

**REPUBLIC OF AZERBAIJAN**

*On the right of manuscript*

**ABSTRACT**

of the dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**PROBLEMS OF SYSTEM ANALYSIS OF ONE-MEMBER  
NOMINATIVE SENTENCES IN RUSSIAN**

Speciality: 5707.01 – Slavic languages

Field of science: Philology

Applicant: **Ilakha Rasim Xaligova**

**BAKU – 2024**

The work was performed at the Department of Modern Russian Language of Baku Slavic University

Scientific supervisor: Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor  
**Ilyas Hamidulla Hamidov**

Official opponents: Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor  
**Galina Dmitriyevna Udalykh**

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor  
**Mikail Magamed Jafarov**

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor  
**Vasiliy Ivanovich Suprun**

Dissertation council ED 2.13 of Supreme Attestation Commission under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan operating at the Baku Slavic University

Chairman of the  
Dissertation council: Doctor of Philological Sciences,  
Professor  
**Rahila Huseyn Guliyeva**

Scientific secretary of the  
Dissertation council: Doctor of Philosophy on Philology  
**Suad Arif Afandiyeva**

Chairman of the scientific  
seminar: Doctor of Philological Sciences,  
Professor  
**Tavakkul Hadi Shukurbayli**

## GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WORK

**Relevance and studying degree of the topic.** One-member nominative sentences represent a special layer in the typology of the Russian simple sentence. These units are considered in almost all modern school and university textbooks, analyzed in academic publications. The material of the one-member sentences (ONS) became the object of study of several dissertations written in the late 60s and early 70s of the twentieth century. A large number of articles have been devoted to them, in which certain lexical and grammatical features and stylistic possibilities have been revealed.

Despite a fairly serious research attention, ONSs are still the subject of theoretical disagreements, which in practice of teaching turn into great difficulties in their qualification.

One way or another, unified scientific grounds for determining the linguistic (systemic) status of ONSs have not yet been developed in Russian linguistics, which leads either to an unjustifiably narrow understanding of the grammatical nature of these units, to a narrowing of their syntactic boundaries, or to their broad interpretation, in which units are included in the sphere of functioning of the ONSs under various pretexts, only outwardly – as nouns or substantive combinations – resembling one-member "substantive", i.e. denominative suggestions.

The current picture of studying and qualifying ONSs is due to the fact that:

a) many researchers of the system of one-member sentences proceed from a single, in their opinion, principle of contrasting the form of expression of the main member in one-member constructions – from the opposition of a personal verb and a noun, and the latter is distributed as follows: if the main member of the sentence is a noun in the form of the nominative case, then this is a denominative (nominative) sentence (Боль. Обморок. Больница), but if this is the form of the genitive case, then the sentence is considered genitive (Цыц! Ни звука!); b) some scientists include in the complex of differential features of ONS the property of presence/absence of modal evaluation, in which only those units that are devoid of the semantics of emotional evaluation are recognized as nominative: such as “Тайга. Вечная мерзлота.”; as for

units like “Какая красота! Просто чудо!”, then they are considered two-member incomplete, although the presence/absence of a subjective modal assessment cannot, in our opinion, be a criterion for establishing the type, constructive model of a sentence as a syntactic unit. In other words, the units “Вечна” and “Вечна! Красота!” represent identical constructive models of ONSs, although they differ in exclamation/non-exclamation; c) the determination of the special place of ONSs in the system of one-member sentences by some researchers is subject to a purely semantic feature – the possibility of naming a certain object, if present, perceived in concrete terms, visible space-time limits; however, a purely semantic characteristic narrows the limits of ONS; outside these limits there are sentences, the meaning of which is not to state some phenomenon or fact of reality, but in their emotional designation, expressive qualification [for more details, see 1.1, Chapter I]; d) there are no studies in the field of ONSs focused on modern theories of reference (theories of stable correlation of a designation, a linguistic unit with a concept), which has been intensively developed recently and which can become a key point in removing the duality of ONSs, when they are considered in one case predicate, and in others subject. This state is one of the most complex theoretical assessments, in which the main member of a constructive syntactic unit is recognized as either a predicate or a subject; e) in the theory of syntax there are no attempts to qualify one-member sentences in general and ONSs – in particular from the standpoint of actualization, i.e. from the standpoint of the actual division of the proposal; the position of the noun in these sentences in the context of the topic-rheme opposition is not determined; if the main member of the ONS can be qualified, as is done in some cases, either as a subject or as a predicate, then, apparently, this member of the sentence should also be able to perform the functions of both theme and rheme. Our preliminary analytical procedures confirm the opposite – ONSs in the vast majority of cases actualize the rhematic element of the predicative unit, i.e. they consist of rhema; f) the position of syntacticists in relation to constructions with adverbial extenders is not entirely clear: “Дом за рекой”, “Слева письменный стол” (like remarks). These units also receive an ambiguous interpretation – either as denominations

or as two-member elliptical ones – this complicates the process of their syntactic analysis both in school and university practice.

These and some other propositions (they will be discussed in Chapter I), related to the identification of systemic relations in the field of ONSs, with the establishment of their syntactic status and functional nature, determine the degree of relevance of the study of nominative sentences in the Russian language.

The material for our analysis will be units selected from the classical and modern fiction and journalistic literature of Russian writers and poets. Due to the fact that we consider ONS units in all their formal semantic modifications, we have compiled a card index that includes both ONSs and some constructions similar to them in form, meaning and function for comparative analysis, and also to establish the scope of paradigmatic and syntagmatic capabilities of the similar units being compared. As for attracting material from texts of various genres (poetry, prose, drama), the question seems to us to be fundamental in the sense that the linguistic reality of ONSs, if we consider them to be a special model of the Russian member sentence, must be confirmed and illustrated in all genres of the living language, in other words, it must be proven that ONS is not specific to any one sphere of the existence of language.

**The object and the subject of the study.** The object of the study, therefore, is the structure, the systematically organized sphere of Russian one-member sentences, opposed to each other within the limits of verbal and nominal constructions, possessing all the categorical properties of the sentence – predicativity, modality and syntactic tense.

The subject of the study is the corpus of nominal (denominative) one-member sentences of the Russian language and the system of formally and semantically similar denominative units that reveal the specifics of the "classical" ONS.

**The purpose and the objectives of the study.** The purpose of the study is a sufficiently reasoned definition of the semantic-syntactic parameters that single out ONS in the system of a simple sentence of the Russian language.

The objectives of the study are largely conditioned to the general goal of our work: a) establishing the defining properties of the ONS, opposing them to other types of one-member predicative and nominative constructions (genitive and vocative); b) determination of the range of main and peripheral features of the ONS as a model; c) a systematic description of ONSs and the development of a logically consistent criterion for their classification – in terms of semantics, in terms of contextual function.

**The main goal of the research** is a comparative analysis of the wedding concept spheres presented in Russian and Azerbaijani languages.

**The following provisions are put forward for defense:**

1. ONSs should be considered in the general system of one-member sentences of the Russian language, not only along the lines of nominal patterns, but also verbal constructions, since only such a frontal study helps to determine their specificity as special models of one-member sentences.

2. ONSs cannot be represented by a single classification: their semantic-structural and pragmatic properties require the use of classifications on various grounds.

3. ONSs require the definition of their linguistic status within the limits of two objectively existing trends in the language – lexicalization of predicative units (i.e., the process of forming nominative lexical units on the basis of sentence structures, and, conversely, the process of acquiring the property of predicativeness by nominative units: e.g.: tumble-weed (dry weed grass) = Well, a downpour!).

