to whistle), *сніжити* (to snow), *чавкату* (to smack). It has been established that verbs of processual semantics require more dependent components, and this trend is observed with verbs that have lost their actional seme and moved to the class of processual ones. A small number of open valence positions has been established, which corresponds to the traditional scientific division, in particular, of the verb *світату* (to dawn), but most reactions suggest the presence of an additional number of distributors compared to the scientific division by valence characteristics. Verbs that scientists mainly classify as monovalent with a wide potential for transformation into divalent, respondents ranked as divalent or trivalent, which makes it possible to finally change the traditional division of verbs into groups based on valence features. A small number of the identified open fourth position of verb lexemes indicates the inconsistency of its allocation for direct communication.

KEYWORDS: speech generation, valence, actionality, processuality, actant, adjunct, distributor

In the 1980s, the functioning of language units became the main subject of linguistic research: scholars emphasised that it was necessary not only to interpret the content, specificity, and components of language units, but also to study their function in speech; this area was called "functional linguistics". However, the problem is that the factual material for research in this area is works of fiction, which often differ from real, live speech. Therefore, the results of research based on such materials are often not correlated with real-time speech. Although there were periods in the history of linguistics when language was considered from the point of view of psychology, the true relationship between language and speech in terms of generation, functioning, perception, and the interplay between speech and thinking and consciousness began to be analysed only in psycholinguistic research. Factual material from fiction or journalistic works is mostly perceived neutrally, since it is impossible to investigate the author's state of mind at the time of creating the text. However, the study of the communication process or even individual linguistic units in the aspect of psycholinguistic diagnostics not only broadens the subject of research but also allows us to determine the influence of various factors on the generation of speech: neutral or emotionally charged state, personal experience, extra-linguistic situation, etc. Scientists emphasise that the importance of the subject in language communication, the actualisation of his or her knowledge plays a major role in language theory and the description of the model of understanding (Zasiekina, 2002). The reorientation of linguistic research to the connection of speech with the individual and his or her consciousness makes it possible to have a complex and holistic vision of human communication activity and the functioning of language units.

An important issue in the study of the communication process is the study of the generation of speech (in linguistic literature – verbalisation) and its constituent parts, in particular, the analysis of the verb's valence characteristics. Linguists argue that the main factor in shaping the structure of a sentence is the verb, which groups important secondary and even subject syntax around it, i.e. when producing a statement, the speaker first of all chooses the right verb, attaching the necessary semantic components to it. The main problem, according to researchers, is to establish the number of dependent components in the positions opened by the verb: some researchers name 3 substitutable relations (Tesnière, 1988), others believe that there can be 5–6 dependent syntaxes (Vykhovanets, 2004) and even 7 (Zahnitko, 2011; Masytska, 1997). In addition to the subject, object and addressee, scholars add tools and locatives of different semantics: the beginning and end of movement, the direction of movement (Zahnitko, 2011). Modern research is more focused on the analysis of the valence features of other parts of speech: relative adjectives (Stepanenko, 2018); nouns (Kostusiak, 2008; Chuban, Kardash, 2020), verbal

valence in literary language and dialects (Kholodion, 2021). However, so far there has been no study of verb valence in the Ukrainian language in terms of its perception by speakers, although it is the reaction of speakers, their perception of the completeness of a construction with a particular verb that would allow us to draw accurate conclusions. It is the determination of the verb valence, including procedural verbs, by questioning respondents to determine the number of open positions, the speakers' perception of the number of extenders of the verb's lexical meaning that is the relevance of the proposed study.

The purpose of the study is to outline the specifics of the valence of action and procedural verbs (in and out of context) in terms of their perception by speakers, to establish the minimum and maximum number of open verb positions in different contexts.

