

## МОВОЗНАВСТВО

### ПРОБЛЕМИ ГРАМАТИКИ

UDC 811.161.2'367.51

**Bohdan V. V.**,  
Candidate of Philological Sciences,  
Berdyansk State Pedagogical University

#### **THE EQUIVALENCE OF UNITS AT DIFFERENT SYNTACTIC LEVELS: FORMAL ASPECT OF ADJOINING CONSTRUCTIONS AND COMPOSITE SENTENCES IN MODERN UKRAINIAN**

Among the arduous tasks of modern linguistics one of the leading ones is a comprehensive study of text as a maximum unit of language activity. This global problem cannot be solved successfully without conducting research on different text components – their structure, semantics, pragmatics, function and regularities in their connections. Among the most important text units there are two that stand out: composite sentences and adjoining constructions (AC) with adjoining connective words (CW), which are homonymous to coordinating and subordinating conjunctions. These composite sentences and AC are the object of our research.

Despite the great interest of scholars in textual problems, there is a great lack of papers dedicated to the study of ACs and the criteria for their dissociation from composite sentences, the different types of adjoining that exist, and, especially, parcelling. Nevertheless, modern linguistic research in that direction has made it possible to learn (with the help of a text) those functions and regularities of a language that can only be revealed by the studying of linguistic units in textual segments that are bigger than a sentence [16, 17].

For this paper research was conducted on common features of formal structures of ACs and composite sentences so as to be able to determine the peculiarities of their functioning. The comparison of a formal arrangement of an AC and a composite sentence will mainly be based on complex sentences (CS), which are more demonstrative for our study because they are much more diverse in structural terms than compound sentences.

The similarity in terms of form, semantics and executable functions between CSs and ACs led to the fact that some researchers did not see much difference between them. Linguists hold widely differing views on ACs. We call an AC a two-component text unit divided by an external punctuation mark (that divides sentences) into two parts that have a fixed position – an autosemantic base utterance (BU) and synsemantic adjoined part (AP). And that AP forms a separate sentence that is connected with a BU by a CW, which determines the ease of an AC's syntactic singling out in a text. For example:

(1) *Ти повинна вийти на сцену – там твоє місце<sup>BU</sup>. А<sup>CW</sup> все інше на ньому<sup>AP</sup>* [26].

In this paper, an AC with CW and CSs are considered as variable units at various syntactic levels (text and sentence levels respectively). In this article, “variability” is understood in broad terms to mean the ability of language units to change, but not

necessarily keep an identical meaning [3, 4].

When considering grammatical principles of ACs and CSs, linguists have pointed out certain external isomorphism of the syntactic structures of their models, which include: 1) the presence of two parts in their composition (BU + AP) in an AC and a main clause / clauses and a subordinate clause / clauses in a CS that can be characterized by a contact representation, a direct or an inverted word order; 2) primary function of one part (a BU and a main clause) in relation to another, dependent one (an AP and subordinate clause; 3) the existence of predictable / unpredictable connections in CSs and two classes of ACs that are related to them – “shifted”, the parts of which are incompatible in content and cannot form a CS, and those in which an AP is compatible with a BU in the plane of content, and its transformation into a CS is possible; 4) the simplicity of identification of an AP and a subordinate clause in the text due to the presence of an AC in their initial position; 5) the possibility of the existence of both units in the form of elementary and non-elementary structures.