4. ONSs are characterized by a special form of entry into the system of actual division of the sentence – they invariably represent the rhematic element of the utterance, which is clearly opposed to verbal one-member sentences.

5. The bulk of ONSs do not have paradigmatic forms, those of them that allow for a “temporary paradigm”, becoming a two-part construction, constitute the area of syntactic synonymy.

**The scientific novelty of the dissertation** lies in the fact that a) for the first time it raises and solves the issue of semantic-

structural qualification of the ONS within the framework of the mandatory consideration of the theme / rhematic systemic oppositions; b) the syntactic status of the ONS is determined on the basis of a mandatory set of features: the temporal paradigm of a given unit, its paradigm on the basis of affirmation / negation and the representation of its main member by both nouns and pronouns and substantiated adjectives; c) a position is put forward that ONSs, due to their diversity, cannot be characterized by a single classification, they require coverage and qualification within several classifications that take into account 1) their contextual meaning-function (pragmatics); 2) their morphological expression; 3) their expressive appraisal or lack thereof; 4) their functional (according to the purpose of the statement) heterogeneity.

### **The theoretical significance and the practical significance.**

The theoretical significance of the work is primarily due to the fact that in it the syntactic problem of verbocentricity / nominocentricity of the Russian sentence receives its systemic understanding along the lines of “lexicalization of predicative units”,  $\longleftrightarrow$  “acquiring the property of predicativeness by nominative units”. In none of the existing works on the theory of one-member sentences, the question is considered in the marked manner; this technique opens up good opportunities for rethinking the status of syntactic constructions, both predicative and nominative.

The practical significance of the work is determined by the possibility of compiling a special theoretical course "The system of forms of nominative one-member sentences in the Russian language", which fits well into the program for undergraduates of the Faculty of Philology, as well as for magistrants. The results of the study can be used in compiling part of the methodological developments for one-member sentences in general.

**The approbation and application of the research** was carried out in discussions of its individual parts at meetings of the Department of the Russian Language of the Baku Slavic University, the main positions of the work are presented in the form of reports at republican and international conferences.

**Name of the organization where the dissertation work has been done.** The work has been done by the Department of Russian Language of Baku Slavic University.

**The total volume of the dissertation with a sign, indicating the volume of the structural units of the dissertation separately.**

The dissertation consists of an introduction, three chapters, a conclusion and a list of references. The total volume of the dissertation is 142 pages, 207705 signs, consisting Introduction – 7 pages, 11591 signs, Chapter I – 36 pages, 58951 signs, Chapter II – 14 pages, 22702 signs, Chapter III – 65 pages, 103022 signs, Conclusion – 7 pages, 11439 signs.

## **MAIN CONTENT OF THE WORK**

In the **introduction** of the dissertation, the relevance of the research topic is substantiated, its object and subject, the main goal and objectives, theoretical and practical significance are determined, the methods and positions submitted for defense are discussed.

The first chapter is called "**One-member nominative (denominative) sentences as an object of syntactic analysis**", which consists of three subchapters: "A brief history of the study of ONS in linguistics", "The current state of the study and presentation of ONS", "Theoretical principles for qualifying the linguistic essence of ONS, adopted in this work." The third subchapter includes four sections: "ONP in the light of the theory of actual articulation", "ONP in the light of the theory of language nomination and the nominative (onomasiological) concept of the sentence", "ONP in the light of the theory of speech acts" and "ONP in the light of their part-speech representation".

One-member nominative sentences have historically attracted the attention of many syntaxis's and logicians, despite their stylistic and functional isolation, characteristic only for colloquial speech and artistic journalism.

The various theoretical directions that have historically developed in Russian linguistics (logical-grammatical, formal-grammatical, structural-semantic, etc.) differed especially from each other against the



background of qualification and theoretical coverage of varieties of one-member sentences. Especially many different interpretations were observed regarding nominative sentences, in the course of characterizing which some scientists gave them a broad interpretation, including in their category both sentence-words and “nominatives” not in the form of the nominative case (В аэропорт!) and even a whole range of titles of works of art, titles of various formats, etc. Other syntaxists recognized as nominative only those sentences that have the semantics of presence – being of a phenomenon, a fact and which are represented by the nominative case of a noun: Опушка леса. Тишина. Полдень. (М.Пришвин).

F.I.Buslaev believed that the existence of non-subjective sentences (i.e. sentences consisting only of the predicate) is quite possible – for example, impersonal sentences. *“But there is not a single sentence that would consist only of the subject”*<sup>1</sup>. In other words, F.I.Buslaev denies the existence of a nominal type of sentences, i.e. verbless (non-predicative) sentences.

K.S.Aksakov took a special position regarding the presence/absence of one-member (non-predicative) sentences in the Russian language.

According to Aksakov, the forms «Дождь», «Был дождь», «Будет дождь», etc. should not be considered forms of one nominative sentence «Дождь», because here, when you say «Был дождь», «Будет дождь», “you do not just call the object by its name – because the object itself is not in front of you, but you want to indicate the relations of the existence of the object to the moment you are in: in one case you remember it, in another you imagine it. The verb here, obviously, becomes necessary”<sup>2</sup>. Semantics, or rather the semantic specificity of the unit «Дождь», thus, K.S.Aksakov defines as naming a thing, an object by its own name within the time in which the speaker is.

N.Bogoroditsky considered one-member sentences to be complete, in which nothing “should be implied”, and *“never dare to put one form instead of another; for in this way it is impossible to make*

---

<sup>1</sup> Виноградов, В.В. Из истории изучения русского синтаксиса (от Ломоносова до Потебни и Фортунатова). Изд. МГУ, – 1958, – с. 232.

<sup>2</sup> Аксаков, К.С. Опыт русской грамматики / К.Аксаков. – Москва, – 1980, – с. 245.

another from one form”<sup>3</sup>. According to N.Bogoroditsky, techniques of syntactic analogies and parallels cannot be the basis for understanding the linguistic essence of a particular syntactic unit. Henceforth, the qualification of sentences like Winter. Snow. Blizzard, etc. cannot be subordinated to their so-called "complete analogues": Была зима; Будет зима.

Sentences *Зима. Мороз. Пожар!* A.A.Shakhmatov characterizes as units “*expressing the presence of the named phenomena or objects at the present time, at the present minute*”<sup>4</sup>. Recognizing these units as one-member, the scientist notes that there are no sufficient grounds for defining them as two-member sentences "violated (with the omission of one or another predicate)". The constructions «Была зима», «Будет мороз» should, according to A.Shakhmatov, be two-member sentences, since both main members of the sentence are present in them. “*This circumstance seems to shake the position on the one-member sentences of Зима. Мороз. And it gives reason to think about the omission of the present tense of the verb to be in them*”<sup>5</sup>. However, in favor of the independence and one-member sentences, *Зима. Мороз. Пожар!* A.Shakhmatov puts forward several arguments: firstly, in the present tense they should be considered as one-member, “*for the completeness of their meaning does not require the insertion of the 3rd person singular of the verb to be; secondly, the grammatical design of these sentences, their intonation (“emphasis”) and emphatic pronunciation “obviously separates them from two-member sentences*”<sup>6</sup>; thirdly, in some other languages there is no omission of the present tense of the verb to be, therefore, in Russian they cannot be explained based on the presence of two-member forms in the past or future tenses.

