Historiography of Studying a Single Complex Sentence: From a Structural Approach to Neurolinguistics

Liudmyla YASNOHURSKA¹,
Oksana BURKOVSKA²,
Svitlana PAMPURA³

¹ Rivne State University of the Humanities,
Rivne, Ukraine, ludmillka21@ukr.net

² Donetsk National Medical University,
Kramatorsk, Ukraine,
kasanka.i82@gmail.com

³ State Higher Educational Institution
“Donbas State Pedagogical University”,
Sloviansk, Ukraine, slanalight@gmail.com

Abstract: The article reconsiders linguistic views on a single complex sentence under the postmodernist crisis of social sciences. The relevance of the study is determined by the lack of linguistic and historiographical coverage of the issues of simple sentence syntax in German studies, Romance philology, and Slavic studies, which would demonstrate the dynamics of methods from the formal-semantic and structural - to the modern neurolinguistics. The need for a special linguistic-historiographical study is due to the need to study the studies of those syntax who denied the thesis of the defining structural and mental features of single-syllable sentences. On this basis, the need to systematize the concepts of monosyllabic/disyllable complexity of simple sentences available in modern linguistics is actualized. At the same time, the postmodernist “alienation” from classical views should contribute to the classification system of simple sentences, as well as elucidation of psycho- and neurolinguistic mechanisms of their generation. The use of an integrated approach allowed to reach a qualitatively new level of generalizations, that is relevant to the postmodernist state of humanities. The latest theories and the involvement of a large number of facts have made it possible to obtain certain results in the study of the monosyllabic/disyllable of a simple sentence. Attempts to describe the essence of such complex and multifaceted categories as monosyllabic/disyllable sentences throughout the period of existence of syntactic theory are characterized by variability of guidelines and variety of approaches.

Keywords: *simple sentence syntax, neurolinguistics, psycholinguistics, German studies, Romance philology, Slavic studies, linguistic-historiographical research, modern linguistics, simple sentences, Indo-European languages.*

How to cite: Yasnohurska, L., Burkovska, O., & Pampura, S. (2021). Historiography of Studying a Single Complex Sentence: From a Structural Approach to Neurolinguistics. *Postmodern Openings*, 12(2), 450-471.
<https://doi.org/10.18662/po/12.2/317>

Introduction

A sentence is one of the most important syntactic units in which all levels of language intersect and integrate. The question of the nature of a sentence is one of the most difficult in syntax. The sentence occupies a central place in syntactic science and at the same time does not have a common definition, because it is difficult to introduce into the definition the whole set of features of the sentence. At the heart of the doctrine of the sentence is a simple sentence. It is the minimum independent unit of communication. The most controversial position is the classical idea of the two-sentence structure, which correlates with the mental and neurophysiological laws of thinking - the linguistic division of the external world into subjects and their predicative features. In this regard, a simple sentence was presented to scholars in the light of syncretism, mental inarticulation, and was often denied as a taxonomic category.

Monosyllabic sentences were and are to be studied in logical-grammatical, psychological, formal, structural, functional and neuropsychological aspects. However, the new epistemological conditions originated in the postmodernist era require that all partial and individual theories of grammatical phenomena should be reconsidered and generalized.

Thus, it is essential to consider the main postmodernist trends related to language and its grammatical system.

The postmodernist paradigm has influenced social sciences conceptually. Unfortunately, it has introduced eclecticism to replace systematicity and syncretism. One can talk about “the postmodernization of social sciences”, given the constantly changing socio-political narrative (Nerubasska, 2020a; Nerubasska, 2020b; Onishchuk, 2020; Stojanović, 2017). In this regard, linguistics does not so much develop new concepts as “cannot leave postmodernism” and becomes “a grammar of the process” rather than a grammar of the system.

Postmodernism has objectified the complexity of the language-meaning-knowledge interaction. When one considers grammar to be the most generalized paradigmatic meaning, it seems almost impossible to adequately represent it through objective knowledge. In particular, Petcu (2018) recognizes the decline of great narratives in favour of context, subjectivity, sensuality and variability through the prism of prominent theorists of postmodernism. In this case, paradigmatics should yield to syntagmatics, and the creation of adequate grammars as paradigmatic systems does not seem possible.

On the other hand, postmodernism has a long critical and discourse-oriented tradition regarding humanities. It is a powerful source of intellectualism which aims to clarify the nature of knowledge, thinking and “spirit”. According to Bowden (2018; 2020), however, texts need to be rethought, not studied structurally. Consequently, the postmodernist intellectualism has both strengths and weaknesses in terms of language learning.

Kiklewicz (2020) considers the linguistic postmodernist discourse to be based on terminology, which changes rapidly under the new cultural conditions (irrationalism (antiscientism), pragmacentrism (sociocentrism) and simulacrumism). These changes can be grouped into four phenomena, namely, ambisemy, transfusion, complications and approximation. Such predominantly semantic phenomena leave little chance for developing new fundamental grammars on a rationalist basis.

Scholars tend to view scientific dimensions of the postmodernism as a transition between “positivist and postpositivist epistemological paradigms,”. This transition has at least a dozen methodological dimensions called “fundamental tensions in epistemology” (Nicolae 2018). The problem of developing valid humanitarian epistemologies at the heart of the postmodernism is complicated by the multiplicity of the criteria. These criteria include both intra-textual semantic and ideological positions, types of generation, geography and origin.

In the context of modern linguistics, the postmodernism acts a factor of choice in social, ethical and epistemological aspects (Kiklewicz, 2016). If one extrapolates these aspects to theoretical sections of linguistics which include grammar in the classical sense, the postmodernism contributes to strengthening such trends in linguistics as blurring the subject of research, ignoring “the directives of language” (abusing traditional scientific language), violating the requirements for statement verification and the rules of communication (Kiklewicz, 2016, p. 21). Accordingly, the priority areas of linguistic research are cognitive linguistics, anthropological linguistics, cultural linguistics and ethnolinguistics.