Traditionally, linguists consider valence as the ability to attach dependent components to express a particular meaning, and valence can be potential, i.e. realised in certain contexts, and zero, since some semantic groups of verbs can function independently, without any extenders. The researchers emphasise that process verbs require fewer extenders than action verbs, since processes occur undirected, against someone's will, and therefore they do not actualise, for example, causative, modal or object syntaxes. Instead, action verbs are more capacious and cannot function without object, address, subject and other actants. However, speech generation is a complex process that is related not only to the verb's semantics or syntactic structure; according to O. Luria, speech is possible only when there is a motivation - the need to express one's own opinion or inform (Luria, 1998). The scholars emphasise that "a person operates... with semantic units that are determined by the communicative intent and intention" (Kalmykova, 2008), and thus, to express the specific content of a message, more dependent words may be required, even those not provided for by the verb's semantics. The speaker's intention may be complex, veiled, economical, the speech situation may be familiar or new, and therefore the number of verb-dependent syntaxes may vary depending on the speech situation or the speaker's intention, rather than on the meaning of the predicate verb. In addition, the process of speech generation is also influenced by the speaker's intelligence, operational thinking, knowledge base, psyche, emotions, feelings, etc. (Kalmykova, 2008), so it is not justified to single out the valence features of the verb only on the basis of the material of a literary text.

It should be emphasised that the study of a text as a separate entity is based not only on the process of text creation but also on its possible perception, and therefore valence cannot be considered in isolation from the text and its specific stylistic features. For example, in different genres of the journalistic style, it is possible to have an excessive number of extenders, since shortening the statement may lead to misunderstanding or partial understanding of the message. Texts in the official business style are even more overloaded with repetition and consistent use of redundant vocabulary to avoid double explanation and interpretations. Colloquial style is the least regulated in terms of filling in the necessary valence positions, since the interlocutors may have a common speech situation, motive and intention, etc. The researchers emphasise that in order to reduce the number of valence positions, one can focus not on the subject but on the action or object itself, and vice versa - the action can move to the passive sphere, which is also manifested only in the aspect of the stylistic belonging of the text.

R. Dixon and A. Aikhenvald, studying valence, concluded that the verb in the sentence structure can reduce or increase open valence positions (Dixon, 1997). In particular, transitive verbs can lose their connection with the dependent object, and reflexive can be used instead of word combinations, which reduces the number of extenders. Conversely, if the arguments move from the periphery to the core, the circumstantial elements become crucial for expressing the general meaning of the whole utterance. Thus, the valence positions of the verb in speech are mobile and cannot be determined precisely.

The valence characteristics of the verb are not related to the verb semantics, i.e. in the human mind the meaning of the verb is isolated from the extenders, because the speaker adds to the sentence structure the elements necessary to achieve the intention, not those that ensure the understanding of the verb. According to recent research, two models of language organization in the brain have been identified: cognitivistic and connectionist. The connectionist model states that "the representation of a concept is not written down in a ready-made form, but is created each time due to the peculiarities of the external stimulus" (Zasiakin, 2010, p. 50). Any concept represented by a verbal lexeme indeed reveals the incredible flexibility of the speaker's and receiver's thinking, who are unaware of the concept of valence, but create new syntactic structures every time.

Researchers have proposed different theories of speech generation, but they have three common stages: motive or intention; internal speech (a collapsed semantic scheme with a predicate, which is then extended by dependent components); and extended external speech (Osgood, 1963). The motive for speech is the main one in the complex process of speech generation, since it takes into account, among many factors, the possible perception, i.e. prediction of the result of the utterance, and for an acceptable result it is necessary to verbalise the intention of speech as successfully as possible. At the stage of internal speech, the speaker actualises the most appropriate linguistic means without focusing on the specifics of the verb valence. The components included in the syntagm may be redundant, but they will contribute to the speaker's intention. Researchers note that it is necessary to study the second stage of speech generation: internal formulations, as they are largely elusive and mysterious (Harley, 2011). A detailed analysis of the valence of verbal vocabulary will contribute to deepening knowledge about speech generation.

Research methodology.