The issue of nominative sentences is also deeply developed in the works of A.M.Peshkovsky. Under “nominative sentences”, the author

---

<sup>3</sup> Богородицкий, Н. По вопросу о русской грамматике как учебнике // Журнал Министерства Народного просвещения, 139 т. – 1843. – с. 232.

<sup>4</sup> Шахматов А.А. Синтаксис русского языка. / А.Шахматов. – Ленинград: Учпедгиз, – 1941, – с. 61.

<sup>5</sup> Шахматов А.А. Синтаксис русского языка. / А.Шахматов. – Ленинград: Учпедгиз, – 1941, – с. 51.

<sup>6</sup> Шахматов А.А. Синтаксис русского языка. / А.Шахматов. – Ленинград: Учпедгиз, – 1941, – с. 52.

combines “all those sentences in which the predicate is ... the nominative case of a noun and in which, by their very nature, there can be neither a subject nor a verbal predicate”<sup>7</sup>.

For clarity of what has been said, let us recall G.Paul's interpretation of the ONS. It would seem that for his time he gave a completely original assessment of the nature of nominal sentences: in some cases, the sentence Пожар! is a psychological subject (for a listener who has not yet seen the fire), and the situation itself is the predicate, and vice versa, this sentence for the one who reports this is the subject, and the predicate is the very concept of fire<sup>8</sup>. From the point of view of the psychology of speech perception, such an interpretation may not contradict the nature of the sentence "Пожар!", as well as its "associative perception". But the syntactic problem of one-memberedness / two-memberedness of denominative and other sentences should not be solved, as S.D.Katsnelson writes about it, in this way: *“The output proposed by Paul does not have sufficient persuasive power ... The inclusion of the idea of the external object in the number of internal elements of the sentence in itself is unacceptable, just as, from the point of view of Paul himself, it is unacceptable to assume an ellipsis in the case of an incomplete sentence ... After all, the idea of an external situation accompanies any act of speech. If the inclusion of an external situation makes it possible to turn one-membered sentences into two-membered sentences, then ... as a result of such an operation, the basic, two-membered type of the sentence will turn into a three-membered one”*<sup>9</sup>.

The logic of S.D.Katsnelson's reasoning cannot be ignored. He proceeds from the fact that the involvement of the “*structural elements*” of an extralinguistic situation must be common to qualification or all predicative units, or none: the situation element cannot be included in the structure of a syntactic unit as a defining element. It is difficult not to

---

<sup>7</sup> Пешковский, А.М. Русский синтаксис в научном освещении. / А.Пешковский. – Москва: Учпедгиз, – 1956. – с. 173.

<sup>8</sup> Пауль, Герман. Принципы истории языка. – Москва: Иностранная литература, –1960. – с. 153.

<sup>9</sup> Кацнельсон, С.Д. Общее и типологическое языкознание. – Ленинград: Наука, –1986. – с. 248.

accept such an interpretation of one of the basic principles for establishing sentence structure.

Such facts of explaining the syntactic nature of the ONS testify, first of all, in our opinion, that in the qualification of the nature of the formation and functioning of the ONS, much of the traditional, historically established one still remains. This applies to almost all issues of semantics and structure of ONSs – their one-memberedness / two-memberedness, their completeness / incompleteness, their division into subject / predicate, their semantics of being / non-being, ways of expressing their main member (noun / pronoun), etc.

ONSs are, as is well known, entirely at the level of the undivided meaning of a predicative statement, i.e. they are always communicatively monomial – they represent only a rheme. If we proceed from the fact that normal, constructively-syntactically fully organized sentences reveal the obligatory correlation of the topic (basis) of the statement and the rheme (essence) of the statement, then, apparently, there is reason to consider the ONS as communicatively non-articulated units. «Степь. Безмолвие. Тусклый лунный свет», etc. units, regardless of their lexical composition (from the number of words presented), act only as a rheme. Such a functional purpose is one of the characteristic features of ONSs.

From this point of view, i.e. non-occurrence in the theme-rhematic articulation, ONSs for the most part reveal the meaning of being an “event name” (in the words of S.D.Katsnelson). *“To turn into sentences, words of this type (Пожар. Война. Дождь, etc.) need only to clarify their grammatical tense. But in some cases this is not required either, since the situation or the speech context that replaces it makes such a clarification redundant. Compare: Пожар!, where the cry and intonation indicate the relevance of the event”*<sup>10</sup>.

Therefore, in connection with this, it would be correct to speak about the syncretism of the concept-lexeme and the word expressing the “event name” (cf.: dictionary unit “пожар” and ONS “Пожар!”). But, in our opinion, it is difficult to say that ONSs are units of constructive syntax, i.e. units that have all the systemic properties of a normal

---

<sup>10</sup> Кацнельсон, С.Д. Общее и типологическое языкознание. – Ленинград: Наука, –1986. – с. 143.

sentence, which forms the basis of a particular language. ONSs are not linguistic universals, they are not in all languages in the function in which they act in Russian. So, for example, this type of nominative sentences is not typical for our Azerbaijani language (Ночь. Улица. Фонарь. Аптека (А.Блок) = Gecədir. Kūçədir (?) Fonardır (?) Aptekdir (?), etc.), although in the system of remarks in dramatic works they are used as successfully as in other languages. The fact that ONSs are not a separate type of units of constructive syntax, but represent units of actual syntax, is also confirmed by the following fact: ONSs are not represented in their basic forms in the paremiological fund of the language. There are no proverbs, sayings, signs, riddles, etc. built according to a scheme, for example, ONSs of a proper existential type (existential, demonstrative-existential, evaluative existential, etc.). And it's natural. Paremiological units are constructions representing the so-called ascertaining thinking. And the latter, as noted by I.H.Hamidov, is always constructively binomial, bipolar, i.e. corresponds to the requirements of the logical formulation of the statement<sup>11</sup>, even if they are expressed in one-member units. Apparently, for this reason, among the units of the paremiological fund, neither infinitive (with an isolated infinitive), nor genitive, nor nominative (nominal) sentences are found. This fact gives certain grounds to believe that nominative sentences (including the above-mentioned forms of infinitive and genitive ones) should be qualified as "rhematic fragments" of sentences that have full dissection: Наступила пугающая тишина – Господи, какая пугающая тишина! – Какая тишина! – Тишина!

In our opinion, I.H.Hamidov's opinion on this issue is quite fair. He believes that the actualized member of the sentence, its predicativeness is based in such cases not on the contextual environment, as is commonly believed, but rather on the "phraseological" situational structure of the nominative or infinitive sentence itself (see about this more details)<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> Гамидов, И.Г. Философия грамматики афоризмов и пословиц / И.Гамидов. – Баку: Сабах, – 2001, – с. 118-122.

<sup>12</sup> Гамидов, И.Г. К теоретическим основаниям классификации односоставных предложений / И.Г.Гамидов, А.В. Фарзалиева // – Баку: Ученые записки Бакинского славянского университета, – 2014. №1, – с. 28-29.

Consideration of ONSs from the standpoint of speech acts is a new aspect of their study. ONS, just like performative utterances, are not included in the system of oppositions in the category of affirmation / negation, ONS, just like performatives, function within the present tense, ONS, like performatives, are an expression of the subject's assessment regarding some phenomena of reality<sup>13</sup>.

