

DOI 10.32342/2523-4463-2017-0-13-179-183

УДК 81'1

O. BURKOVSKA,

*Assistant referee of German and Slavonic Philology Department
Donbass State Pedagogical University (Sloviansk)*

THE PROBLEM OF THE ONE-MEMBER SENTENCES AS A SEPARATE CATEGORY IN THE 50 OF THE XXth CENTURY – EARLY XXist CENTURY

The article is devoted to the selection of one-member simple sentences in the Ukrainian and Russian languages during the development of the semantic direction. The views of various linguists on the question of all two-member sentences of above mentioned languages are analyzed.

Key words: simple sentence, one-member sentence, two-member sentence, Semantics, syntactic synonymy.

In the 50-ies of the last century semantics has gained great fame in the linguistic circles, which led to the review of the question of the one-member sentences as a separate category in general.

A lot of Ukrainian and foreign linguists reject the common opposition the one-member sentence / the two-member sentence and cast doubt and deny the very notion of one-member sentence. Regarding the problem of the two-member sentences of any and all sentences of the Ukrainian and Russian languages, the researchers suggest different approaches in their scientific works.

The scientific views of V.G. Admoni, Ye.O. Sedelnikov, M.V. Panov, M. Guiraud-Weber, N.Yu. Shvedova, N.D. Arutiunova, I.I. Slynko, O.S. Melnychuk, G.O. Zolotova, K.G. Gorodenska, I.R. Vyhovanets, V.M. Britsyn and other linguists are noteworthy.

The aim of the article is to present the views of a number linguists on the matter of the one-member sentence in the Ukrainian and Russian languages from the position of the two-member sentence.

This goal is concretized in the following tasks:

1. to analyze the views of native and foreign linguists on all two-member sentences of the Ukrainian and Russian languages;
2. to outline prospects for further studies of the one-member sentences from the position of the two-member sentences.

V.G. Admoni in 1955 after the release of the II volume of the Academic Russian Grammar (1954) published theoretical work «On the Two-member Sentence» where he «dubbed» the problem of the one-member sentence in the Russian language as one of the «cursed» issues of linguistics. The author writes that «due to its social nature, the act of verbal communication is always two-member structure. This suggests that the linguistic unit that forms the act of verbal communication, the sentence, should be basically two-member structure, although it may not always get its clear expression» [1, p. 140].

To summarize the analysis of the grammatical structure of sentences like *прийду; даю тобі слово; говорять; працюю; світає; сумно*, – V. G. Admoni characterizes them as the two-member sentences, using the concept «morphological notion of two-member sentence», and asserts the «two-member notion being a natural and distinctive feature of any sentence of the Russian language» [1, p. 157].

Ye.O. Sedelnikov in the article «The Structure of Simple Sentences in the Framework of Syntagmatic and Paradigmatic Relations» also states that «the sentence is always binary, i.e. it is a syntagma in which one member performs the function of identification (the subject) and the second – the function of distinction (the predicate)» [2, p. 73].

Developing the ideas of transformational syntax, the author concludes that «the characteristic feature of Russian is the presence in it of such forms and patterns of sentences, in which one of the members of the syntagma, that forms them, is submitted by zero» [2, p. 74]. Ye.O. Sedelnikov classifies all sentences as two-member structures by their syntactic form extensively using the concept of the syntactic zero, the concept of a zero subject and predicate [3, p. 17].

The idea of the syntactic zero, in its broad interpretation, was principal for linguistic essay «The Russian Language» by M.V. Panov. «The basis of any sentence, as the scholar asserts, is a predicative phrase...a noun in the nominative case + a conjugated verb (one of these members may be replaced by zero)» [4, p. 106]. The sentences that are traditionally referred to the one-member definite-personal, indefinite-personal, generalized-personal, nominative and impersonal ones are classified by the author as the two-member sentences with a zero subject.

Concerning the sentences mentioned M.V. Panov justifies that «for example, the indefinite-personal meaning of a verb can be realized only when the subject is “absent”. The significant absence of the subject should be considered as a special indicator, so in sentences with indefinite-personal, generalized-personal and impersonal forms of the verb the presence of the subject expressed by zero must be recognized» [4, p. 106]. Only the infinitive sentences like *Мовчати! Досить спати!* are recognized in this essay as the one-member (one-component) sentences.

«One-member theory» of simple sentences in the Russian language is under the critics in the article of the French scientist-slavist M. Guiraud-Weber «On the Classification of the Simple Sentence in Modern Russian». Using such concepts as «syntactic subject», «zero subject», «two-member inconsistent model» drives the author to the conclusion about the syntactical two-member notion of any simple sentence in the modern Russian language [5, p. 65–75].