The differences between an AC and a CS are seen in: 1) the different types of syntactic relations between the parts of an AC and a CS (adjoining and subordinate respectively). The use of an AP after a long pause focuses attention on it and thus significantly increases both the role of the pause and pragmatic effect of an AP, which results in: a) a vividness of intonation and an abruptness of an AP; b) the acquisition of new meanings and expressiveness by an AP that are not characteristic of a subordinate clause; 2) the impossibility for a CS to have a syntactically dominant or dependent word in the other composite sentence, while such syntactic relations exist between the components of an AC, similar to those relations that exist among formally independent sentences; 3) the existence of both free and fixed part order in a CS and a strictly fixed order in an AC (a BU + an AP) that does not deny (unlike in a CS) the possibility of an existence of distant grammatical and semantic relations between the parts of an AC and 4) the impossibility for an AC to be included in the structure of a CS and vice versa, the possibility for a syntactic unit similar to a composite sentence to be part of an AC structure; 5) punctuation marks between their parts: a comma, a dash, a colon, a semicolon or no punctuation in a CS, and a period, a question mark, an exclamation mark and a stage direction in an AC. The common punctuation mark for both units is three dots. A CW that has strong connecting and anaphoric properties helps to distinguish an AC from other types of adjoining at the sentence level as well as from other units at a text level.

We support the idea that some communicatively important information can be transmitted by both a subordinate clause of a CS [Шульжук] and an AP in an AC [7, 10; 10, 57; 14, 40], and that makes them equal in significance to a main clause / BU. For the first time we have singled out these kinds of APs that are equal in importance to Bu's) not only semantically but also formally, i.e. they are structurally integral elements of an AC. For example:

(2) *Правду не порахуєш відсотками, тому вона абсолют<sup>BU</sup>. А об'єктивність лише критерій<sup>AP</sup>. Відтак другу виміряють, а першу відстоюють [24].*

The attempt to eliminate the AP (*А об'єктивність лише критерій*) from the AC leads to asemantic inconsistency of the BU in the following (after the AC) sentence (*Правду*

*не порахуєш відсотками, тому вона абсолют... Відтак другу виміряють, а першу відстоюють).*

The researchers studying ACs in many languages agree that the lower bound of a BU and the upper bound of an AP are always easy to identify due to the mandatory formal indicator – a CW. As far as a BU is concerned, all scholars are in agreement that it is autosemantic as well as structurally and intonationally complete [5, 11, 19; 15, 13], which can be seen in syntactic structures of different sizes. When analyzing APs no one denies that separate words and word combinations can be joined to a BU, but the statement that they are members of the previous sentence (a BU) [6, 9–14; 11, 85; 17, 15] has attracted constructive criticism. For example, according to Vira Rinberg, an AP resembles a sentence part, but in accordance with its syntactic and communicative purpose an AP does not have its distinctive characteristics, among which are semantic and intonational independence [15, 18].

There is a genuine difference of opinion among scientists as to the naming of APs that are larger in size than a word combination: a sentence (step / complete / incomplete / distinguishing / simple / composite) [1, 57–58, 6, 9–14; 8, 200–202], a subordinate clause with a correlate, a specific incomplete sentence of a transitional type (from a sentence part to an incomplete sentence [12, 122], and a predicative unit of a different structure [11, 85]. In our view, such an assessment of an AP is not justified because any sentence must be notable for an external autonomy and be able to act outside a context as a complete segment of speech [4, 14]. Comparing this definition of a sentence with a universally recognized provision that concerns AC's (an AP semantically depends on the previous component (a BU) since it is generated by it and cannot exist without it), we have reached the conclusion that they are complete opposites. While classifying an AP it can only be said that according to its formal features it may coincide with a composite sentence, however it cannot be a composite sentence per se.

The interpretation of an AP as a predicative unit has also been justifiably criticized because a predicate relationship can exist among predicative units only within a sentence, and within an AC the relations between its parts can only be adjoining ones [4; 15; 17, 24].

Observations made with the help of text material in Ukrainian reveal both a linear (consecutive) and a parallel adjoining of an AP. A linear adjoining takes place when a BU is closely connected by its content with an AP that consists of one part. At a sentence level we can draw an analogy with a CS with an elementary structure (with one subordinate clause). A parallel adjoining, which is more characteristic of multicomponent APs, correlates to non-elementary CSs (with two or more subordinate clauses). This type of adjoining is sometimes contrasted with a consecutive one as a widening by a syntactically homogeneous component as opposed to a widening by a syntactically dependent component [13, 145–146; 18, 9–10]. It should be noted that we do not fully share this view since an AP is in any case syntactically dependent on a BU.