It is known that the main member of the ONS is always expressed by a noun, substantive combinations. Other parts of speech are not represented as the main member of the sentence in the ONS.

There are numerous so-called indicative ONSs, presented in combinations such as «Вот и мы», «Вот он!», «Опять ты?», «То то и оно», etc. The noted units practically remain without a separate, special qualification and are not considered either in the field of ONSs or in the field of incomplete sentences, except for “То то и оно”, which is considered a sentence word.

Thus, the partial nature of the main member of the ONS should not be associated only with substantives. Here a special role belongs to personal pronouns.

*The main provisions and materials of the first chapter are presented in the following publications author.*<sup>14</sup>

The second subchapter is called **"The Place of the ONS in the Typological System of Simple Sentences in the Russian Language"**. Here, special attention is paid to the place of the ONS in the system of one-member sentences, the question of the meaning of existentiality and the category of beingness, and constructions that coincide in form with nominative sentences.

---

<sup>13</sup> Богданов, В.В. Перформативное предложение и его парадигмы // Прагматические и семантические аспекты синтаксиса. – Калинин, КГУ, – 1985, – с.18-27.

<sup>14</sup> Халыгова, И.Р. Заметки по истории изучения односоставных номинативных предложений (ОНП) в языкознании // – Bakı: Humanitar elmlərin öyrənilməsinin aktual problemləri, – 2014. №4. – с.62-68.; Основные параметры системного анализа односоставных предложений в русском языке // – Bakı, BSU: Elmi əsərlər. – 2018, №1. – с.3-9.; Современное состояние изучения представления односоставных номинативных предложений // – Bakı: Dil və ədəbiyyat BDU. Beynəlxalq elmi-nəzəri jurnal.– 2018. №2 (106), – с. 37-40.

The place of nominative sentences among one-member sentences is determined primarily by the opposition of a group of nominal sentences (nominative, genitive, vocative) to a group of verbal ones (definitely personal, indefinitely personal, generalized personal, impersonal and infinitive). Such a distinction is one of the generally accepted positions in the classification of one-member sentences of the Russian language<sup>15</sup>.

However, it should be noted that when establishing the so-called “paradigm of nominative sentences”, the implicitness (lack of expression) of the verb element in nominative sentences is allegedly affirmed: Весна. Была весна. Будет весна.

As P.A.Lekant rightly notes, the form of the present tense characteristic of the ONS is a special present tense, it does not correlate with the past or future tense (ibid.). Therefore, “the introduction of a verb in the past or future tense radically changes the syntactic position of the noun and contributes to the expression of beingness in a lexical way”, i.e. descriptively (Была полночь; Снегу-то было!)<sup>16</sup>.

Indeed, the present tense of nominative sentences does not need morphological expressors and cannot be represented by a verb copula; this, as K.S.Aksakov pointed out in his time, is the time when the speaker does not “remember” and “imagines” anything, this is the time when the speaker “calls things, objects by their proper name” within that period of time, in which he himself is, a witness of which he himself is<sup>17</sup>. On the other hand, the lack of a paradigm in such proposals as “Весна. Талые снега”, etc. it is impossible, as we noted in Chapter I of the work, to explain only from the point of view of the possibility / impossibility of using the verb word *быть*. Here, in our opinion, the actualization characteristic of the ONS plays a significant role: they represent the rheme of the statement and therefore cannot have a full-fledged paradigmatic system, which occurs only in constructions that

---

<sup>15</sup> Валгина, Н.С. Синтаксис современного русского языка / Н.Валгина. – Москва, Изд. 2-ое, – 1978, – 438 с.

<sup>16</sup> Валгина, Н.С. Синтаксис современного русского языка / Н.Валгина. – Москва, Изд. 2-ое, – 1978, – 438 с.

<sup>17</sup> Виноградов, В.В. Из истории изучения русского синтаксиса (от Ломоносова до Потебни и Фортунатова). – Москва: МГУ, – 1958, – с. 245.

represent normal, theme-rhematically dissected statements (Наступила тяжелая тишина; Была глубокая ночь).

The fact that ONSs represent rhematic elements (i.e., they are "charged" only rhematically) is also confirmed by the fact that they cannot have negative forms: Ночь – Не ночь; Мороз – Не мороз. Their negative forms take them out of the realm of the ONS. It turns out either a one-member impersonal sentence (Мороза не было), or a genitive sentence (Ни единой души!).

As can be seen, along the marked two lines (lack of a temporal paradigm and non-inclusion in the affirmation / negation system), ONS, firstly, is opposed to both other one-part nominal sentences and verbal one-part sentences.

Based on our working definition of ONS, we will consider the following forms of their implementation to be nominative: 1. One-word expressions – Сумерки. Прохлада; 2. Common: Спящая тайга. Вечная мерзлота (В.Ажаев. Далеко от Москвы, ч.21); 3. Expressively painted: Молодчина! Экий подлец! 4. Expressions like Пожар!, Бомба! Танки! 5. Constructions representing an element of a complex sentence: Женщина, которая поет; мгновение, которое стоило жизни, etc.

This is not a classification of ONSs, but a range of forms for their implementation.

As we have already seen, ONSs of any form and structure are determined based on this category – the category of beingness (otherwise – existentiality). In the first chapter of the work, we noted the formation of a separate syntactic-semantic theory of the sentence, called the onomasiological theory of the sentence. We noted that this theory proceeds from the understanding that any sentence (with the meaning of the presence / absence of something, with the meaning of stating the actuality or virtuality, etc.) *“does not just name something, but also states that this something exists or, conversely, does not exist”*<sup>18</sup>.

The main, differentiating feature between the ONS and the names of books, institutions and other inscriptions on signboards is

---

<sup>18</sup> Лекант, П.А. Система именных односоставных предложений в современном русском языке // Ученые записки МОПИ им. Крупской, т.163, – вып.12, 1966, – с. 33.



that units such as «Тихий Дон», «Евгений Онегин», «Телеграф», «Детский мир», etc. coincide with ONS only in the form of the nominative case of the noun. The main function of these names is the name-indication "without the meaning of being" in its manifestation in which this meaning is formed in the ONS<sup>19</sup>. These names cannot even be included in the conditional paradigmatic system of a) temporary forms, b) according to the purpose of the statement (they cannot create interrogative or incentive forms if they initially represent "narrative" names), c) do not create negative forms if they are framed as "affirmative", etc.

The idea that *"the nominative representation is an expression of a weakly divided thought ..."* and it expresses a logical-psychological judgment does little to clarify the issue (ibid.), since in the syntactic theory there is no phenomenon of "weakly divided utterances", and it is in principle indefinable. A.M.Peshkovsky (he is the author of the designation "nominative representation") does not recognize a nominative sentence in the nominative representation, believing that this *"nominative does not denote either address, or existence, or active subject ..., no object qualifying another object, but only a reminder of the object, an idea of it"*<sup>20</sup>.

Indeed, the word «человек» ("man") in the position of a nominative representation (Человек! Это звучит гордо! М.Горький. На дне) can be an element of the previous remark in dialogic speech. The speaker excludes from the interlocutor's remark the element about which he expresses his opinion. But this element does not have independence (communicative), being just a link (even a repetition) between the two remarks of the interlocutors:

– Да ведь они *любят* друг друга...

– Любят говоришь... *Любовь!* Сколько лжи и лицемерия порой прикрывается *этим словом*. Сколько судеб искалечено им... (А.Куприн. Яма. гл.12).