It is known that the structural approach to grammar is the most obvious and understandable since it tends to paradigmaticize phenomena. As noted by Kaluarachchi (2020), “structuralism is a method of interpreting and analyzing human cognition, behaviour, culture and experience, which focuses on the contrast between elements in conceptual systems. It can simply be defined as a science of the relationship between signs to determine their meanings. Therefore, structuralism is something directly related to semiotics” (Kaluarachchi, 2020, p. 32). In the light of the postmodernism,

however, there appears to be a modification of structuralism, that is poststructuralism. It views language as the result of “the collective self” within which (in the world of texts) one lives. Thus, it can interpret the grammar of language but as a phenomenon that does not exist outside the text.

In the 1950s and 1960s, the structural approach to anthropological phenomena underwent a crisis. The main idea is the absence of laws affecting the system externally and existing outside it (either in linguistics, politics or economics). Structuralism has some “prospects” in the postmodernism, although it deals with numerous transformations and critical remarks.

It is believed that the postmodernist era favours construction grammar and cognitive linguistics. Construction grammar can be outlined in the postmodernism based on its main contradictions (objectivism – subjectivism; individualism – universalism; monism – dualism; centralism – decentralism). At the same time, cognitive linguistics embodies linguistic cognition of reality. Both linguistic realms can be constructed “from a post-philosophical standpoint and materialism” (Yin, 2018). It follows that grammatical studies in the postmodernist era are developing under transcendentalism and nativism.

Weideman (2017) identifies seven styles in applied interpretation of linguistic phenomena, including synergetics and the dynamical systems theory. These styles correspond to “the spirit of the times” and the philosophical and cultural traditions under which they developed. However, it is still unknown whether applied linguistics can exceed the postmodernism. The non-reductionist trends observed recently in social sciences seem to be rather promising in this regard.

In general, the postmodernism is considered to be a crisis period for language and linguistics. According to Fedorova (2019), one can employ structural, typological and historical-typological methods to clarify the language-postmodernism interaction and reconsider modern and classical views on language in the context of the postmodernism. This assumption confirms the relevance of the historical-typological review of single complex sentences as an original psycholinguistic and grammatical phenomenon.

Therefore, the article aims to cover the historical progress of linguists’ views during the 19th century – the early 21st century on single complex sentences in the context of the crisis but also the revision state of humanities in the postmodernist era.

The purpose of the study is the disclosure of the concepts of linguists of the 19th century at the beginning of the 21st century related to the study of the syntax of mono-compound sentences in Indo-European languages. The task of the article is also to trace the rudiments of psycholinguistic and neurolinguistic approaches in linguistic-historical discourse.

Linguo-historiographical aspect of studying mononuclear sentences in Indo-European languages

The main attention is paid to the doctrine of the principles of distinguishing monosyllabic sentences from disyllable ones in the clubs of linguists of the 19th century – the beginning of the XXI century.

Monosyllabic sentences are a special structural-semantic type of simple sentences that have the grammatical composition of only one main member, acts in an independent position and makes up the predicative basis of the sentence. They do not have a second leading term, but they are structurally complete predicative units. From unplaced sentences (sentence words Yes. No.) Monosyllables differ in membership and the ability to spread by secondary members. The distinction between the types of one-compound sentences is mainly based on the partial expression of the main term of the sentence, because of which monosyllabic sentences are differentiated into verbal and nominative. The main types of mononuclear sentences, traditionally distinguished in linguistics, are marked-personal, indefinitely personal, generalized-personal, impersonal, infinitive, genitive, nominative and vocative. This classification is based on structural (morphological nature of the expression of the main term) and semantic (grammatical semantics of the sentence); such logical and semantic indicator as certainty / uncertainty, as well as the communicative purpose of the proposal are taken into account. The category of personality / non-personality is based on the psychological instruction of native speakers about the obligatory nature of the explicit or implicit executor of the action.

Monosyllabic sentences represent a significant fragment of the syntax of the Slavic languages. But, despite the significant number of works devoted to them, they remain the least studied among other objects of the articulation. Representatives of different linguistic directions use different approaches to their interpretation - logical-grammatical, formal-grammatical, semantic-syntactic, and heterogeneity of approaches to the description of these syntactic units is inherent in the works that are based on the same initial principles of the analysis of syntactic phenomena, in particular the

study of semantic syntactic direction and psychological, according to some theories - innate grammatical structures.

It should be noted that among linguists there is no single view of simple sentences as an independent category. Shakhmatov (1941), Peshkovsky (1934) and Vinogradov (1978) interpreted simple sentences as an independent category. But other scholars question the very notion of simple sentences and deny their existence.

The study of the varieties of monosyllabic sentences allowed us to conclude that in connection with the historical realities and the level of development of syntactic science, impersonal monosyllabic sentences were the first to be singled out. The concepts of Vostokov (1874) and Potebnya (1888) are very interesting for researchers. Thus, the last-named, despite the conservatism of many views, for the first time in East Slavic linguistics noted the role of the mental in the nature of language units.

An important stage in the development of the doctrine of monosyllabic sentences is associated with the name of Shakhmatov (1941) – the creator of the doctrine of disyllable / monosyllabic simple sentences (in their syntactic form). The syntactic concept of grammatical disyllable / monosyllabic of a simple sentence by Shakhmatov (1941) was the basis of the second volume of the academic "Grammar of the Russian Language" (1954), edited by Vinogradov (1978). Later, under the influence of this grammar, the idea of grammatical disyllable / monosyllabic of a sentence became a basic concept in all, without exception, university textbooks on Russian syntax. In Ukrainian linguistics, Bulakhovsky (1952) and others studied monosyllabic sentences.

Monosyllabic sentences in Germanic and Romance languages have not interested scientists for a long time. The status of monosyllabic sentences in English and German causes a lot of controversy due to the fact that German and English syntax implies the presence of two components in the structure of sentences - subject and predicate. The authors of most works on the theoretical grammar of foreign languages do not even raise the issue of monotonousness, and sentences that do not have a standard two-part structure are not studied at all. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that most Russian linguists (Smirnitsky, 1957) recognize the presence of monosyllabic sentences in English.