The factual material of the article is the results of a directed experiment of the respondents to identify syntagmatic associations. For this purpose, a questionnaire was developed in which the participants were asked at the first stage to determine the number of valence positions of the verb lexemes *вирувати* (to rage), *залити* (to flood), *заціматити* (to bloom), *икати* (to hiccup), *казати* (to say), *клекотіти* (to roar), *котитися* (to roll), *переконувати* (to persuade), *ревіти* (to howl), *розливатися* (to spill), *свистіти* (to whistle), *сніжити* (to snow), *чавкати* (to smack); at the second stage to determine the valence of the same verbs, but in a mini-context with the subject syntax, which, however, they had to take into account when determining the valence. Verb lexemes were selected based on two criteria: 1) the ability to appear in impersonal expressions; 2) the ability to be desemantised and metaphorised. The respondents had to indicate in the appropriate column the number of dependent syntaxes of each verb required to realise an informative statement: from 0 to 5-6 (the 5-6 were combined, since the structure of constructions of this type is similar, and a possible sixth component could be a locative of place or direction). The prerequisite was to identify only one variant of valence. In the colloquial style, which is close to the artistic style in terms of emotional impact and expressive means, these criteria are often decisive. The respondents were 3rd and 4th year students and teachers of the Ukrainian Language Department of the National Pedagogical Drahomanov University aged 22 to 40. Total number of respondents: 78 students and 8 teachers of the Ukrainian Language Department. Most of the respondents were women (95%), due to the specifics of the faculty. The survey was conducted outside of class time in a comfortable environment without any restrictions, meaning that respondents had the opportunity to think about their answers, construct minimal syntactic structures, etc.

In the course of the study, the following general and linguistic methods were also used: descriptive – for inventorying the results of the questionnaire in order to establish the specificity of the valence features of procedural and action verbs; contextual analysis – to find out the influence of the subject syntax, as well as the sentence structure – impersonal or personal – on the opening of free dependent positions by the verb; and statistical analysis – to establish the correlations between the valence characteristics of the analysed verbs.

Results and discussion.

The results of the survey show that the majority of speakers identify mainly the potential valence of verbs realised by one, two or, rarely, three dependent components, i.e. the realisation of the speaker's intention can actualise the appropriate number of extenders, which is sufficient to form an utterance. Some respondents (71%) considered only the verb *сніжити* (to snow) to be zero-valued, i.e. not requiring additional semantic verbalisers. The fact that, according to the respondents, the maximum number of extenders is possible in sentences with procedural verbs (*икати* (to hiccup), *чавкати* (to champ), *залити* (to flood) – four dependent syntaxes – denies the opinion of linguists about the ability of procedural verbs to form the structure of a sentence with a minimum number of extenders. The results of the study did not reveal the qualification of any of the proposed verbs as five- or six-valent.

Avalent verbs.

This group includes verbs that can stand alone in a sentence, without actant or adjunct components. These are verbs of the lexical and semantic group denoting the processes of nature: *дощити* (to rain), *сніжити* (to snow), *вихолити* (to whirl), *хурделити* (to snow heavily), *світати* (to

dawn), *вечоріти* (to grow dark), etc. A specific feature of this group is the absence of an explicit subject - according to most scholars, the verb itself implicitly expresses the subject: *Воно світає* (It dawns), *Воно дощить* (It rains), *Воно мрячить* (It drizzles), etc., but due to the specifics of the grammatical centre formation and general semantics, these verbs are classified as impersonal.

Among the verbs proposed for analysis, there was one impersonal verb, *сніжити* (to snow), which is a typical representative of procedural semantics for denoting natural phenomena, since it does not require dependent left- and right-hand components. Traditionally, verbs of this lexical and semantic group are considered to be zero-valued. At the same time, scholars emphasise that zero-valence is a formal indicator, since the subject syntax is implicit in the verb. It is noteworthy that in and out of context, 71% of respondents defined this verb as zero-valued, but for the remaining 29%, the verb semantics itself is not enough for the sentence structure, so they defined *сніжити* (to snow) as a verb with one open valence position. This unanimity indicates that the generation of syntactic structure with the verb *сніжити* (to snow) to a greater extent is activated by specific "mental representations" (Zasiekin, 2010, p. 257), i.e. elements closely related to fragments of the surrounding reality. It is worth noting that this lexeme was defined as monovalent by teachers and students who studied the topic of "valence" in their classes on the modern Ukrainian literary language. It is quite natural that other respondents, who did not have the relevant scientific experience and knowledge, identified the verb *сніжити* (to snow) as zero-valent.