The grammatical opposition the two-member sentence / the one-member sentence is strongly challenged by the authors of the «The Russian Grammar» (1980). The list of one-component and two-component structural schemes of sentences were given in the section «The Simple Sentence» by N. Yu. Shvedova. And it is quite a different principle of classification, which does not accept the outlined structural plan of the section «the Syntax of Phrases and Simple Sentences» in the theoretical «Fundamentals of a Descriptive Grammar of the Modern Russian Literary Language» (M., 1966), where, primarily, two-member and one-member sentences with their structural schema were clearly defined [3, p. 18].

It should be noted that Shakhmatov's doctrine on the grammatical two-member / one-member notion of the sentence had a particularly intense change in the 70–80-s of the XXth century in the result of the «semantic explosion» in the linguistics, specifically in syntax. Therefore, in 1969, N.D. Arutyunova attempted to refer to the ideas of the logical syntax by F.I. Buslaev [6, p. 42].

As a representative of a logic-based approach N. D. Arutyunova distinguishes four logical types of sentences, which are determined by the train of thought from the rheme to the theme and the categories, which the thought binds. The sentences based on formal one-component conjugated-verbal schemes are related to the logical type of the «sentence of characterization», where the predicate relation connects the subject and the features allocated in it. Such sentences can inform about features, conditions and relations of separate subjects, phenomena, events, concepts, for example: *Погода сьогодні гарна; Оленка весь день пише; Шевченко – автор «Кавказу»; Зошит – на полиці.* In this concept the linguistic content is not distinguished with sufficient clarity from the extralinguistic one and results in structurally different sentences getting into one type: objective, indicative or processive – both one-member and two-member [7, p. 76].

In Ukrainian linguistics paradigmatics of the one-member sentences was offered by I.I. Slyngo, who noted that «all sentences should be analysed at two levels, those of generalized models and of actual sentences. Sentence patterns can be basic (non-derivative) and with a variety of transformations (derivatives)» [8, p. 50–51]. The author suggests one- and two-component-

structure classification of sentences and with reference to the logical semantic approach, states that «at the level of non-derivative models one-component structures are nonexistent. They arise at the level of derived models and are a pure linguistic phenomenon – the reduction to the verbal or adverbial predicate, or at the level of stylistic-communicative options..., at the level of actual sentences the limits between two-component and one-component models in many cases are erased» [8, p. 53].

I.O. Melchuk tried to interpret the one-member sentences using a set of matching structural patterns. He defined “one-member notion as a constructive-predicative feature of a simple sentence that is implemented in the relevant structural diagrams derived from inherent to syntactic system patterns in a predictable and an unpredictable spreading of an undifferentiated basic part of the sentence by secondary parts of the sentence” [9, p. 28].

At the end of the last century the traditional notion of one-member sentence in Russian syntax was the subject to a critical revision in the works by G.O. Zolotova «Essay on the Functional Syntax of the Russian Language» (M., 1973), «Communicative Aspects of the Russian Syntax» (M., 1982), and in the article «On Some Theoretical Results of Work on «Syntactic Dictionary of the Russian Language» likewise in her other articles.

She claims that «realizing speech-mental act of linking subject and attribute the sentence is two-member in essence» [10, p. 54]. «The traditional division of sentences into two-member and one-member, by G.O. Zolotova, informs us about the presence/absence in the sentence of the subject in the nominative case. This characteristic structure of the sentence is not likely to belong to the characteristics that define the essence of the phenomenon, as a lot of models express the component that is produced by other means, and the role and way of processing the component is ignored by this division» [11, p. 503].

In the Ukrainian linguistics in the late XXth century – at the beginning of the XXIst century it an active study of the theoretical foundations of the semantic-syntactical level of the sentence is observed as well. It was highlighted in works by K.G. Gorodenska, I.R. Vykhovanets, N.L. Ivanytska, M.V. Mirchenko, L.M. Blyzniuk, O.I. Bondar, O.A. Tron', G.V. Kutna, O.A. Semeniuk, O.P. Sulym, N.M. Kostusiak and other linguists.

According to K.G. Gorodenska, the one-member structure should be described at the level of its formal syntactical structure, «since at the actually semantic level it's always two-member» [12, p. 50]. The researcher believes that the correlates of definite-personal, generalized-personal and indefinite-personal sentences are semantically basic sentences, which are formed by the predicate of an action or a state and by a non-predicative component with the semantical functions of the doer or of the state media. Actually, the semantical structure of the impersonal sentences is formed by the semantically simple sentences, the main component of which are the various types of the state predicates and the media of these states. Basic constructions with the predicate of the general physical state and the media of this state are the semantic basis of the nominative sentences [12, p. 52].