In Germanic theory, monosyllabic sentences have not yet developed. The unclosed structure, mainly considered in past years, was based on the concept of a binominal sentence structure, does not reflect the modern development of syntactic thought. In works on the syntax of the German language, there are two directly opposite trends in relation to monosyllabic

sentences. Some researchers, among them Brugman (1904), Heringer (1973), are interested in this type of proposal, while others, such as Grebe (1959), ignore these structures. However, within the school of young grammarians, who were among the first to use a positivist (experimental) approach and natural-scientific approaches to the interpretation of linguistic phenomena, the phenomenon of monosyllabic nature was singled out, although not fully explained (Paul, 1960).

In modern linguistics, when classifying mononuclear sentences, objective difficulties arise associated with the choice of the classification principle, and the history of the study of mononuclear sentences evidences to the conclusion that it is insufficient to take into account only one of any signs as the basis for distribution to the corresponding groups of sentences, and psycholinguistic nature violates the classical idea of the subject-predicative way of thinking and the generation of expression.

Consideration of monosyllabic sentences should be based on the inequality of formal-grammatical and semantic-syntactic planes of the sentence structure, which makes it reasonable to distinguish between verb and noun monosyllabic sentences on the basis of formal expression of predicative. At the same time, it is necessary to state the inequality of types of monosyllabic sentences, because sentences with pronounced personal semantics stand out among them. In this case, the form of the main member of the sentence in its volume contains an indication of the performer of the action or the bearer of the state, outlining its expression. That is why the attribution of these sentences to modifications of dissyllable (status of definite-personal, generalized-personal monosyllabic sentences in the concepts of Vykhovanets (1993) or indication of a specific dimension of personal semantics - indefinite- personal). Such a discrepancy in the works of linguists indirectly testified to the idea of asymmetry of linguistic meaning and form, of unequal participation of bilateral neurophysiological speech mechanism, which should clearly distinguish the subject (rational, general) and its sign or judgment about it (irrational, individual).

For full and comprehensive disclosure of conceptual statements of researchers of XIX - XXI centuries, concerning, first of all, the decision of questions of allocation of principles of classification of monosyllabic sentences, the concrete historical-linguistic material is investigated in the following directions: 1) 2) analysis of the basic theories and criteria of classifications of monosyllabic sentences; 3) comparison of the principles of selection of simple sentences on the material of different Indo-European languages; 4) chronology and periodization of classifications of simple sentences; 5) analysis of alternative views on the problem of simplicity.

Mononuclear sentences and problems of their classification in the linguistics of the XIX century - the beginning of the XXI century.

The issue of the essence of mononuclear sentences was the subject of attention of many Ukrainian, Russian and foreign scientists representing various linguistic directions and schools. In linguistics of the 19th century - the beginning of the 21st century, the concepts of monosyllabic in the synchronous aspect were realized in the logical-grammatical, psychological, formal, structural-semantic, structural and functional approaches.

Representatives of the Kharkiv Linguistic School (Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy, 1912; Potebnya, 1888), using a psychological approach, tried to find out the specifics of the structural construction of meaningless sentences. Based on the assessment of the syntactic status of the main member, a classification of monosyllabic constructions (subjectless, relatively subjectless, nominative) was created. Already at this stage, there are categories that have become the forerunners of the neurolinguistic approach: subjectivity, symbolism, identification as psychomental universals.

The psychological approach in the study of monosyllabic constructions was also used by “Mladogrammiki” (Junggrammatiker (German) (scientists of the Leipzig Linguistic School), however, the researchers did not agree on the status of single-component sentences. Thus, Paul (1960), relying on the mandatory dissyllable structure of a simple sentence, did not distinguish monosyllabic sentences into a separate type, but could not deny their existence. Brugman (1904) adhered to a different point of view on the monotony of simple sentences, identifying four types of one-component sentences: interjection, vocal, imperative and impersonal.

Intensively the teaching of monosyllabic sentences began to develop at the beginning of the twentieth century. The contribution of Peshkovsky (1934) is significant: the structures he considered were qualified as a specific type of Russian sentence and were first differentiated into impersonal verbs, indefinite verbal verbs, generalized personal verbs, nominative and infinitive. Peshkovsky (1934) considered the procrastination category, which is based on predicates, which is based on a verb.

Shakhmatov (1941) singled out a type of Russian sentence in which the messages of the psychological subject and the predicate find a relationship in one member of the sentence. He combined such sentences into one type and for the first time in Russian grammar called them monosyllabic, and he called the monosyllabic sentences the main member of the sentence, corresponding in meaning to the combination of the subject with the predicate. Shakhmatov (1941) based the differentiation of

mononuclear sentences on the nature of the main term (formally, he was identified with the subject or predicate) and divided them into four groups: 1) *non-predicate-subject*; 2) *predicate-subject*; 3) *vocative*; 4) *impersonal*. The concept of Shakhmatov (1941) significantly influenced the further development of syntactic science and was included in most textbooks on the Russian language for higher education. The scientist first put forward a psycholinguistic theory of the possible syncretism of subject and predicate in the generation of a statement (sentence).

The inconsistency of Shakhmatov (1941) in solving the question of the grammatical status of the main member of a mononuclear sentence is reflected in the different qualifications of this member of the sentence in later scientific publications on the problem of mononuclear sentence. Vinogradov (1978) differentiated mononuclear sentences taking into account the semantic and morphological feature of the main member: *indefinite-personal, generalized-personal, impersonal, infinitive and nominative; "words-sentences" were referred to the category of monosyllabic*.

Some scholars recognized the appeal of Vinogradov (1978) only to the specificity of the main member of monosyllabic sentences, because this could lead to the unification of all types of monosyllabic sentences.

The development of structural syntax was the impetus for the creation of a typology of simple sentences based on the nature of their paradigms. There are three types of monosyllabic sentences: 1) sentences with their own paradigm (complete or incomplete); 2) a sentence with a mixed paradigm (complete or incomplete); 3) sentences that lack a paradigm. The paradigmatic approach correlates with psycholinguistic positions on the condensation of utterances, ellipses, metonymic nature of thinking, which violate the completeness of paradigmatic relations, and so on.