---

<sup>19</sup> Современный русский язык / Под ред. В.А.Белошапковой. – Москва: Высшая школа, – 1981, – с. 73.

<sup>20</sup> Пешковский, А.М. Русский синтаксис в научном освещении. / А.Пешковский. – Москва: Учпедгиз, – 1956, – с. 175.

This element can be contextually prepositive or postpositive, but it necessarily has its pronominal substitute in the main utterance (человек is the word – это; любовь is the word им), which indicates that the derivation of this word is beyond the limits of the main statement serves as a linguo-psychological and stylistic device to focus the attention of the interlocutor precisely on this concept. Therefore, the nominative representation always appears in its dictionary meaning as a lexeme denoting something, but not reporting “something” about it.

III. Some scholars include units of speech etiquette, greetings as nominative sentences: Good afternoon, Good morning, etc. “These constructions, notes E.M.Galkina-Fedoruk, *“only outwardly coincide with the nominative ones. In fact, they refer (as an expression of wishes) to incentive proposals”*<sup>21</sup>.

Sentences of this type have their own specifics, firstly, in that they do not have the meaning of being, the existence of a fact, object, phenomenon: incentive sentences have an unreal meaning that can be realized or not realized. They are connected with virtual, conceivable reality. And, secondly, in these constructions, the object, the subject (Аварийный ход!, Картечь!, etc.) is presented not in the form of the nominative case, but, as can be seen from the texts, in the form of the accusative case: ... А операция идет своим чередом. – Вск, ножницы! Ток!<sup>22</sup>.

*The main provisions and materials of the second chapter are presented in the following publications author.*<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Галкина-Федорук, Е.М. Безличные предложения в современном русском языке / Е.Галкина-Федорук. – Москва: МГУ, – 1958, – с. 130.

<sup>22</sup> Галкина-Федорук, Е.М. Безличные предложения в современном русском языке / Е.Галкина-Федорук. – Москва: МГУ, – 1958, – с. 133.

<sup>23</sup> Халыгова, И.Р. Некоторые теоретические положения, связанные с определением места номинативных предложений в общей системе односоставных конструкций // – Украина: Науковий вісник кафедри ЮНЕСКО Київського національного лінгвістичного університету Філологія педагогіка психологія, - 2019. Вип. 38. – с.149-154.; Классификация односоставных номинативных предложений на базе системы речевых актов // – Bakı, Elm və təhsil, Filologiya məsələləri. AMEA M.Füzuli adına Əlyazmalar İnstitutu, – 2019. №11. – s.74-83.; Вопрос о конструкциях, по форме совпадающих с номинативными предложениями // Doktorant və gənc tədqiqatçıların XXIII Respublika elmi konfranslarının materialları, – Bakı, İnşaat və Memarlıq İnstitutu, – 03-04 dekabr, – 2019. II c. – s.185-187.

The third chapter is called **"Typological characteristics and classification of ONSs"**, which consists of two subchapters: "General remarks" and "Typological classifications of ONSs". The second subchapter includes nine sections: "Classification of the ONS on the basis of the dismemberment / non-dismemberment of the structure"; "Undivided ONS"; "Dismembered ONS"; "Classification of ONSs based on the system of speech acts"; "One-member nominative sentences-constatives with a descriptive meaning"; "ONS-constatives with affective meaning"; "ONS-constatives with demonstrative value"; "Class of ONS-qualifiers"; "The class of ONS-performatives".

Nominative sentences are considered undivided, in which the main member of the sentence is expressed as an isolated, independent noun. These are one-word ONSs: Княгиня, пари!.. за кого вы держите? (Л.Толстой. Анна Каренина, ч.2, гл.28); – Дикарь! – говорил он иногда вслух, вспоминая нищего (И.Бунин. Птицы небесные); Многоголосица! Именно многоголосица Питера... стала основным мотивом и признаком окружающей жизни (Б.Евсеев. Евстигней, гл.24); Дева Света! Где ты, донна Анна? / Анна! Анна! – Тишина (А.Блок. Шаги командора).

Historically established opinions about the ONS, as we have seen by examining the syntactic works, are concentrated around the complex of morphological and semantic features of these one-member sentences. Central in this complex are that a) the main member of the sentence in them is expressed by a noun in the form of the nominative case (hence the name "nominative" – from the Latin name of the nominative case of the noun "nominative"); b) the main member of the nominative sentence "combines the function of naming an object and the idea of its existence, being – static being"<sup>24</sup>; c) the dominant existential meaning differs in shades – demonstrative-existential, evaluative-existential, desirable-existential, etc.; d) ONSs are presented in the language-speech in their varieties: dissected, non-segmented, "complicated" by the range of specific particles, etc.; e) ONSs are "figures" of colloquial-dialogical units and special textual forms.

---

<sup>24</sup> Валгина, Н.С. Синтаксис современного русского языка / Н.Валгина. – Москва, Изд. 2-ое, – 1978, – с. 186.

All predicative categories – modality, time, person, space are, as it were, "*pressed*" in the material of the word-sentence uttered by the subject. This property of the undifferentiated ONS was noticed by A.M.Peshkovsky, "*... just such an addition entails the loss of that existential meaning that is felt with verbalness*"<sup>25</sup>. The above is confirmed by a comparison with another ONS, expressed by the same noun «дикарь»: Удивило и поразило его равнодушие молодой к нему, больному. «Зверь, дикарь!» – думал он и, вспоминая о свадьбе, злобно прибавлял: – И отлично! Так ей и надо!» (И.Бунин. Деревня, гл.3).

In this case, the ONS «Дикарь» has the meaning of "ruthlessness", the absolute indifference inherent in animals, as evidenced by the contact use of these words.

And if we take into account that, according to a big account, "*... and the verb names by predicating*"<sup>26</sup>, then it is quite logical to say the opposite: nouns also predicate by naming. And this will be the essential definition of the syntactic status of sentences like «Зима. Морозы трескучие. Ночь. Оловянный диск луны», etc.

These sentences are contrasted with undivided versions of the ONS in that at least two members of the sentence are distinguished in them – the main one (the nominative itself) and its distributor (the secondary member of the sentence):

1) – Михаил Кузьмич Антонов, прошу помнить! – предупредил он Самгина.

– Какой искусный актер, – подумал Самгин... (М.Горький. Жизнь Клима Самгина, ч.2).

Dissected ONSs are sometimes referred to as "common". But in both terminological notations, the essence of these ONSs is reduced to the possibility of highlighting in them another (or other) members of the sentence, except for the main one<sup>27</sup>.

---

<sup>25</sup> Пешковский, А.М. Русский синтаксис в научном освещении / А.Пешковский. – Москва: Учпедгиз, – 1956, – с. 174.

<sup>26</sup> Булгаков, С.Н. Философия имени / С.Булгаков. Изд. 2-ое. – Санкт-Петербург, Наука, – 2008, – с. 107.

<sup>27</sup> Валгина, Н.С. Синтаксис современного русского языка / Н.Валгина. – Москва, Изд. 2-ое, – 1978, – с. 189-190.

When it comes to dissected ONSs, all researchers unanimously note that these constructions are distributed only by the definitive member of the sentence (either agreed or inconsistent definition): Морозный день, конец декабря (М.Шолохов. Поднятая целина, гл.18).