Taking into consideration the size of the added component (an AP) linguists single out the following variants of it: a) simpleones – word forms (example 3), word combinations (example 4), units structurally similar to elliptical predicative units (example 5), complete predicative unit (example 6) and b) complexones – with several predicative units in the form

of a CS (Example 7) or a sequence of sentences:

(3) *Вона підійде до мене і каже: “Піди пообідай, а потім скільки хочеш дуйся на мене<sup>BU</sup>. Але пообідай”<sup>AP</sup>* [27].

(4) *Відтак через “єднання” ми втратили унікальну можливість політичного перебалансування<sup>BU</sup>.*

*Але досить про минуле<sup>AP</sup>* [24].

(5) *Отака, друзі, дурня на високому рівні<sup>BU</sup>. А на нижчому – взагалі повна шизуха<sup>AP</sup>* [Винничук 2012 б].

(6) *Ви одразу побачите, наскільки ростиме Ваш рейтинг, від добрих справ, а не спекуляцій та маніпуляцій на мовний баталіях<sup>BU</sup>.*

*Але поїзд уже пішов<sup>AP</sup>* [25].

(7) *Ні, спеціально на той розпродаж ми не їхали, але проїжджаючи неподалік, забігали і цікавилися, що ж тут такого доброго за пів ціни можна придбати<sup>BU</sup>. Але щоразу виявлялося: те, що за півціни, уже продалося, зате ще діють знижки на 5 і навіть – яка радість! – 7%<sup>AP</sup>!!!* [22].

Researchers point to the possibility of adjoining being possible after a BU in a syntactic unit of any size up to a composite syntactic unit [2, 2; 8, 13, 200–202; 9, 35–48]. Developing this idea, we offer a more detailed classification of multicomponent APs, arranging ACs that have such APs according to the classification of CSs with several subordinate clauses and composite sentences with various types of syntactic relations. ACs with multicomponent APs can have (similar to non-elementary CSs and composite sentences) various types of syntactic relations of different sizes (the number of “sentence parts”) and depth of structure (the number of levels of division into parts). Thus, we single out basic ACs (elementary, formally indivisible: BU + CW + AP) and derivative ACs (non-elementary, compound: (BU + CW<sub>1</sub> + AP<sub>1</sub> + CW<sub>2</sub> + AP<sub>2</sub> + CW<sub>3</sub> + AP<sub>3</sub> ... + CW<sub>n</sub> + AP<sub>n</sub>). Among derivative ACs, we single out the following: 1) APs similar to the consecutive (stage) subordination, 2) APs similar to collateral subordination (homogeneous, heterogeneous and mixed), and 3) ACs with relationships among their different parts similar to those that exist in a composite sentence with various types of syntactic relations. At the same time, the dominant part in relationships between a BU and an AP is the adjoining relationship, and all the other possible ones “overlap” it. For example:

(8) *Я виріс в оперному театрі, батьки мої співали і вся родина співала<sup>BU</sup>. А вона – балерина<sup>AP1</sup>. І ми собі так сидимо, обговорюємо різних тенорів і мецо-сопрано, і кажемо, що ми, може, й марно прожили ці 44 роки і не розбіглися<sup>AP2</sup>. Хоча на початку життя ми і заяву подавали на розлучення<sup>AP3</sup>. Але, слава Богу, вистачило розуму<sup>AP4</sup>* [27].

In this example the relations between the BU and AP<sub>1</sub> are manifested with the help of CW<sub>1</sub>A (external level of division), between AP<sub>1</sub> and AP<sub>2</sub> with the help of CW<sub>2</sub>I (internal level of division), between AP<sub>2</sub> and AP<sub>3</sub> – CW<sub>3</sub> Хоча, and between AP<sub>3</sub> and AP<sub>4</sub> – CW<sub>4</sub> Але. Close lexical and semantic relations of the complex structure components eliminate the attempts of their transformation (we cannot remove any of the APs from the AC or change their order without losing internal semantic coherence among them. We have correlated this consecutive adjoining at a textual level with the CSs that have stage (consecutive)

subordination (at a sentence level).