A greater flexibility and variety of results was recorded in determining the valence of other verbs, and the variability of free positions of action and procedural verbs that can be metaphorised, i.e. act in indirect speech acts, was equally revealed. Verbal lexemes, as previous studies have shown, actualise in the minds of respondents mainly the first, direct meaning, and only in some cases associations with metaphorical meanings are possible, especially if the verb is part of idiom.

Monovalent verbs.

Traditionally, this group includes verbs that require only a left-handed actant – the subject-carrier of the predicative feature. According to A. Zahnitko, such lexemes are self-sufficient to form a separate syntactic structure (Zahnitko, 2011). Mostly these are verbs with procedural semantics of speech, sound, behaviour, activity, movement, etc.: *гавкати* (to bark), *курликати* (to clang), *кричати* (to scream), *висьохкувати* (to warble), etc. Among the verbs analysed, there were verbs of this group such as *казати* (to say), *икати* (to hiccup), *ревіти* (to howl), *свистіти* (to whistle), *чавкати* (to champ), *клекотіти* (to roar), *зацвітати* (to bloom), but the participants of the experiment mostly classified them as bivalent (within 40-50%) and trivalent (30-50%). These results indicate that procedural semantics mainly needs to be clarified in terms of duration, location, cause, etc. Action verbs are capable of forming syntactic structures based on the S – P – Obj scheme, which is sufficient for the realisation of the speaker's intention. However, for predicates with a procedural seme, the presence of a subject is not enough, because such a statement is assertive rather than informative: *Вітер реве* (The wind howls) – *Вітер реве третю добу* (The wind has been howling for the third day) – *Вітер особливо реве в горах* (The wind howls especially in the mountains); *Івола свистить* (The oriole whistles) – *Івола свистить у кущах* (The oriole whistles in the bushes), *Соловей висьохкує* (The nightingale warbles) – *Соловей висьохкує біля хати* (The nightingale warbles near the house) – *Соловей висьохкує ночами* (The nightingale warbles at night).

For the study, the respondents were offered the following personal verbs that can act as the main member of a one-part impersonal sentence: *чавкати* (to champ), *клекотіти* (to roar). The increase in the valence positions of the verb *чавкати* (to champ), used in the impersonal sense, is also recorded. In the minds of speakers, this verb is obviously associated primarily with its second meaning: "To chew with loud smacking of the lips; to smack the mouth" (SUM, vol. 11, p. 260), while its use in the sense "To seep, to be sucked under pressure from something, making characteristic smacking, smacking, squelching sounds (of a swamp, mud, mire, etc.)" (SUM, vol. 11, p. 260) is limited in time and is associated with certain weather conditions of rain, early spring or with the characteristics of the soil, in particular marshland, which produces such sounds. Therefore, in order to implement the semantics of the personal lexeme *чавкати* (to champ), 92% of respondents named one substituted position as obligatory, 8% of respondents believed that this verb requires four extensions, but in the context of *Чавкає* (It champs), the majority of participants identified two obligatory positions (53%), one and three (17% each) and four (13%). Thus, according to the respondents, the actionality seme actualises a smaller number of dependent components than the procedural seme.

The results of the distribution of open valence positions of the verb *клекоміти* (*to roar*) are different: out of context, 7% of respondents identified the possibility of four dependent components, but in both cases of functioning: personal (action) and impersonal (procedural), the respondents identified only two possible open positions. Therefore, verbs of the lexical-semantic group denoting sound manifestation, regardless of the presence/absence of the subject syntax, need to be spread equally.

Given the results of the study, the opinion of N. Kostusiak is convincing, as she notes that "the group of monovalent verbs is not clearly regulated, it can be replenished by components that structure other valence classes of predicates" (Kostusiak, 2012, p. 198). Indeed, the speaker's intention is not realised by a verb with a single component, since it creates the effect of a statement, not of informing or persuading, promoting one's own opinion, etc: *Вогонь котиться* (*Fire rolls*) – *Вогонь швидко котиться* (*Fire rolls quickly*) – *Вогонь котиться полем* (*Fire rolls along the field*). Researchers of the process of speech generation emphasise that at the stage of transition of internal speech into external speech, the syntactic structure becomes syntactically extended (Leontyev, 1999).