ONS – constatives are units in which the value of the statement of being, existence is the purpose of this unit. Existential sentences affirm the presence, existence of a phenomenon, a fact, these are “*judgments of existence without complications with additional shades*”<sup>28</sup>. This type of ONS is basic among all varieties of nominative sentences both in terms of its frequency and the number of varieties.

To clarify the semantic structure of ONS-constatives, consider one example:

– Тятка! – крикнул детский голос. – А ведь это Каштанка!  
– Каштанка и есть! – подтвердил пьяненький, дребезжащий тенорок. – *Каштанка!* Федюшка, это, накажи бог, Каштанка! (А.Чехов. Каштанка, гл.7).

The example quite voluminously illustrates the implementation of syntactic synonymy in the relations of four units that are adequate in meaning: А ведь это Каштанка!; Каштанка и есть!; Каштанка! и ...это, накажи бог, Каштанка!

The sudden, unexpected appearance of a dog beloved by all is represented both by two-member constructions (there are three of them), and by a one-member nominative sentence «Каштанка!».

It is this semantic-functional similarity (even identity) that apparently made it possible to qualify ONSs as incomplete sentences in which the verb-predicate is allegedly omitted.

The very linguistic possibility of these forms testifies to the fact that a) ONS-constatives are basic units with wide possibilities of designing according to various models and modifications. Speaking about the basicity of models, we mean, first of all, the sphere of nominative sentences; b) ONS-constatives perform specific functions, due to their ability to combine predicative meanings with an emotionally expressive property (connotative meaning), which is

---

<sup>28</sup> Бабайцева, В.В. Односоставные предложения в современном русском языке. – Москва: Просвещение, – 1968, – с. 126.

formed by a special intonation; c) ONS-constatives are special forms of predicative expressions, characterized by a high degree of abstraction.

We think that in this regard, the authors of the "Russian Grammar" adhere to a more objective, purely syntactic (semantic-functional) principle of defining the ONS; they proceed from a) the expression of the predicative basis of the ONS (noun in the form of the nominative case), b) the lexical diversity of their content, c) the breadth of the semantic structure, which is based d) on the generalized meaning of being, existence (existential state). *The breadth of the semantic possibilities of the ONS makes it possible to use them "in different conditions ... in all spheres of the literary language"*<sup>29</sup>.

And, of course, not always in the form that is presented in the text, it is possible to establish the exact semantic purpose of the ONS, especially in cases where they are expressed by an "isolated" nominative noun.

The ONS of the negative form deserves special attention. These units are not recognized by all syntactic scholars.

In this regard, I would like to note one not entirely clear fact: the statement of something does not always correspond to its being, existence, and, conversely, a negative form, a negative nomination should not always be perceived as non-being, non-existence of a fact, property, phenomenon:

– Да и не говорит ничего вовсе. Ясное дело: *не француз, немец*, немой, стало быть. Зато, как надобно рисовать – малевать, немец ловко показывает (Б.Евсеев. Евстигней, гл.3. Compare: "Причина ясна: партизаны" from the previous list of examples.

According to the generally accepted definition of the ONS (especially of constatives), it turns out that the «немец» from the example is a one-member nominative sentence (just like «партизаны»), but «не француз» is not.

Such a position and such a qualification turn out to be unsteady at the very first stage of the analysis: after all, «не француз» represents an element of actualization – «не француз, а немец». Actualization in this case is complete, in opposition to both sides of the actualized element.

---

<sup>29</sup> Современный русский язык (в двух частях) / Под ред. Е.М.Галкиной-Федорук, Ч.П. Морфология и синтаксис. – Москва: Изд. МГУ, – 1964, – с. 358-360.

This, firstly, allows us to speak about the functional integrity of the construction «не француз, а немец», and secondly, that a one-member nominative sentence is not a single word «не француз», «немец», but the whole combination as a whole. These units are quite suitable for their qualification as ONSs, in which “the nominative case of the noun gives a resultative generalization of what has been said before” or the reason for the previous judgment is expressed<sup>30</sup>.

We are talking about such nominative sentences as *Пожар!*, *Авария!*, *Лавина!* (meaning “save yourself”), *Swamp!* etc.

“Sentences like *Зима. Мороз. Пожар*, expressing the presence of the named phenomena or objects at the present time, at the present moment, we recognized as one-member and, moreover, complete, since we have no reason to define them as broken two-member sentences – with the omission of one or another predicate,” wrote A.A.Shakhmatov<sup>31</sup>.

The study of the syntactic literature on this issue allows us to conclude that the characteristics of these sentences-exclamations are brought under the general scheme of analysis of all types of ONS-constatives. There is a general semantic-functional evaluation of the series *Ночь. Улица; Рассвет. Берег моря; Тишина. Опушка леса; Пожар! Беда!* etc. And it is argued that the main difference between the groups of this class of units is that one of them is close to two-member, having a potential paradigm (*Ночь; Рассвет...*) in time and inclination, while others are deprived of this possibility (*Боже, змея!; Лавина!*)<sup>32</sup>.

The impossibility of paradigmatic modifications for the latter is not their only difference. They have a number of specific characteristics. First of all, it is that units of the type *Пожар!; Змея! Самолет!* maximally concise, do not tend to spread – *страшный пожар!; большая змея!* etc. They are a kind of indicators of the general language trend of economy.

---

<sup>30</sup> Галкина-Федорук, Е.М. / Е.М.Галкина-Федорук, К.В.Горшкова, Н.М.Шанский. Современный русский язык. Синтаксис. – Москва: Учпедгиз, 1958, – с. 129.

<sup>31</sup> Шахматов А.А. Синтаксис русского языка. / А.Шахматов. – Ленинград: Учпедгиз, – 1941, – с. 51.

<sup>32</sup> Попова И.А. О «двусоставности» номинативных предложений // Исследования по современному русскому языку. Сб.ст. посвящ. Е.М.Галкиной-Федорук. – Москва: МГУ, – 1970, – с.178.

On the other hand, these ONS-constatives act as not only some message, but necessarily combine this communicative goal with other linguo-psychological connotations – a call for help, attracting the attention of others, a special form of expressing fear, danger or, conversely, delight, etc. This moment of the semantic volume of these sentences was very vividly described by G.Paul: “*So, for example, someone met a child on the street and sees that he is in danger; in this case, he will most likely confine himself to the exclamation-cry “Child!”*”, addressing this to the person who looks after the child”<sup>33</sup>.

To be more specific, these units represent special forms of verbal reaction to certain objects, which are represented not as objects, but as a psychological phenomenon that causes an affective reaction to it in the speaking subject. In this sense, these sentences are verbal, lexical analogues of interjections expressing a feeling of fear, delight, triumph, etc.: Прodelав еще несколько подобных неважных фокусов, незнакомец вдруг схватил себя за голову, изобразил на лице своем ужас и закричал: – Караул! Пожар! Горим! (А.Чехов. Каштанка).

We decided, on the basis of all that has been said, to designate these units as a category of ONS with the meaning of an affective nomination, expressed in notification, warning, call for help, emotional conclusion.

These are those nominative sentences in which the meaning of being-existence of something is realized through pointing to it. “The main meaning of the particle *сом* is in these sentences is an indication of something that is or is happening in the immediate vicinity or in general the presence of something,” the authors of the “Grammar of the Russian Language” note<sup>34</sup>.

ONSs of demonstrative semantics express broader semantic shades, their meaning cannot be reduced only to indicating the presence of a fact, a state. In these nominative sentences, “*the demonstrative meaning can be weakened and the meaning of the assessment (ironic, disapproving, etc.) comes to the fore*”, as well as

---

<sup>33</sup> Пауль, Герман. Принципы истории языка. – Москва: Иностранная литература, – 1960, – с. 153.