Research by Yurchenko (1972) deserves some attention, who, in the spirit of transformational grammar with its functional idea of the presence of primary (initial) and secondary (derived) sentence structures, presented a system of varieties of monosyllabic sentences. He believed that definite-personal, generalized-personal and indefinite-personal sentences occupy an intermediate position between the main type of sentence (MTS) and the impersonal verb sentence; nominative sentences in general were derived by him from the linguistic system of types of simple sentences and qualified as speech utterances.

A holistic concept of one-component sentences through the description of their models was proposed by Ivanytska (1971). In these models, one of the classification features of sentences is the structural features of the predicative syntagm, which can be two-member (then a two-

member sentence model is formed) and single-member ones, causing the construction of models of monosyllabic sentences. According to Ivanytska (1971), an approach to the analysis of vernacular constructions, the essence of which is to abstract from concrete sentences, from their lexical content, the number of components is an effective way to "process" the syntactic structure of a simple sentence. In the Ukrainian language, Ivanytska (1971) singled out the following models of monosyllabic sentences as *nominative, impersonal, infinitive, indefinitely personal, generalized personal, marked-personal*. Within the framework of this doctrine, the nonstructural term "sentence arrangement", important for psycholinguistics, was proposed as a possibility of idiom stylistic (within the limits of admissible valences) variability.

The authors of the second volume of the academic "Russian Grammar" divide monosyllabic structural bases in East Slavic languages into one-component, two-component and three-component.

Of considerable interest for the study of problems of simplicity is the work of Slynko, Guyvanyuk, & Kobylanska (1994), in which, using a structural approach to the syntax of a simple sentence, made an important psycholinguistic observation: despite the accurate formal description of syntactic units, its significant drawback is in structural, semantic, communicative aspects and an attempt to reduce it to the classification of structural schemes. That is, the language structure and language usage (use of language units) are not symmetrical. Beside this, monosyllabic sentences differed in formal-grammatical and semantic features, however, the term monosyllabic sentences were replaced by the term *simple sentences*. The authors of this textbook identified seven types of monosyllabic sentences: *simple verb sentences, sentences with predicate adverbs and predicates, actually infinitive sentences, infinitive sentences with a complicated basis, single-core nominative sentences, quantitative-genitive sentences, genitive negative sentences*.

One of the key concepts in determining monosyllabic is predicative. Within some interpretations, the minimal structure of a sentence can be represented by a single grammatical form in which the predicative is expressed and names a particular object, phenomenon, action (Zolotova et al., 2004). Predicativeness is an important philosophical, logical and psycholinguistic category that reflects one of the most important laws of human thinking - the attribution of actual features to the objects of reality in the process of their cognition and linguistic expression.

The morphological principle of classification of monosyllabic sentences has become widely used. A number of syntaxists (Mirchenko, 2004; Zagnitko, 2011) rely on the morphological nature of the main member in determining the types of monosyllabic sentences.

Lekant (1971) pointed out the expediency of using the grammatical form as the main one for establishing the typology of monosyllabic sentences. The linguist subdivided all monosyllabic constructions into two structural-grammatical types: 1) single-verb sentences, among which marked-personal, indefinite-personal, generalized-personal, impersonal and infinitive sentences stand out; 2) nominal (substantive) monosyllabic sentences, to which the author attributed nominative and genitive sentences.

A number of important theoretical generalizations can be found in numerous studies by Babaitseva (2004). One-syllable sentences, in her opinion, are not an isolated group of syntactic constructions, so the elucidation of their specific properties is possible only on the basis of establishing systematic connections of monosyllabic sentences with both dissyllable and non-compound sentences. Babaitseva (2004) singled out and described in detail seven structural-semantic types of one-syllable sentences: definite-personal, indefinite-personal, generalized-personal, impersonal, infinitive, nominative and vocative. The researcher noted that the selected types differ in the morphological nature of the main member, the degree of its syntactic classification, the nature of the secondary members. According to the morphological nature of the main member, she divided all monosyllabic sentences into verbs and nouns.

Vykhovanets (1993) expanded the grammatical range of monosyllabic sentences and, according to the morphological principle, identified four types of monosyllabic constructions: *verb, infinitive, noun and adverb*.

Mirchenko (2004) built his theory of syntactic categories on the concept of Vykhovanets (1993); according to this theory, verb and noun constructions are qualified as core, and adverbs - peripheral because their single core requires implicit additional ways to identify the status of the sentence-forming component compared to the classic dissyllable sentence. Recognition of implicitness as a linguistic universal directly correlates with the neuropsychology of thinking and speaking, because the non-naming of obvious objects and their attributes is compensated by their presence in internal speech, nonverbal means, in the psycholinguistic nature of pragmatic language, and so on.

The structural principle was the basis for the classification of monosyllabic sentences by Gorodetska (1997), but it took into account not only the morphological explication of the main component of a monosyllabic sentence, but also the characteristics of the nearest predicate distributors. According to these criteria, she identified six types of

monosyllabic sentences: adverbial, conjugative, participle, infinitive, nominative and pro-nominative.

A detailed structural-semantic classification of monosyllabic sentences was presented by Zagnitko (2011), synthesizing grammatical and semantic features. The author identified three main types of monosyllabic sentences: verb, infinitive and noun, but each of them has its own subtypes: *verb - definite-personal, indefinite-personal, generalized-personal, impersonal; infinitive - infinitive-nominal and infinitive-impersonal; noun - nominative (existential, indicative, evaluative, proper-nominal, motivational-desirable, with a nominative theme, substantive-qualitative-evaluative), genitive (quantitative-genitive, genitive-negative).*

The study of monosyllabic sentences as a separate, independent category of monosyllabic offers was carried out by such famous Ukrainian and Russian scientists as Kazarina (2007), Osipova (2009).