It is also worth noting that, despite the general tendency towards language economy, external speech should be constructed in such a way that the recipient understands and realises it. "Speech perception involves the reception of heard or seen elements of language, establishing their interconnection and forming an idea of their meaning... The process of understanding involves the recipient establishing semantic connections between words, which together make up the meaning of the statement. As a result of comprehension, the listener may come to understand or misunderstand the meaning of the statement" (Kalmykova, 2008). If the utterance omits a component that clarifies the meaning, connections between words, etc., there is a higher probability of inadequate perception of the utterance by the recipient, and therefore verbs that are mainly classified as monovalent in external speech implement two or more open connections. For example, in the construction *Донька икає* (*The daughter hiccups*), the predicate expressed by the verb sound should verbalise only one subject syntax, but it was associated with two, three and four dependent positions by the respondents, which can be explained by the desire to clarify the semantics of the process in terms of the cause of its occurrence, duration, etc. The speaker's intention when expressing information is not to state the fact of extra-linguistic reality, but to find out the reason, the possibility of correcting it, establishing its course, etc.

Verbs of the actual procedural semantics *котиться* (*to roll*), *свистіти* (*to whistle*), *казати* (*to say*) with a non-creature subject (*Тарілка котиться* (*The plate rolls*), *Вогонь котиться* (*The fire rolls*), *Віник свистить* (*The broom whistles*), *Очі кажуть* (*The eyes say*)), according to the respondents, require one or two distributors, which can obviously be explained by the metaphorisation of the utterance, respectively the subject and one circumstantial component (verbs are intransitive, so the object syntax is not predictable), which specifies the course of the process in terms of time or place. In particular, the verb *котиться* (*to roll*) in the contexts *Тарілка котиться* (*The plate rolls*) and *Вогонь котиться* (*The fire rolls*) was identified as bivalent by 70% and 72% of respondents respectively, and trivalent by 8% and 7%. Similar statistics were found for the verbs *вурувати* (*to eddy*) (*Вода вурє* (*Water eddies*), *зацвітати* (*to bloom*) (*Усе зацвітає* (*Everything blooms*), *Вода зацвітає* (*Water blooms*), *розливатися* (*to spill*), *Вода розливається* (*Water spills*)). Thus, the idea of one potential valence position of action verbs seems doubtful, since it is not enough to form a statement necessary for adequate perception by the recipient.

Divalent verbs.

Different researchers include different lexical and semantic groups in the group of bivalent predicates: I. Vykhovanets – state predicates (Vykhovanets, 1993), O. Mezhov – procedural predicates (Mezhov, 2007), etc. Most researchers, however, believe that bivalent verbs are transitive (actional) verbs that require a left-handed subject and a right-handed object. The results of the study confirm these ideas: transitive verbs, regardless of the semantics of the subject and possible metaphorisation, according to the results of the questionnaire, require the replacement of two, rarely three valence positions. For the experiment, two contexts with the transitive verb *persuade* were offered: *переконувати* (*to convince*): *Мату переконує* (*The mother convinces*) and *Винадок переконує* (*The case convinces*), but despite the specifics of the semantics of the subject syntax, the results of the survey are almost identical: 80% and 60% of respondents respectively named this verb bivalent. The metaphorisation of the verb does not affect its valence characteristics; on the contrary, similarly to monovalent verbs of actual procedural semantics, 32% of the participants identified it as trivalent in the

context *Випадок переконує* (*The case convinces*), while 20% of the participants identified it as trivalent in the context *Мати переконує* (*The mother convinces*).