The ACs in the following examples are similar to the CSs with homogeneous, heterogeneous and mixed subordination.

(9) (a) *Я це роблю тому, що в мене дома є дружина, яка від мене цього вимагає<sup>BU</sup>. Що в мене дома є троє дітей, які в мене спитають: “Тато, а чому ти цього не зробив?”<sup>AP</sup>* [28].

(b) *Я був готовий пробачити їм усе<sup>BU</sup>.*

*І непричетність до цієї країни<sup>AP1</sup>. І небажання розмовляти її мовою<sup>AP2</sup>. І безконечне потрапляння в позафутбольні новини з усілякими “мазераті” та нічними клубами<sup>AP3</sup>* [20].

The relationships between components of the BU and AP in (9 a) – *що ...Що ...* and among the APs in (9 b) – *І... І...І...* are of the same syntactic type. The reduction of any of the APs ((9 b) is the most demonstrative here) does not destroy the ACs semantically. It only with draws information partially. It is possible to change the syntactic position of the APs in the AC without changing its semantics significantly. Among the clauses of a CS of this type coordinating relationships with the same functional load (in this case – enumeration) exist at an internal level of division. But such relationships cannot exist in structures with heterogeneous (parallel) collateral subordination among their parts due to the fact that several APs are in several different semantic and syntactic relationships with a BU. The analogue of a CS of this type is the AC in (10).

(10) *Навіщо такій країні міжнародні аеропорти<sup>BU</sup>?*

*Отож варто літати, поки літається<sup>AP1</sup>. Поки новий аеропорт не почав сипатися<sup>AP2</sup>. Тому я і рвонув знецацька до Барселони<sup>AP3</sup>* [21].

All the APs are introduced by the CWs of different syntactic types: AP<sub>1</sub> is introduced by *Отож* (the equivalent of a consequence clause), AP<sub>2</sub> – by *Поки* (the equivalent of a time clause), AP<sub>3</sub> by *Тому* (the equivalent of a purpose clause). AP<sub>3</sub> is formally connected to AP<sub>2</sub>, but its content correlates not only with AP<sub>2</sub> but also with AP<sub>1</sub>. It is even possible to change the places of both AP<sub>1</sub> and AP<sub>3</sub> without losing the semantic coherence of the whole AP. In addition, it is even possible to exclude any AP from the AC. In this case, the AC will only lose some additional information that does not significantly affect its adequate perception.

Another piece of evidence for the existence of universal relationships at different syntactic levels is the example below of an AC with these kinds of relationships among its parts which are the functional equivalent of those in a multicomponent composite sentence with different types of syntactic relationships. For example:

(11) *“Думаю, все! Зараз почнеться<sup>BU</sup>. І тут вона каже: “Я буду за тебе голосувати!”<sup>AP1</sup>. І вона мені пояснила, чому буде за мене голосувати<sup>AP2</sup>. Бо я є передбачуваним”<sup>AP3</sup>* [28].

AP<sub>1</sub> and AP<sub>2</sub> are introduced with the help of CW / homonymous to the coordinating *і*. AP<sub>3</sub> – with *Бо* homonymous to the subordinating *бо*. The components are so closely linked together (both grammatically and semantically) that they are not interchangeable; even AP<sub>1</sub> and AP<sub>2</sub>, which have an analogous coordinating relationship.

To sum up, we can come to the conclusion that non-elementary ACs with CWs can realize practically all the models of arrangement and all the semantic and syntactic relations

that are characteristic of non-elementary CSs. ACs with SWs and composite sentences have equivalent structures, but in the text hierarchy they are on different syntactic levels – a textual and a sentence level respectively.