In other Slavic languages (Czech, Croatian, Polish, Belarusian), the prevalence of monosyllabic sentences differs from what is in Ukrainian and Russian; these designs have mainly book-stylistic use. Scientists note the presence of verbal and no simple one-part groups, but the number of types, summarized under the appropriate category, may contain a different number of structures.

In Slavic languages, monosyllabic constructions and their grammatical features have caused discussion in linguistic circles since the beginning of the 19th century; monosyllabic sentences of German, English, French and Italian for a long time were not the subject of special syntactic studies, they were fixed as profanities and, together with incomplete and elliptic sentences, were considered as a departure from the binominal scheme; such structures did not belong to independent syntactic units.

In the framework of verbose-centric theories (declensions, the form of the verb is absolutely important for the characterization of sentences), the problem of one-folding was not posed at all. The exceptions were impersonal sentences; they were considered not from the point of view of their own linguistic characteristics, but from the point of view of the logical possibility of constructing a subject less utterance. Another reason for the lack of attention to monosyllabic sentences in English and German is due to the presence of a formal predicate. However, the formal predicate only changes the quantitative relationship between the one-part and two-part sentences in English and German and in languages that do not have such a component, and in principle does not exclude the possibility of the existence of two-part structures in these languages. Moreover, the linguistic material convinces that monosyllabic sentences in English and German are

independent syntactic units, have a wide range of uses and, of course, require comprehensive study.

There is no consensus among Russian Germanists as to whether there are monosyllabic sentences in English. Thus, Barkhudarov (1966) denied their existence. The scholar believed that in the case of "deviation" of the English sentence from the subject-predicate structure there is not a simple sentence, but an ellipse.

In Russian linguistics (Barkhudarov, 1966; Smirnitsky, 1957), the prevailing approach is that there are one-syllable sentences in English. Linguists considered dissyllable / monosyllabic from a purely formal point of view and considered the main criterion for differentiation to be the number of main members present in the sentence structure. If the subject and predicate are distinguished in the sentence structure, then the sentence is dissyllable. If there is only one main member, which is usually not treated as a subject or as a predicate, the sentence is classified as monosyllabic. But the imperfection of this approach is that any formally one-syllable sentence can be correlated with a formally dissyllable and in this case interpret any one-syllable sentence as an elliptical dissyllable.

Most often, the classification of English simple sentences is based on the teachings of Shakhmatov (1941). Most scholars single out nominative sentences. Some researchers (Ignatiuk, 1978) among the monosyllabic also include infinitive and impersonal.

In German syntax, the theory of monosyllabic is not sufficiently developed. The classification of simple structures is based on a two-sentence structure and is mainly represented by studies of previous years. Proponents of the theory of monosyllabic in German linguistics (Brugman, 1904) considered monosyllabic sentences not as independent syntactic units, which in one way or another should be represented in the typology of sentences, but as structures, deviated from the basic pattern.

In the syntactic theories of the later and modern period there is a tendency to a systematic description of syntax, which is reflected primarily in the formation of sentence typologies, which provides a description of all the samples on which sentences of German are built. Various principles were used to distinguish models (schemes, samples) of sentences - from the criterion of semantic completeness of a sentence (Grebe, 1959) to the structural minimum of a sentence (Helbig & Buscha, 1974). However, despite the fact that the proposed typologies would have to present all the samples of German sentences, we do not find models of simple sentences in any of the presented schemes.

In some grammars, simple sentences fall into the section of morphology, where these communicative units without any connection with the general syntactic theory illustrate the possibilities of functioning of certain parts of speech. In formalized grammars, where the very principle of analysis should provide a description of monosyllabic structures of the German language, there is also a tendency to keep unchanged the notion of non-normative monosyllabic formations. However, the very emergence of a communicative approach that replaces the formal-syntactic testifies to the penetration of psycholinguistic tendencies in descriptive grammars.

In French linguistics, monosyllabic sentences belong to the type of sentences with an abbreviated syntactic structure and are divided into monosyllabic complete and monosyllabic incomplete. They are classified by morphological, syntactic and semantic features. Italian is characterized by the presence of verb and noun monosyllabic sentences.

The study of monosyllabic sentences in Indo-European languages (in the linguistic-historiographical aspect) allows us to conclude that in these languages there is a large group of syntactic units, which should be classified as monosyllabic structures with inherent features (presence of one constructive center; informativeness; indicating the ellipticity of one of the members).

Theories, alternative concepts of monosyllabic, in linguistics of the XIX century - the beginning of the XXI century.

Since the middle of the twentieth century, especially in the last two decades, under the influence of the development of the semantic direction, the question of the real existence of monosyllabic sentences as an independent structural type of simple sentence has become sharply debated. Some scholars tried to return to the ideas of the logical-grammatical syntax about the obligatory dissyllable structure of the sentence (Grech, 1972; Vostokov, 1874).

Exploring the problem of dissyllable/ monosyllabic sentences of the Russian language, V first considered simple sentences in terms of communicative act, which is the subject of study of psycholinguistics. The scientist noted that by its social nature, the act of speech communication is always dissyllable. And this suggests that the sentence should be basically dissyllable.

In the 60's of the twentieth century in line with the ideas of transformational syntax, a fundamentally new concept appeared - the concept of syntactic zero (zero subject and predicate), on the basis of which all sentences were classified as two-part structures. Linguists, classifying

simple sentences as dissyllable models, used the concepts of sentence binary, syntactic subject, zero subject, dissyllable inconsistent model; tried to introduce the opposition "sentence with a verbal subject / sentence with a zero subject", which is possible only in the framework of a dissyllable sentence. This step provides important material for the neurolinguistic study of a simple sentence, because the speed of neural processing of stimuli and the degree of verbal response to them depends on such parameters as specificity, appropriateness, pattern (stereotypical response) and so on.

The method of transformational analysis was used to uncover the essence of impersonal sentences. The principle of identifying such proposals is the possibility of raising them to a core or non-core non-specific proposal. This concept was supported by the reality of the existence of the subject in the form of the genitive case (Barkhudarov, 1966) (in the transition from the deep structure to the surface, certain elements of the sentence are subject to "erasure" or replacement by zero). The concepts of "deep syntactic / semantic structure", "innate grammatical structure", etc. are in fact paralinguistic terms that can be explained only taking into account psycho- and neurolinguistic indicators.