The specificity of the change of free valence positions was recorded with the verb *залити* (*to flood*). The respondents were offered two contexts: personal and impersonal, and the dictionary presents this word as transitive with a possible implicit subject *вода* (*water*) in an impersonal sentence: "1.To cover or fill with water (of water); flood" (SUM, vol. 3, p. 183). The verb *залити* (*to flood*) has to actualise two dependent word forms - subject and object. In the personal construction with the predicative centre *Вода заливає* (*Water floods*), the respondents identified mainly two (70%) and three (30%) substitutable valences, but in the impersonal expression *Заливає* (*It floods*) 40% of the participants each identified two and four extenders as necessary for the full meaning, and 20% considered three dependent components to be obligatory. The impersonal use of the transitive verb shifts the semantic centre of the expression from the predicate to the substantive and circumstantial extenders; the verb semantics itself is not enough to form a complete message.

The results of the study partially confirm S. Zasiëkin's opinion that the syntactic structure for the reflection of the concept is created each time, and does not exist in a ready-made form (Zasiëkin, 2010, p. 50-51). Monosemous verbs and, for example, sound verbs, regardless of whether they are used in or out of context, actualise the same number of open valence positions. That is, they are not created as new ones every time, which is evident in the table.

verb	avalent	monovalent	divalent	trivalent	quardivalent
Залити (to flood)	7%	29%	29%	29%	6%
Заливає (it floods, impersonal in Ukrainian)			40%	20%	40%
Вода заливає (Water floods)			70%		30%
Чавкати (to champ)		92%			8%
Чавкає (it champs, impersonal in Ukrainian)		17%	53%	17%	13%
Тарілка котиться (The plate rolls)		22%	70%	8%	
Вогонь котиться (The fire rolls)		21%	72%	7%	
Мати переконує (The mother convinces...)			80%	20%	
Випадок переконує (The case convinces...)			60%	32%	8%
Донька гикає (The daughter hiccups)			34%	49%	17%
Сніжити (in and out of context)	71%	29%			
Клекотіти (to roar)			93%		7%
Клекотіти (personal)			100%		
Клекотіти (impersonal)			100%		
Віник свистів... (The broom whistled...)		85%		15%	
Син свистить... (The son whistles...)		90%		10%	
Вирувати (to eddy)		3%	90%	7%	
Вирує вода... (Water eddies...)		2%	98%		
Усе зацвітає... (Everything blooms...)		9%	91%		
Вода зацвітає... (Water blooms...)		5%	87%	8%	

Розливатися (to spill)		12%	81%	7%	
Ріка розливається... (The river spills...)		5%	85%	10%	
Казати (to say)			78%	22%	
Очі кажуть... (The eyes say...)			84%	16%	

Conclusions.

The psycholinguistic analysis of the valence of action and procedural verbs allows us to draw the following conclusions:

- According to the number of open valence positions, the majority of respondents identified one zero-valued, *to snow*, which does not require extension and is capable of expressing the general meaning of the utterance independently. This is a verb of processual semantics, denoting a natural process.

- Verbs traditionally classified by scholars as monovalent, with a significant potential for transition to other valence groups, evoked different associative connections among respondents: lexemes of the actual procedural semantics mostly require two, rarely three, extenders for adequate perception of statements with these predicative centres. The results of the experiment make it possible to finally change the traditional division of verbs into groups based on valence features.

- It is impossible to establish precisely the groups of two- and three-valent verbs, since some verbs were assigned to different valence groups by different respondents in almost the same percentage.

- The small number of verbs in the open fourth position indicates that it is controversial to allocate it for direct, dialogic, communication.

- The respondents did not single out verbs requiring five or six extenders. According to the results of the experiment, we can state that verbs of procedural semantics require more dependent components, and this tendency is observed with verbs that have lost the seme of activation and have moved to the class of procedural verbs.

Further research can be directed towards the study of the valence features of verbal vocabulary in different styles of speech.