I.R. Vykhovanets qualifies definite-personal, indefinite-personal and generalized-personal sentences as two-member ones with a zero subject, since these structures have or could potentially have subjective syntaxeme due to the valence of the corresponding predicate [13, p. 75–76].

With reference to the formal-syntactic approach V.M. Britsyn raises the problem about the necessity to revise the methodological approach to the analysis of one-member sentences, because «in their majority the one-member sentences are monosyllabic only formally from the point of view of comparing them with the two-member subject-predicate structures. In such sentences lexical and grammatical semantics are tightly intertwined, and sometimes syncretically combined, there is also syntactical homonymy and synonymy...» [14, p. 87]. For this reason, according to the researcher, such syntactic units require detailed study at all levels of sentence structure.

Therefore, the first decade of the XXI century is associated with studies of the the one-member sentence in the ratio of the multi-level characteristics. M.V. Mirchenko considers that such analysis of the the one-member sentence structure provides a comparison of «formal-syntactical and semantic-syntactical characteristics as the form and content of the sentence sign, and, consequently, the study of the correlation of interlevel symmetry / asymmetry» [15,

p. 274]. Hereinafter, K.G. Gorodenska, K.O. Kosenko, O.V. Godz and other researchers have devoted their works to the investigation of the correlation of formal-syntactical and semantic-syntactical parameters of the one-member sentences of the Ukrainian language.

The problem of the one-member and the two-member notion of the sentences in the Ukrainian and Russian languages has a long history of research, but the rapid development of semantics directly raised the problem of the real existence of one-member sentences as an independent structural type of simple sentences. But there is no common point of view among linguists who support the theory of fundamental two-member notion of the sentences. The current stage of development of syntax science involves the study of one-member sentence in the comparison of formal-syntactical and semantic-syntactical parameters.

We see prospects for further research in the in-depth study of a number of topical issues of the syntax of a the simple sentence in the Ukrainian and Russian languages.

Bibliography

1. Адмони В.Г. О двусоставности предложения / В.Г. Адмони // Ученые записки I ЛГПИ-ИЯ, новая серия. – Л.: Наука, 1955. – Вып. 2. – С. 133–162.
2. Седелников Е.А. Структура простого предложения с точки зрения синтагматических и парадигматических отношений / Е.А. Седелников // Филологические науки. – 1961. – № 3. – С. 66–77.
3. Долин Ю.Т. Вопросы теории односоставного предложения (на материале русского языка) / Ю.Т. Долин. – Оренбург: ИПК ГОУ ОГУ, 2008. – 129 с.
4. Панов М.В. Русский язык / М.В. Панов // Языки народов СССР. Т. I. Индоевропейские языки. – М.: Наука, 1966. – С. 55–122.
5. Гиро-Вебер М. К вопросу о классификации простого предложения в современном русском языке / М. Гиро-Вебер // Вопросы языкознания. – 1979. – № 6. – С. 65–75.
6. Арутюнова Н.Д. Вариации на тему предложения / Н.Д. Арутюнова // Инвариантные синтаксические значения и структура предложения. – М.: Наука, 1969. – С. 29–47.
7. Арутюнова Н.Д. Предложение и его смысл: Логико-семантические проблемы / Н.Д. Арутюнова. – М.: Наука, 1976. – 383 с.
8. Слинько І.І. Парадигматика простого речення української мови (односкладне речення) / І.І. Слинько // Мовознавство. – 1980. – № 3. – С. 22–29.
9. Мельчук И.А. Типология пассивных конструкций: Диатезы и залого / И.А. Мельчук. – Л.: Наука, 1974. – 156 с.
10. Золотова Г.А. Синтаксические основания коммуникативной лингвистики / Г.А. Золотова // Вопросы языкознания. – 1988. – № 4. – С. 52–58.
11. Золотова Г.А. О перспективах синтаксических исследований / Г.А. Золотова // Известия АН СССР, СЛЯ. – 1986. – № 6. – С. 501–512.
12. Городенська К.Г. Дериважація синтаксичних одиниць / К.Г. Городенська. – К.: Наукова думка, 1991. – 192 с.
13. Вихованець І.Р. Граматика української мови. Синтаксис / І.Р. Вихованець. – К.: Либідь, 1993. – 368 с.
14. Брицин В.М. Односкладні речення в українській мові: до питання методології їхнього дослідження / В.М. Брицин // Мовознавство. – 2001. – № 3. – С. 81–87.
15. Мірченко М.В. Структура синтаксичних категорій / М.В. Мірченко. – Луцьк: РВВ «Вежа», 2004. – 392 с.