Logically-oriented approach to the study of sentence structure was the impetus for the differentiation of sentences into one-component and two-component. This principle of classification denied the classical structural schemes of dissyllable and monosyllabic sentences. As a supporter of this concept, according to which the linguistic content is not distinguished from the extralingual. Arutyunova, & Shiryaev (1983) did not divide sentences into monosyllabic and dissyllable. Shmelev (1976), abandoning the idea of subject-predicate dichotomy, considered any two-component construction. Slynko, Guyvanyuk, & Kobylanska (1994), analyzing all sentences at two levels: at the level of generalized models and at the level of real sentences, concluded that at the level of real sentences the boundaries between one-component and two-component models are erased.

The theory of the fundamental duality of a Russian sentence was developed by Zolotova, Onipenko, & Sidorova (2004). In their opinion, the presence or absence of a subject in the nominative case is not an indicator of the monosyllabic of a simple sentence. Studying impersonal sentences, the researcher uses the concept of non-nominative subject and spontaneous cause of action. The appearance of spontaneous causative, from the point of view of neurolinguistics, is a left-sided reaction to a cognitively nondeterministic situation, which indicates the approximation of semantic syntax to explain the neurophysiological nature of the generation of expression.

The development of semantic syntax gave impetus to the active development of the theoretical foundations of the semantic-syntactic level of the sentence. Lomov (1994) represented monosyllabic as a meaningful rather than a formal category; he believed that any one-syllable sentence indicates the existence / non-existence of a single semantic object, which is interpreted either as an object, or as a sign, or as a process. Lomov (1994) was supported by Gorodenska (1991), Mirchenko (2004) and others. Gorodenska (1991) believes that at the actual semantic level, all constructions are always twofold. The absence of subject-predicate construction in a sentence is not an indicator of simplicity; such syntactic constructions require detailed study at all levels of sentence structure.

Scientists were ambiguous about genitive, vocative structures and constructions that coincide in form with nominative sentences.

Studying the specifics of the structure, semantics and functioning of so-called genitive sentences, some scholars considered them as a kind of impersonal monosyllabic. Peshkovsky (1934) and others attributed them to constructions of nominal type.

Peshkovsky (1934), Babaitseva (2004) and Mirchenko (2004) did not consider vocative sentences as independent syntactic constructions.) etc.; they were attributed to atypical monosyllabic constructions, emphasizing the need to analyze these formations at the communicative rather than syntactic level.

Scientists mostly denied the status of a sentence to proper noun constructions (Shakhmatov, 1941).

Nominative themes or nominal representations were considered by linguists as a special type of two-membered (segmented) constructions (Kadomtseva, 1986; Peshkovsky, 1934).

Conclusions

The doctrine of monosyllabic sentences began in the linguistics of the nineteenth century. For the first time using a psychological approach to language, scholars have explored the nature and essence of simple sentences. This approach was also used by young grammarians in the study of monosyllabic constructions, but in their works one can observe contradictions in relation to monosyllabic sentences as an independent construction.

Proponents of the psychological approach have tried to clarify the specifics of the structural construction of pointless structures. Based on the assessment of the syntactic status of the main member, a classification of monosyllabic constructions (subject less, relatively subject less, nominative)

was formed; in linguistics of the 30's - 60's of the twentieth century an important place was given to the question of the qualification of the main member of simple sentences.

The formal expression of the predicative connection as the main criterion for distinguishing between dissyllable and monosyllabic sentence structure is reflected in the studies of linguists of the middle of the XX century - the beginning of the XXI century. The concept of monosyllabic sentences was expanded, new (additional) types of monosyllabic sentences were identified.

The structural approach became popular in the linguistics of the 1940's and 1960's. In contrast to the traditional approach to the study of syntactic connections in a sentence, structuralists used a formalized apparatus of research procedures. An important achievement of structuralism was the development of a set of techniques for analyzing the structure of the sentence; it is a question of hierarchical organization of constituents of the sentence, separation of its main components, definition of dependence / independence of a syntactic form, and also about set of transformational rules. Representatives of transformational grammar, studying monosyllabic sentences on the basis of functional-semantic criterion, used the term *single-core sentences* and considered verbal constructions (impersonal, infinitive, actually infinitive, infinitive sentences with a compound basis) to be the main ones; nominative constructions were qualified as speech utterances.

Linguists of the second half of the XX century - the beginning of the XXI century, taking into account the *semantic, structural, formal approaches*, began to reconsider the issues of monosyllabic / dissyllable sentence complexity, and the very concept of one-syllable sentence was questioned. In particular, theories of the fundamental dissyllable of any sentence, one-component / two-component sentences, non-nominative subject, etc. have emerged.

Throughout the period of studying monosyllabic sentences, linguists intensively described their individual varieties, which allowed to reveal the variety of monosyllabic sentences and showed that these are not sharply opposed types of structures, but structures that have many common features. Therefore, along with the common classification of monosyllabic sentences, there are constructions whose syntactic qualification is not unambiguous. When studying simple sentences, some scientists do not give genitive, vocative, and nominative constructions that coincide in form with the status of independent categories of monosyllabic sentences, but attribute

them either to other types of monosyllabic sentences or deprive them of the status of sentences.

The growing attention to the content of a simple sentence has led to an increase in the interest of linguists in the active study of the theoretical foundations of the semantic-syntactic level of the sentence.

In other Slavic languages (Czech, Croatian, Polish, Belarusian) the same types of monosyllabic sentences are observed as in Russian and Ukrainian, while scientists do not always adhere to terminological unity, and the range of sentences that fall into the appropriate category contains different number of structures. Instead, monosyllabic sentences of Germanic languages, together with incomplete and elliptical ones, are considered as a deviation from the dissyllable scheme, and, consequently, from the norm, and do not belong to independent syntactic units. Scientists study simple sentences not in combination with the general theory of the sentence, but in delimitation with it and consider them examples of departure from the characteristic properties of communicative units.