REFERENCES

- Chuban, T. V., Kardash, L. V. (2020)** Чубань, Т. В., Кардаш, Л. В. Семантико-синтаксична валентність іменника (на матеріалі роману «Маруся» Василя Шкляра). // *Закарпатські філологічні студії*. Херсон: Гельветика, 2020. Вип. 14. Т. 2. С. 86-90. (Chuban, T. V., Kardash, L. V. Semantyko-syntaksychna valentnist imennyka (na materialy romanu «Marusia» Vasyliya Shkliara). // *Zakarpatski filolohichni studii*. Kherson: Helvetyka, 2020. Vyp. 14. T. 2. P. 86-90.)
- Dixon, R. M. W., Aikhenvald, A. A. (1997)** Typology of Argument-Determined Constructions. // *Essays on Language Function and Language Type: Dedicated to T. Givón*. Bybee J, J. Haiman, S. A. Thompson (eds.). Amsterdam, pp. 71–112.
- Harley, T. A. (2011)** Psycholinguistics. Los Angeles, Calif.: SAGE, 624 p.
- Kalmykova L. (2008)** Психологія мовлення і психолінгвістика. Калмикова Л., Калмиков Г., Лапшина І., Харченко Н.; За заг. ред. Л. О. Калмикової. Київ: Переяслав-Хмельницький педагогічний інститут, в-во «Фенікс». (Psykhoholohiia movlennia i psykhohinhvistyka. Kalmykova L., Kalmykov H., Lapshyna I., Kharchenko N.; Za zah. red. L. O. Kalmykovoï. Kyiv: Pereiaslav-Khmelnitskyi pedahohichnyi instytut, v-vo «Feniks»).
- Kholodon, O. (2021)** Холодзон, О. Синтаксична й семантична валентність дієслів: діалект VS літературна мова. // *Філологічний часопис*. вип. 1(17). 2021. С. 141 – 156. (Kholodon, O. Syntaksychna y semantychna valentnist diiesliv: dialekt VS literaturna mova. // *Filolohichniy chasopys*. Vyp. 1(17). 2021. S. 141 – 156.)
- Kostusiak, N. (2008)** Костусяк, Н. Валентність віддієслівних та відприкметникових іменників (на матеріалі драматичних творів Лесі Українки). Леся Українка і сучасність. Луцьк: РВВ «Вежа» Волин. нац. ун-ту ім. Лесі Українки, 2008. Т. 4, кн. 2. С. 361-370. (Kostusiak, N. Valentnist viddiieslivnykh ta vidpriyketnykovykh imennykiv (na materialy dramatychnykh tvoriv Lesi Ukrainky). *Lesia Ukrainka i suchasnist*. Lutsk: Volyn. nats. un-t im. Lesi Ukrainky, T. 4, kn. 2. P. 361-370).
- Kostusiak, N. (2012)** Костусяк, Н. Структура міжрівневих категорій сучасної української мови. Луцьк: Волин. нац. ун-т ім. Лесі Українки, 452 с. (Kostusiak, N. Struktura

