

O. A. Zhaboruke

(1949–2019)

Grand Doctor of Philology, Professor

I. A. Zhaboruke

Candidate of Philology (Ph.D),

Associate Professor at the Germanic Philology

and Methods of Foreign Languages Teaching Department

The state institution "South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University
named after K. D. Ushynsky"

Odesa, Ukraine

THE NOUN, THE SUBJECT, THE OBJECT (SPECIFICITY OF INTERRELATIONS)

Summary. *There is no single classification of parts of speech, no common understanding of the syntactic organization of Language. There is also no understanding between the interrelation between the "levels" of Language and, in particular, between such their "representatives" as the Noun and the Subject, the Verb and the Predicate, the Adjective and the Attribute, etc. In a word, the question about interrelations between parts of speech and members of the sentence has not been cleared up yet.*

It is our firm belief, that the solution should be searched in the notions "predication" and "predicativity", insofar as these notions are the focus of the very essence of the natural language, serving the chain by which it is connected with thinking, and through it – with objective reality. Only after viewing these "paired" units of Language through the prism of predication and predicativity, we can come closer to clarifying the nature of their interrelation.

The above analysis, is an attempt to show that Language is a complicated system of subsystems, dialectically interconnected. It is proved by the relationship of the morphological and syntactic levels of Language – the parts of speech and the members of the sentence, which, embodying the dialectical oppositions of matter itself – the unity of the general and the individual, abstract and concrete, static and flow character, provides, alongside with other linguistic means, "objective" reflection of the material world in the subtlest nuances and in all its most complicated manifestations.

Key words: *Language, syntactic organization of Language, "levels" of language, Syntax, Morphology, the Verb, the Noun, the Subject, the Predicate, the Object.*

Stating the problem. It is well-established that Language is an integral entity, in which every element is subordinated to the whole, and, at the same time it is interconnected with the other elements of the system. However, the principles of its structure and functioning remain unclear yet.

Thus, up to now there is no single classification of parts of speech, no common understanding of the syntactic organization of Language. There is also no understanding between the interrelation between the "levels" of Language and, in particular, between such their "representatives" as the Noun and the Subject, the Verb and the Predicate, the Adjective and the Attribute, etc. In a word, the question about interrelations between parts of speech and members of the sentence has not been cleared up yet.

Analysis of the Existing Viewpoints. Modern linguistics offers two main approaches to addressing this problem.

According to the first approach represented by Traditional Syntax, the interrelations between parts of speech and members of the sentence are built on the ground of isomorphism. Wherein, in revealing the essence of the latter, the moment of juxtaposition is emphasized. The noun is opposable to the Subject, the Verb – to the Predicate, the Adjective – to the Attribute, etc. being the units of different "levels" which cannot be mixed up in practice of analysis.

The other approach, inherent to such trends of modern linguistics as generativizm, descriptivizm, and oth. does not recognize division into morphological and syntactical subsystems at all and treats them under the common name "Syntax". As for such notions as the Noun and the Subject, the Verb and the Predicate, the Adjective and the Attribute, such unifying terms as "nominative", "verbal", "adjectival" phrases (NP,VP,AP) are used instead. As we see, unlike the traditional syntax, this approach accentuates the unifying and not the adversarial point.

But more recently, however, mostly in foreign linguistics, the so called “compromise” approach is being spread. It goes about the, so called, “mixed-type grammars” [5, p. 8], particularly, A University Grammar of English by R. Quirk et al [11]. Communicative Grammar of English by G. Leech and J.A. Svartvik [10]. In them, by a neat expression of V. I. Yartseva, the tendency “to unite, wherever possible, form and function” [ibid.] can be traced.

In this respect, the so called “theory of syntaxemes” by G.O. Zolotova deserves special attention. This theory is nothing more but an attempt of the author to create a superlevel language unit – a syntaxeme, and, therefore, to clarify the problem of language structure and functioning [3;4], the basis being the traditional Morphology and Syntax in connection with semantics of cases.

The Authors’ Approach. And what is the actual relation between the Noun and the Subject, the Verb and the Predicate, the Adjective and the Attribute?