#### Literature

1. Бабайцева В. В. Синкретизм парцелированных и присоединенных субстантивных фрагментов текста / В. В. Бабайцева // Филологические науки. – 1997. – № 4. – С. 56–65.
2. Баталова И. К. Квалификация высказываний с присоединением в аспекте актуального членения в английском языке : автореф. дис. ... д. филол. н. : 10.02.04 “Германские языки” / И. К. Баталова. – Л., 1974. – 28 с.
3. Беляева Т. В. Варіантність і синонімія в умовно-наслідкових складних реченнях : автореф. дис. ... к. філол. н. : 10.02.01 “Українська мова” / Т. В. Беляева. – Харків, 2004. – 20 с.
4. Білодід І. К. Надфразні єдності як елемент тексту в функціональних стилях літературної мови / І. К. Білодід // Мовознавство. – 1979. – № 2. – С. 14–23.
5. Богдан В. В. Синтактика, семантика, прагматика англомовних приєднувальних конструкцій і складних речень з підрядним зв'язком : [монографія] / В. В. Богдан. – Донецьк : “ЛАНДОН-XXI”, 2011. – 263 с.
6. Гаибова М. Т. Присоединительные конструкции и их стилистические функции в художественной прозе (на материале английского языка) : автореф. дис. ... к. филол. н. : 10.02.04 “Германские языки” / М. Т. Гаибова. – М., 1973. – 21 с.
7. Дмитренко В. А. Структура, семантика и функции союзных форм связи в смысловых миниатюрах в современном английском языке / В. А. Дмитренко // Вісник Харківськ. нац. ун-ту. Серія : романо-германська філологія. – 2002. – № 572. – С. 87–93.
8. Дудик П. С. Синтаксис сучасного українського розмовного літературного мовлення / П. С. Дудик. – К. : Наук. думка, 1973. – 288 с.
9. Кобзев П. В. Присоединение и обособление / П. В. Кобзев // Хабаровский ГПИ : [уч. записки]. – Хабаровск, 1969. – Т. 20. – С. 35–48.
10. Коцюбовська Г. А. Приєднувальні конструкції : функціонально-текстовий аспект : дис. ... к. філол. н. : 10.02.01 “Українська мова” / Г. А. Коцюбовська. – Дніпропетровськ, 2002. – 188 с.
11. Малахов С. В. Присоединительные конструкции в большевистских листовках эпохи первой революции / С. В. Малахов // Вопросы истории русского литературного языка XIX–XX вв. : [межвузовский сборник научных трудов]. – М., 1985. – С. 83–92.
12. Попова И. А. Неполные предложения в современном русском языке / И. А. Попова // Труды института языкознания АН СССР. – М., 1953. – Т. 2. – С. 3–136.
13. Пронь Н. А. Присоединительные конструкции в современном русском языке (на материале произведений К. А. Федина) / Н. А. Пронь // Вопросы истории и теории русского языка. – Калуга, 1971. – Вып. 4. – С. 144–175.
14. Пустовар О. В. Номінативний і комунікативний аспекти парцеляції в сучасній німецькій мові : автореф. дис. ... к. філол. н. : 10.02.04 “Германські мови” / О. В. Пустовар. – Донецьк, 2006. – 20 с.
15. Ринберг В. Л. Конструкции связного текста в современном русском языке / В. Л. Ринберг. – Львов : Вища школа, 1987. – 168 с.
16. Тураева З. Я. Лингвистика текста на исходе второго тысячелетия / З. Я. Тураева // Вісник Київськ. лінгвістичного ун-ту. – 1999. – № 2. – Т. 2. – С. 17–25.
17. Шалимова Г. С. Современный русский язык : синтаксис ; присоединительные конструкции в современном русском языке / Г. С. Шалимова. – М., 1971. – 50 с.
18. Шафиро М. Е. Присоединение как явление речевого синтаксиса : автореф. дис. ... к. филол. н. : 10.02.01 “Русский язык” / М. Е. Шафиро. – Саратов, 1965. – 23 с.
19. Шульжук К. Ф. Складне речення в українській мові / К. Ф. Шульжук. – К. : Радянська школа, 1989. – 136 с.