It can be concluded that within the classical linguistic paradigms the phenomenon of sentence single-syllable has always been incompletely analyzed, as it required a study of the neuropsychological nature of human speech, which became possible only in the post-classical period. On the other hand, in most of the analyzed theories there are rudiments of a psycholinguistic approach to the analyzed phenomenon.

At present, monosyllabic sentences are not an important object of neurolinguistics, but they are important linguistic material for elucidating the neurophysiological nature of atypical language units. Thus, the analysis of neural responses (P600, ELAN, N400) to simple sentences allowed us to draw conclusions about the existence of typical and integrated models, which allows us to develop a new model of the relationship between neural structures and speech structures (Fodor et al., 1974; Frazier, 1978). It is the P600 effect that best demonstrates a person's attempt to reconstruct the specifics of a sentence (single, incomplete, interrupted) to a sufficient cognitive minimum, expressed by a clear time delay to the amplitude maximum of the electric potential.

Neurophysiological models of perception and processing of grammatical sentence structures, especially atypical or new for the experimental compositional structures, were developed by Dominey, Hoen, & Inui (2008). This indicates that a complete picture of the functioning of simple sentences is possible only with a trilateral approach: structural syntax - functional syntax - neurolinguistic modeling.

We consider the principle of combining the best scientific achievements of the past with the development of new approaches to studying the problem of monosyllabic / dissyllable of simple sentences and in wide involvement in the analysis of Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages to be promising for further scientific research.

References

- Arutyunova, N. D., & Shiryaev, E. N. (1983). *Russkoye predlozheniye: bytiynny tip (Struktura i znacheniy)* [Russian proposal: being type (structure and meaning)]. Russian language. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/2167065/>
- Babaitseva, V. V. (2004). *Sistema odnosostavnykh predlozheniy v sovremennom russkom yazyke* [System of single-compound sentences in modern Russian language]. Drofa. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/3028776/>
- Barkhudarov, L. S. (1966). *Struktura prostogo predlozheniya sovremennogo angliyskogo yazyka* [The structure of a simple sentence of the modern English language]. Vysshaya shkola. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/451654/>
- Bowden, B. (2020). The intellectual origins of postmodernism. In B. Bowden, J. Muldoon, A. M. Gould, & A. J. McMurray (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Management History* (pp. 645–669). Springer International Publishing.
- Bowden, B. (Ed.), (2018). *Work, wealth, and postmodernism*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brugman, K. (1904). *Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* [Brief comparative grammar of the Indo-European languages]. De Gruyter.
- Bulakhovsky, L. A. (1952). *Kurs russkogo literaturnogo yazyka* [The course of the Russian literary language]. Radyanska shkola. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/1831623/>
- Dominey, P. F., Hoen, M., & Inui, T. (2006). A neurolinguistic model of grammatical construction processing. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 18(12), 2088–2107. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2006.18.12.2088>
- Fedorova, M. (2019). *Postmodernizm v kontekste sovremennogo yazyka* [Postmodernism in the context of modern language]. In Proceedings of the 30th International Scientific-Practical Conference on “Culturology, Arts and Philology: Modern Views and Scientific Research” (pp. 99-104). Internauka. [https://internauka.org/archive2/phil/12\(27\).pdf](https://internauka.org/archive2/phil/12(27).pdf)
- Fodor, J. A., Bever, T. G., & Garrett, M. F. (1974). *The psychology of language: an introduction to psycholinguistics and generative grammar*. New McGraw-Hill.
- Frazier, L. (1978). *On comprehending sentences: syntactic parsing strategies* [Unpublished PhD dissertation]. University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.
- Gorodenska, K. H. (1991). *Deryvatsiya syntaksichnykh odynyts* [Derivation of syntactic units]. Naukova dumka.

- Gorodetska, V. A. (1997). *Struktura odnoskladnogo recheniya ukrayinskoyi movy (u porivnyanni z rosiyskoyu)* [Structure of a single sentence of the Ukrainian language (in comparison with Russian)] [Unpublished PhD Thesis]. M. P. National Pedagogical University, Kyiv.
- Grebe, P. (1959). *Der Grobe Duden: Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache* [The Grobe Duden: grammar of contemporary German]. Hrsg. von P. Grebe.
- Grech, N. I. (1827). *Prakticheskaya russkaya gramatika* [Practical Russian grammar]. Publishing House of N. Grech.
- Helbig, G., & Buscha, J. (1974). *Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht* [German grammar: a handbook for teaching abroad]. VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Heringer, H. J. (1973). *Theorie der deutscher Syntax* [The theory of German syntax]. Hoeber.
- Ignatiuk, Yu. S. (1978). *Bezlichnyye predlozheniya i osobennosti ikh funktsionirovaniya v sovremennom angliyskom yazyke (na materiale angliyskogo yazyka Velikobritanii, SSHA i Avstralii)* [Impersonal sentences and features of their functioning in modern English (based on the English language of Great Britain, USA and Australia)] [Unpublished PhD Thesis]. V. I. Lenin State Pedagogical Institute, Moscow.
- Ivanytska, N. L. (1971). Syntaksychna struktura prostoho recheniya. Ukrayinska mova ta literatura v shkoli [Syntactic structure of a simple sentence]. *Ukrayinska mova ta literatura v shkoli* [Ukrainian Language and Literature in School], 1, 27–33.
- Kadomtseva, L. O. (1986). *Ukrayinska mova: Syntaksys prostobo recheniya* [Ukrainian language: syntax of a simple sentence]. Vyshcha shkola.
- Kaluarachchi, S. (2020). *Poststructuralist and postmodernist approaches of languages*. Academia.edu.
https://www.academia.edu/42725160/Poststructuralist_and_postmodernist_approaches_of_language
- Kazarina, V. I. (2007). *Sovremennyy russkiy sintaksis: strukturnaya organizatsiya prostogo predlozheniya* [Modern Russian syntax: structural organization of a simple sentence]. I. A. Bunin Yelets State University.
- Kiklewicz, A. (2020). Active processes in the terminology of modern linguistics. *Przegląd Wschodnioeuropejski*, 11(1), 335–359.
<https://doi.org/10.31648/pw.5993>
- Kiklewicz, A. K. (2016). Postmodernizm jako czynnik zmian we współczesnym językoznawstwie w aspekcie epistemicznym, społecznym i etycznym (przy uwzględnieniu innych nauk humanistycznych). Cz. 1 [Postmodernism as a change factor in modern linguistics, in the epistemic, social and ethical aspect (taking into account the humanities). Part 1]. *LingVaria*, 1, 21–34.
<http://akademicka.pl/doi/10.12797/LV.11.2016.21.03>