References

1. Admoni, V.G. *O dvusostavnosti predlozhenia* [On the two-member notion of the sentence]. *Uchenye zapiski 1 LGPIIYa, novaia seria* [The scientists notes, 1st LSPIFL, new series]. Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1955, vol. 2, pp. 133-162.
2. Sedelnikov, E.A. *Struktura prostogo predlozhenija s tochki zrenija sintagmaticheskikh i paradigmaticeskikh otnoshenij* [The structure of a simple sentence from the point of view of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations]. *Filologicheskiye nauki* [Philological sciences], 1961, no. 3, pp. 66-77.

3. Dolin, Yu.T. *Voprosy teorii odnosostavnogo predlozhenia (na material russkogo yazyka)* [The questions of the one-member sentence theory (on the Russian language)]. Orenburg, IPK GOU OGU Publ., 2008, 129 p.

4. Panov, N.V. *Russkii yazyk* [The Russian language], *Yazyki narodov SSSR* [Languages of peoples of the USSR]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1966, vol. 1, pp. 55-122.

5. Guiraud-Weber, M. *K voprosu o klassifikacii prostogo predlozhenija v sovremennom russkom jazyke* [On the classification of a simple sentence in the modern Russian language]. *Voprosy yazykoznanija* [Questions of linguistics], 1979, no. 6, pp. 65-75.

6. Arutyunova, N.D. *Variatsii na temu predlozheniya* [Variations on a theme the sentence matter]. *Invariantnye sintaksicheskie znacheniya i struktura predlozheniya* [Invariant syntactic meaning and sentence structure]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1969, pp. 29-47.

7. Arutyunova, N.D. *Predlozhenie i ego smysl: Logiko-semanticheskie problemy* [The sentence and its sense: Logical and semantic problems]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1976, 383 p.

8. Slinko, I. *Paradyhmatyka prostoho rechennia ukrains'koi movy (odnoskladne rechennia)* [Paradigmatica simple sentences of Ukrainian language (one-member sentence)]. *Movoznavstvo* [Linguistics], 1980, no. 3, pp. 22-29.

9. Melchuk, S.A. *Tipologiya passivnyh konstruksiy: Diatezy i zalogi* [Typology of passive constructions: Diathesis and voices]. Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1974, 156 p.

10. Zolotova, G.A. *Sintaksicheskie osnovanija kommunikativnoj lingvistiki* [Syntactical bases of communicative linguistics]. *Voprosy yazykoznanija* [Questions of linguistics], 1988, no. 4, pp. 52-58.

11. Zolotova, G.A. *O perspektivah sintaksicheskikh issledovanij* [On the prospects of syntactic studies]. *Izvestiya AN SSSR, SLYA* [News of the Academy of Sciences USSR, Slavonic Linguistics], 1986, no. 6, pp. 501-512.

12. Gorodenska, K.G. *Deryvaciya syntaksychnyh odynyc'* [Derivation of syntactic units]. Kyiv, Naukova Dumka Publ., 1991, 192 p.

13. Vykhoanets, I.R. *Gramatyka ukrainskoi movy. Syntaksys* [Grammar of the Ukrainian language. Syntax]. Kyiv, Lybid Publ., 1993, 368 p.

14. Britsin, V.M. *Odnoskladni rechennia v ukrains'kij movi: do pytannia metodolohii ikhn'oho doslidzhennia* [One-member sentences in the Ukrainian language: to the question of the methodology of their study]. *Movoznavstvo* [Linguistics], 2001, no. 3, pp. 81-87.

15. Mirchenko, M.V. *Struktura syntaksychnyh kategoriy* [The Structure of syntactic categories]. Lutsk, RVV "Vezha" Publ., 2004. 392 p.

Стаття присвячена проблемі виділення односкладного простого речення в українській та російських мовах у період розвитку семантичного напрямку. Проаналізовано погляди різних вчених-лінгвістів щодо питання двоскладності всіх речень зазначених мов.

Ключові слова: просте речення, односкладне речення, двоскладне речення, семантика, синтаксична синонімія.

Статья посвящена проблеме выделения односоставного предложения в украинском и русском языках в период развития семантического направления. Проанализированы взгляды различных ученых-лингвистов на проблему двусоставности всех предложений упомянутых языков.

Ключевые слова: простое предложение, односоставное предложение, двусоставное предложение, семантика, синтаксическая синонимия.

Одержано 21.11.2016