### **Illustrative material**

1. Андрухович Ю. Вам сказано : успіх! [Електронний ресурс] / Ю. Андрухович. – Режим доступу : <http://tsn.ua/analitika/vam-skazano-uspих.html>.
2. Андрухович Ю. Єврофінал [Електронний ресурс] / Ю. Андрухович. – Режим доступу : <http://tsn.ua/analitika/yevrofinal.html>.
3. Винничук Ю. Країна Безглуздія [Електронний ресурс] / Ю. Винничук. – Режим доступу : <http://tsn.ua/analitika/krayina-bezgluzdiya.html>.
4. Винничук Ю. Наймані брехуни [Електронний ресурс] / Ю. Винничук. – Режим доступу : <http://tsn.ua/analitika/naymani-brehuni.html>.
5. В'ятрович В. Правда чи об'єктивність [Електронний ресурс] / В. В'ятрович. – Режим доступу : <http://tsn.ua/analitika/pravda-chi-ob-yektivnist.html>.
6. Корчинський Д. Війна [Електронний ресурс] / Д. Корчинський. – Режим доступу : <http://tsn.ua/analitika/viyna.html>.
7. Сенічкін Р. Після смерті чоловіка я сказала, що на сцену більше не вийду [Електронний ресурс] / Р. Сенічкін. – Режим доступу : <http://tsn.ua/glamur/shou-biznes/sofiya-rotaru-pislya-smerti-cholovika-ya-skazala-scho-na-scenu-bilshe-viydu.html>.
8. Ступка Б. Головне дотягти до 70-ти, а потім живи, скільки хочеш [Електронний ресурс] / Б. Ступка. – Режим доступу : <http://tsn.ua/kultura/bogdan-stupka-golovne-dotyagti-do-70-ti-a-potim-zhivi-skilki-hochesh.html>.
9. Тягнибок О. Я не чорт з хвостом і не Тягнибакс [Електронний ресурс] / О. Тягнибок. – Режим доступу : <http://tsn.ua/politika/oleg-tyagnibok-v-donecku-mi-legko-zrobimo-3-5.html>.

### **Анотація**

У роботі розглянуті схожі й відмінні, облігаторні й факультативні риси формальної організації приєднувальних конструкцій і складних речень. Розширено класифікацію приєднаних частин приєднувальних конструкцій, запропоновано критерії відмежування приєднувальних конструкцій від інших складних синтаксичних одиниць. Зроблено висновок про еквівалентність різнорівневих одиниць – приєднувальних конструкцій і складних речень – з погляду їх стрійових основ.

**Ключові слова:** приєднувальна конструкція, базове висловлення, приєднана частина, приєднувальний сполучний засіб, складне речення.

### **Аннотация**

В работе рассмотрены схожие и отличные, облігаторные и факультативные черты формальной организации присоединительных конструкций и сложных предложений. Расширена классификация присоединённых частей присоединительных конструкций, предложены критерии отмежевания присоединительных конструкций от других сложных синтаксических единиц. Сделан вывод об эквивалентности разноуровневых единиц – присоединительных конструкций и сложных предложений – с точки зрения их стрійовых основ.

**Ключевые слова:** присоединительная конструкция, базовое высказывание, присоединённая часть, присоединительное союзное средство, сложное предложение.

### **Summary**

The paper focuses on similar and distinctive, obligatory and optional peculiarities of the formal organization of adjoining constructions and composite sentences. The classification of adjoined parts in adjoining constructions is expanded. Structurally, the adjoining constructions and composite sentences are considered to be equivalent units at different syntactic levels.

**Keywords:** adjoining construction, base utterance, adjoined part, adjoining conjunction, composite sentence.