- mizhrivneyvkh katehorii suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy. Lutsk: Volyn. nats. un-t im. Lesi Ukrainky, 452 s.).
- Leontev, A. (1999)** *Леонтьев, А.* Основы психолингвистики. Москва: Смысл, 287 с. (*Leontev, A.* Osnovy psikholingvistiki. Moskva: Smysl, 287 s.).
- Luriiia, O. (1998)** *Лурия, О.* Язык и сознание. Под ред. Е. Д. Хомской. Ростов-на-Дону: Изд-во «Феникс», 320 с. (*Luriiia, O.* Iazyk i soznanie. Pod red. E. D. Khomskoi. Rostov-na-Donu: Izd-vo «Feniks», 320 s.).
- Masytska, T. (1997)** *Масицька, Т. Є.* Граматична структура дієслівної валентності: монографія. Луцьк : РВВ "Вежа" ВДУ ім. Лесі Українки. 208 с. (*Masytska, T. Ye.* Hramatychna struktura diieslivnoi valentnosti: monohrafiia. Lutsk : RVV "Vezha" VDU im. Lesi Ukrainky. 208 s.).
- Mezhov, O. (2007)** *Межов, О.* Суб'єктні синтаксеми у структурі простого речення. Луцьк, 179 с. (*Mezhov, O.* Subjektnei syntaksemy u strukturi prostoho rechennia. Lutsk, 179 s.).
- Osgood, Ch. E. (1963)** *Osgood, Ch. E.* Psycholinguistics. Psychology: a Study of Science. New York. V.6. pp. xi, 203.
- Stepanenko, M. I. (2018)** *Степаненко, М. І.* Синтаксична і семантична валентність відносних прикметників у сучасній українській мові. Полтава: Аструя, 2018. 236 с. (*Stepanenko, M. I.* Syntaksychna i semantychna valentnist vidnosnykh prykmetnykiv u suchasni ukrainskii movi. Poltava: Astraia, 2018. 236 s.).
- SUM (1970-1980)** *СУМ.* Словник української мови: У 11 томах. АН УРСР. Інститут мовознавства; за ред. І. К. Білодіда. Київ, (*Slovyk ukrainskoi movy: v 11-tu t.* Kyiv: Naukova dumka).
- Tesnière, L. (1988)** *Теньєр, Л.* Основы структурного синтаксиса. Под ред. В. Г. Гака. Москва: Прогресс, 656 с. (*Tesnière, L.* Osnovy strukturnogo sintaksisa. Pod red V. G. Gaka. Moskva: Progress, 656 s.).
- Vykhovanets, I. (1993)** *Вихованець, І.* Граматика української мови. Синтаксис. Київ: Либідь, 368 с. (*Vykhovanets, I.* Hramatyka ukrainskoi movy. Syntaksys. Kyiv: Lybid, 368 s.).
- Vykhovanets, I. (2004)** *Вихованець, І.* Теоретична морфологія української мови. І. Вихованець К. Городенська; за ред. І. Р. Вихованця. Київ: Пульсари, 398 с. (*Vykhovanets, I.* Teoretychna morfolohiia ukrainskoi movy. I. Vykhovanets, K. Horodenska; za red. I. R. Vykhovantsia. Kyiv: Pulsary, 398 s.).
- Zahnitko, A. (2011)** *Загнітко, А.* Теоретична граматики сучасної української мови. Морфологія. Синтаксис. Донецьк: ТОВ «ВКФ «БАО», 435 с. (*Zahnitko, A.* Teoretychna hramatyka suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy. Morfolohiia. Syntaksys. Donetsk: TOV «VKF «BAO». 435 s.).
- Zasiekin, S. (2010)** *Засєкін, С.* Нейролінгвістика сьогодення: теорія і практика. // *Людина. Комп'ютер. Комунікація.* Львів: НУ Львівська політехніка. № 5. с. 50-58. (*Zasiekin, S.* Neirolinhvistyka sohodennia: teoriia i praktyka. // *Liudyna. Kompiuter. Komunikatsiia.* Lviv: NU" Lvivska politekhnika, 5, S. 50-58).
- Zasiekina, L., Zasiekin, S. (2002)** *Засєкіна, Л., Засєкін, С.* Вступ до психолінгвістики. Острого: Видавництво Національного університету «Острозька академія», 168 с. (*Zasiekina, L., Zasiekin, S.* Vstup do psikholingvistiki. Ostroh: Vydavnytstvo Natsionalnoho universytetu «Ostrozka akademiia», 168 s.).

Mark the valence of the verbs with a tick (only one) in the corresponding column (in the left column only the predicative centre, but you should take into account the existing subject syntaxeme in the number of open valence positions, for example, *Очі кажуть* (*The eyes say*)—there is already one valence + (possibly) 1 or 2, so result is - 2 or 3)

Сніжить (It snows).						
Очі кажуть... (The eyes say...)						
Вітер реве... (The wind howls...)						
Донька гикає... (The daughter hiccups...)						
Випадок переконує... (The case convinces...)						
Мати переконує... (The mother convinces...)						
Віник свистів... (The broom whistled...)						

Син свистить... (The son whistles...)						
Чавкає... (It champs...)						
Багно чавкає... (Mud champs...)						
Клекотить... (It roars...)						
Лелека клекотить... (The stork roars...)						
Вирує вода... (Water eddies...)						
Вода заливає... (Water floods...)						
Заливає (It floods)						
Усе зацвітає... (Everything blooms...)						
Вода зацвітає... (Water blooms...)						
Ріка розливається... (The river spills...)						
Вогонь котиться... (The fire rolls...)						
Тарілка котиться... (The plate rolls...)						