<sup>34</sup> Грамматика русского языка / Под ред. В.В.Виноградова, т.2, ч.2 (продолжение). – Москва: Наука, –1960, – с. 58.



*the meaning of negating the properties “of an object that seem naturally expected, for example: Вот вам и гуманность вся его; Да, вот тебе и правый суд»*<sup>35</sup>.

Among the noted units, two groups are clearly distinguished: 1. ONSs, in which the “lexical” semantics of particles here, out, etc. preserved, and they have the meaning of deictic (indicative) marking.

1) – Вот тебе и Америка... Тут много нужных зверей (А.Чехов. Мальчики).

2) ...С тех пор сей итальянец шкиперскую столицу невзлюбил. Теперь в подмосковной глуши в дивном спокойствии обретается... Вот и вся история (Б.Евсеев. Евстигней. гл.12).

There are numerous examples in which the indication is oriented towards the designation of an abstract concept, a fact that develops only within the limits of time. These concepts do not have a spatial characteristic:

1. Что же это такое? – ужаснулся он про себя. – Но ведь я же ее... люблю или нет? Вот задача-то! (А.Чехов. Верочка);

As our observations show, the phraseologized meaning is formed in those indicative ONSs that are formed according to the model of the actual phraseological units «Вот те (тебе) на!» или «Вот так штука».

In this regard, I would like to note one provision: phraseologized units containing elements Вот так or Вот тебе и, in the overwhelming majority, have a negative connotation (a shade of meaning) – either irony or disagreement with the state of affairs. Cf.: Вот тебе, бабушка, и Юрьев день! (пословица) = Как все изменилось за эти шесть-семь лет. Приказов стало больше. На всякое дело – приказ. Вот так царь! Все перевернул по-своему (В.Костылев. Иван грозный. ч.I, гл.2).

Thus, the so-called indicative constants of the ONS can be divided into three subclasses: 1. Properly indicative; 2. Indicative-evaluative and 3. Phraseological constructions that outwardly resemble demonstrative ONSs (“quasi-indicative” units).

---

<sup>35</sup> Валгина, Н.С. Синтаксис современного русского языка / Н.Валгина. – Москва, Изд. 2-ое, – 1978, – с. 187.

The units of all three subclasses are united by one more property: they are characterized by an uncommon design: Вот так денек!; Вот и утро; Вот тебе и сюрприз, etc. In rare cases, a circumstantial word is wedged into these constructions (again):

ONS – qualifications – are those nominative sentences in which the meaning of beingness, existence is complicated by the meaning of evaluation, qualification<sup>36</sup>. Such a complication turns out to be essential for the semantics of these units, since the meaning of being something is relegated to the background. The value of evaluation, the subjective qualification of the existence of some phenomenon or object, comes to the fore. Therefore, these sentences are almost always accompanied by an emotionally expressive intonation:

1. – Какое богатство! Подали лакеи большой кусок жареной баранины и миску с огурцами, потом принесли на сковороде жареного гуся, вареной свинины с хреном. (А.Чехов. Сапожник и нечистая сила). 2) – Ах, какая славная лошадь! У кого вы ее купили? (И.Тургенев. Дворянское гнездо. гл.3);

ONS-qualifiers have a set of properties that distinguish them from other types of nominative sentences: a) the basic meaning of beingness pushed aside by the meaning of qualification, i.e. assessments from the side of the speaking subject; b) the evaluative moment is always subjectively designated; the author's similar unit, in principle, is a rarity; c) an emotionally expressive form is characteristic of them; d) the predicative meaning is represented precisely by the “construction” of the assessment; e) the absolutization of this assessment (estimation) on the part of the subject of speech.

ONS-qualifiers are usually built according to the “какой + noun” model. The adjective – the pronoun “какой” in this model represents the meaning of the absolute negative or positive, i.e. enhances the substantive-existential meaning of the noun – the main member of the sentence, and acts as an intensifying particle, since it turns out to be deprived of its dictionary meaning of the interrogative

---

<sup>36</sup> Валгина, Н.С. Синтаксис современного русского языка / Н.Валгина. – Москва, Изд. 2-ое, – 1978, – с. 187.

word. Therefore, in some cases, in order to clarify, concretize the meaning of the particle “какой”, another adjective is included in the model – a word with a specific semantic relation to a noun:

– *Экая подлая натуришка!* – подумал я и промолчал (А.Писемский. Плотничья артель); – *Какой сказочный город!* – Идешь, идешь и вдруг... (М.Горький. Жизнь Клима Самгина, т.3).

A performative statement is a construction equal to itself; to say means the implementation of the action itself. Such, for example, «Клянусь богом!» (he said, so he swore), «Сукин сын!» (he said, it means cursing), «Добрый путь!» (said-pronounced, then the wish took place), etc.

Observations on the material of this series (see examples) allow us to think that units like «Дупак!», «Хвала!» (not in the sense of ascertaining the presence of praise from someone, but in the sense of “I praise you”), «Пастух!» etc. different from the "classical" ONS samples.

Therefore, these utterances have a slightly different purpose than regular ONS constatives or ONS qualifiers. Their purpose is a pragmatic goal (the basis of the meaning of speech acts).

The stable symbolism of performative ONSs is also expressed in the fact that, as a rule, both in semantics and in form they are associated with the form of the present tense and do not contain negation or modal words. “... *The action in these units unfolds simultaneously with the moment of speech*”<sup>37</sup>.

The implementation of the action at the moment of speech here, as can be seen from the examples, should be qualified as a single act of "action-speech", as conjugated components of a single verbal act.

– Че-естное слово! – запел Сережа, надавливая карандаш и нагибаясь к рисунку. – Че-естное слово!... (А.Чехов. Дома).

The construction «Честное слово!» in this case, it is a kind of oath («Клянусь, больше не буду курить»), the pronunciation of

---

<sup>37</sup> Богданов, В.В. Иллокутивная функция высказывания и перформативный глагол // Содержательные аспекты предложения и текста. – Калинин: КГУ, – 1983, – с. 28-29.

which is functionally equivalent to the content of the oath: I said «Честное слово!» – that he gave his word of honor – one and the same. This property of performative expressions is therefore called self-referentiality. The latter “manifests itself in the fact that the statement is both a linguistic fact, since it is pronounced, and a fact of reality, since it expresses an action, which becomes identical with a statement about an action. Such statements do not inform about any facts of reality that are independent of them, but create them themselves”<sup>38</sup>.

On the basis of the presence / absence of stable reproducibility, two groups are distinguished among ONS-performatives:

1) Phraseological constructions and 2) Constructions created depending on the structure of the situation (based on the figurative thinking of the speaker).

The group of phraseologized constructions includes traditionally stable structures with the meaning of scolding, cursing, swearing assurance or boasting (Сукин сын!; Подонок!; Мошенник!; Негодяй!; Сволочь!; Вот те крест!; Честное слово!; Слово офицера!; Молодчина!; Истинный бог!; Умница! и т.п.).

The group of situationally created units includes such as: Старый дурак!; Ослиная челюсть! Ослиный хвост! Собачья порода!; Гнилое отребье! Самозванец эдакий! Пьяная харя! Пьяная морда!; Прелестное создание!; Умница какая! etc.