- Lekant, P. A. (1971). *Grammaticheskaya forma prostogo predlozheniya i sistema yego strukturno-sintaksicheskikh tipov v sovremennom russkom yazyke* [The grammatical form of a simple sentence and the system of its structural-syntactic types in modern Russian [Unpublished PhD Thesis]. Moscow Regional Pedagogical Institute, Moscow.
- Lomov, A. M. (1994). *Tipologiya russkogo predlozheniya* [Typology of the Russian proposal]. Publishing House of Voronezh University.
- Mirchenko, M. V. (2004). *Struktura syntaksicheskikh katehoriy* [Structure of syntactic categories]. Vezha.
- Nerubasska, A., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020a). The Demarcation of Creativity, Talent and Genius in Humans: a Systemic Aspect. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(2), 240-255. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.2/172>
- Nerubasska, A., Palshkov, K., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020b). A Systemic Philosophical Analysis of the Contemporary Society and the Human: New Potential. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(4), 275-292. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.4/235>
- Nicolae, S. (2018). The modern faces of postmodernism. *Human Studies*, 41, 517–521. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10746-018-9478-4>
- Onishchuk, I., Ikonnikova, M., Antonenko, T., Kharchenko, I., Shestakova, S., Kuzmenko, N., & Maksymchuk, B. (2020). Characteristics of Foreign Language Education in Foreign Countries and Ways of Applying Foreign Experience in Pedagogical Universities of Ukraine. *Revista Romaneasca pentru Educatie Multidimensionala*, 12(3), 44-65. <https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/12.3/308>
- Osipova, E. N. (2009). *Russkiy sintaksis: odnosostavnost predlozheniya* [Russian syntax: monolithic sentence]. Pomorsky University. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/263860/>
- Ovsyaniko-Kulikovskiy, D. N. (1912). *Sintaksis russkogo yazyka* [Syntax of the Russian language]. Izdaniye Zhukovskogo. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/1527669/>
- Paul, H. (1960). *Printsipy istorii yazyka* [Principles of the History of Language]. Publishing House of Foreign Literature.
- Peshkovsky, A. M. (1934). *Russkiy sintaksis v nauchnom osveshchenii* [Russian syntax in scientific coverage]. Uchpedgiz.
- Petcu, C. (2018). Discursivity and grand narratives through the lens of Postmodernism. *Journal of Romanian Literary Studies*, 14, 29–33.
- Potebnya, A. A. (1888). *Iz zapisek po russkoy grammatike* [From notes on Russian grammar]. Publishing House of the Bookstore D. N. Poluehtova. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/1727068/>

- Shakhmatov, A. A. (1941). *Sintaksis russkogo yazyka* [Syntax of the Russian language]. Uchpedgiz. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/761436/>
- Shmelev, D. N. (1976). *Sintaksicheskaya chlenimost vyskazyvaniya v sovremennom russkom yazyke* [Syntactic severity of utterance in modern Russian]. Nauka. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/1876600/>
- Slynko, I. I., Guyvanyuk, N. V., & Kobylanska, M. F. (1994). *Syntaksys suchasnoyi ukrayinskoyi mory: problemni pytannya* [Syntax of the modern Ukrainian language: problematic issues]. Vyshcha shkola. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/2690914/>
- Smirnitsky, A. I. (1957). *Sintaksis angliyskogo yazyka* [Syntax of the English language]. Publishing House of Foreign Literature. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/12237/>
- Stojanović, Đ. (2017). Postmodernizam u drushtvenim naukama: stanje paradigme [Postmodernism in the social sciences: state of paradigm]. *Srpska politichka misao* [Serbian political thought], 32, 5–35.
- Vinogradov, V. V. (1978). *Istoriya russkikh lingvisticheskikh ucheniy* [History of Russian linguistic teachings]. Vysshaya shkola. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/948961/>
- Vostokov, A. Kh. (1874). *Russkaya grammatika* [Russian grammar]. Tipografiya Glazunova. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/2090093/>
- Vykhovanets, I. R. (1993). *Hramatyka ukrayinskoyi mory. Syntaksys* [Grammar of the Ukrainian language. Syntax]. Lybid. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/2471463/>
- Weideman, A. (Ed.). (2017). *Responsible design in applied linguistics: theory and practice*. Springer.
- Yin, W. A. N. G. (2018). A research on construction grammar from the viewpoint of post-modernism. *Journal of Shanghai Normal University (Philosophy & Social Sciences Edition)*, (5)14. https://en.cnki.com.cn/Article_en/CJFDTotall-SSFS201805014.htm
- Yurchenko, V. S. (1972). *Prostoye predlozheniye v sovremennom russkom yazyke* [A simple sentence in modern Russian]. Volga Publishing House.
- Zagnitko, A. P. (2011). *Teoretychna hramatyka suchasnoyi ukrayinskoyi mory. Morfolohiya. Syntaksys* [Theoretical grammar of the modern Ukrainian language. Morphology. Syntax]. BAO. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/2414196/>
- Zolotova, G. A., Onipenko, N. K., & Sidorova, M. Yu. (2004). *Kommunikativnaya grammatika russkogo yazyka* [Communicative grammar of the Russian language]. Nauka. <https://www.twirpx.com/file/1810239/>