ONS-performatives, in our opinion, should be defined (because of their absolute metaphORIZATION) as a set of ready-made predicative meanings that, to a much greater extent than direct ones, store an aesthetic emotional assessment ... Figurative meanings, metaphors are necessary not only as a result of the reflection of the world, but also as a model, a standard of such reflection.

---

<sup>38</sup> Романов, А.А. Прагматические особенности перформативных высказываний // Прагматика и семантика синтаксических единиц. – Калинин: КГУ, – 1984, – с. 88.

*The main provisions and materials of the third chapter are presented in the following publications author.*<sup>39</sup>

In conclusion, the main conclusions and generalizations arising from the content of the thesis are presented.

ONSs are included in the system of units representing “rhematic fragments” of the original two- or one-member syntactic constructions, which have the ability to thematic division. On this basis, we think, the class of constructively self-sufficient one-part sentences (definitely personal, indefinitely personal, generalized personal and impersonal) is contrasted with the class of actualized varieties of one-member sentences (infinitive, nominative, genitive).

This opposition of classes of one-member sentences in our work is illustrated, among other factors, by the fact that in the paremiophraseological system of the Russian language only models of constructive syntax units are presented. Units of actual syntax (infinitive, nominative, etc.) are not represented in this area. This once again confirms the degree of objectivity of one of our supporting positions.

In our work, we tried to determine the range of features that distinguish ONSs from adjacent constructions – from incomplete, elliptical sentences, as well as from those constructions whose

---

<sup>39</sup> Халыгова, И.Р. Типологическая характеристика и классификация односоставных номинативных предложений // – Москва: «МГИМО-Университет», Филологические науки в МГИМО, Односоставные номинативные предложения – констатиры с аффектным значением Культурология, искусствоведение и филология: современные взгляды и научные исследования // Сборник статей по материалам XXXVI научно-практической конференции, – Москва, – 2020. №5 (32). – s.105-108.; Односоставные номинативные предложения в системе речевых актов // «Azərbaycan şərqşünaslığı Şərq-Qərb elmi-mədəni və ictimai-siyasi dialoqu kontekstində» mövzusunda beynəlxalq elmi konfrans, – Bakı, BDU, – 14-15 dekabr, – 2022. – s.135-137.; Перформативные высказывания на базе системы речевых тактов // Ümummilli lider Heydər Əliyevin anadan olmasının 100 illiyinə həsr olunmuş “Azərbaycanşünaslığın aktual məsələləri (tədqiqat, elmi diskurs, beynəlmilləşmə)” mövzusunda XI Beynəlxalq elmi konfransın materialları, – Bakı, BSU, – 4-5 may, – 2023. – s.328-329.; О некоторых особенностях односоставных номинативных предложений-квалификативов // Белорусский государственный педагогический университет им. М.Танка. Язык и межкультурные коммуникации. Сборник научных статей, – Минск: – 2023, – с.455-459.

morphological nature resembles nominative sentences. These are the so-called nominative representations, headings, inscriptions on signs (the latter, as we already know, are included by some scientists in the class of ONS), words and combinations of speech etiquette, as well as isolated repetition words from the previous replica or context. ONSs have quite specific properties that distinguish them from the above-mentioned units.

So, ONSs are syntactic (predicative) one-member sentences with the main member of the sentence expressed by the original form of the noun or its equivalents; the semantics of these sentences is outlined by a circle of statement or indication of the existence of a phenomenon, a fact that can be qualified or performed by the speaking subject in a limited egocentric, spatio-temporal segment of speech; the modal specificity of ONSs is determined by the possibility of realizing their interrogative and negative forms. All these syntactical and semantic properties make ONS one of the most active formations that are widely used in various areas of Russian speech.

**The main positions and conclusions of the dissertation are set out in the following works of the author:**

1. Заметки по истории изучения односоставных номинативных предложений (ОНП) в языкознании // – Bakı: Humanitar elmlərin öyrənilməsinin aktual problemləri, – 2014. №4. – с.62-68.
2. Основные параметры системного анализа односоставных предложений в русском языке // – Bakı, BSU: Elmi əsərlər. – 2018, №1. – с.3-9.
3. Современное состояние изучения представления односоставных номинативных предложений // – Bakı: Dil və ədəbiyyat BDU. Beynəlxalq elmi-nəzəri jurnal.– 2018. №2 (106), – с. 37-40.
4. Некоторые теоретические положения, связанные с определением места номинативных предложений в общей системе односоставных конструкций // – Украина: Науковий вісник кафедри ЮНЕСКО Київського

- національного лінгвістичного університету Філологія педагогіка списхологія, – 2019. Вип. 38. – с.149-154.
5. Классификация односоставных номинативных предложений на базе системы речевых актов // – Bakı, Elm və təhsil, Filologiya məsələləri. AMEA M.Füzuli adına Əlyazmalar İnstitutu, – 2019. №11. – s.74-83.
  6. Вопрос о конструкциях, по форме совпадающих с номинативными предложениями // Doktorant və gənc tədqiqatçıların XXIII Respublika elmi konfranslarının materialları, – Bakı, İnşaat və Memarlıq İnstitutu, – 03-04 dekabr, – 2019. II c. – s.185-187.
  7. Типологическая характеристика и классификация односоставных номинативных предложений // – Москва: «МГИМО-Университет», Филологические науки в МГИМО, – 2020. № 1(21). – s.99-105.
  8. Односоставные номинативные предложения – констативы с аффектным значением Культурология, искусствоведение и филология: современные взгляды и научные исследования // Сборник статей по материалам XXXVI научно-практической конференции, – Москва, – 2020. №5 (32). – s.105-108.
  9. Односоставные номинативные предложения в системе речевых актов // «Azərbaycan şərqşünaslığı Şərq-Qərb elmi-mədəni və ictimai-siyasi dialoqu kontekstində» mövzusunda beynəlxalq elmi konfrans, – Bakı, BDU, – 14-15 dekabr, – 2022. – s.135-137.
  10. Перформативные высказывания на базе системы речевых тактов // Ümummilli lider Heydər Əliyevin anadan olmasının 100 illiyinə həsr olunmuş “Azərbaycanşünaslığın aktual məsələləri (tədqiqat, elmi diskurs, beynəlmilləşmə)” mövzusunda XI Beynəlxalq elmi konfransın materialları, – Bakı, BSU, – 4-5 may, – 2023. – s.328-329.
  11. О некоторых особенностях односоставных номинативных предложений-квалификативов // Белорусский государственный педагогический университет им.

М.Танка. Язык и межкультурные коммуникации. Сборник научных статей, – Минск: – 2023, – с.455-459.

12. Односоставные номинативные предложения – констати́вы с указательным значением // 33-я годовщина Комратского государственного университета. Наука. Образование. Культура. Международная научно-практическая конференция. Сборник статей, т.3. – Комрат: – 2024, – с.297-300.









The defense will be held on 29 October 2024 at 15:00 at the meeting of the Dissertation council ED 2.13 of Supreme Attestation Commission under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan operating at Baku Slavic University.

Address: AZ 1014, Baku, S.Rustam Street 33, Baku Slavic University

Dissertation is accessible at the Baku Slavic University Library.

Electronic version of the abstract is available on the official website of the Baku Slavic University.

Abstract was sent to the required addresses on 28 September 2024.

Signed for print: 18.04.2024

Paper format: A5

Volume: 45910 characters

Number of hard copies: 20