It is our firm belief, that the solution should be searched in the notions “predication” and “predicativity”, insofar as these notions are the focus of the very essence of the natural language, serving the chain by which it is connected with thinking, and through it – with objective reality. Only after viewing these “paired” units of the language through the prism of predication and predicativity, we can come closer to clarifying the nature of their interrelations. Especially as, the Subject and the Object are immediate components of the structure of predication, and the Noun is the part of speech which in the process of speaking is realized in these syntactic functions.

Let us begin with our first “morphological-syntactic pair”: the Noun – the Subject. It is well known that at the very beginning of formation of the natural language, the perception of the surrounding world by a primitive man was non-dispersed, integral. This worldview was realized in the process of sound communication of our ancestors between themselves – in exclamations, utterances, which reflected certain impressions of the surrounding world, encouragement to common actions, etc.

The outlook of the primitive man, that is the outlook at the level of images corresponds to predicativeness – the synthesis of subjective and objective in general.

But gradually in the process of its development, the brain of a human being begins to realize the heterogeneity of matter, extracting from it that part of it which was the most available for observation. Most probable, those were the substantial components of matter – separate objects, things, since they possess relative duration of existence in time. They are also the most noticeable to the human eye and tangible. As a result of this process which took place at the level of subconscious, the first nominations appear – “the ancestor words”. They already have more or less distinct sound form, are remembered by the community and passed to the following generations. It is likely that “the ancestor words” denoted some concrete things and Nouns “objects of everyday life, or surrounding nature. In other words, a class of– “ancestor nouns” appeared. They functioned in language as “ancestor utterances” alongside with utterance-interjections, undecipherable encouraging utterances, etc. Gradually, “the ancestor words” of substantial meaning become an organic part of the slurred utterances but are heard as more or less distinct in their sound form and meaning independent units, which makes them more intelligible for other people. So gradually in utterances appears the contour of the Subject, and namely, the utterance begins to get structured. Hence the conclusion: the “ancestor Noun” is the very same “ancestor Subject” but realized in the process of speech. The second stage of development of Language and Speech caused by the fact that people had the ability of abstract thinking. Observing the surrounding world, and in particular, some subconsciously selected objects of the material world, the primitive man begins to realize their common features, their belonging to the same class of units. It means that the concept of substantiality begins to form in his brain. Of course it could not but reflect on the language. “Ancestor words” with the meaning of substantiality are now understood as a class of homogeneous units, which is expressed in the first attempts of their morphological framing. The evidence of existence of the concept of substantiality lies in the fact that this class of language units is being constantly replenished with nominations the analogues of which do not exist in nature: (various idols, representatives of the so called “hostile power”, etc.). It is significant that morphologically they were modeled after the existing units with the meaning of substantiality.

The formation of other concepts, like concepts of such “attributes of matter”, as specificity of its being in time, its properties followed the concept of substantiality. It means that man begins to think in the abstract in the fullest sense of the word, that is to make a “cross-sections” of various properties of matter, not just substantiality, memorize them and give them names. Thus, new words of abstract meanings appear in language. Some part of them is rethought from the aspect of substantiality, and, accordingly, formalized in a similar way with already existing class of words of substantive meaning.

A sort of apotheosis of abstract thinking was emerging of the structure of predication within the bounds of predicativity. This process became possible as a result of realization by man the existence of matter (the component of substantiality) in time. The structure of predication whose essence lies in a specific “binding” of the concept of substantiality to the “time line” is, actually, nothing more, but conceptual analogue of the *process* of the objective world, that is the structure of the Universe proper. And if so, then it is the means of its *conceptualization (understanding)*, concentration of what and how man thinks about the surrounding world. In other words, the structure of predication is the *bearer of thought* [2:92-100]. Thus, the notion of predication began to include not only realization of reality on the level of images (historically the first stage of reflection), but also on the level of thoughts with the help of the structure of predication – the highest, the most perfect stage (phase) of reflection.

The structure of predication, though being the nucleus of the utterance, its sense-bearing centre, is not reflected in Language yet, as is not corresponding logical predication.

But the reflection on the level of the developed abstract thinking, is connected with understanding of various manifestations of the material world, implies not only the process of its analysis (differentiations), and is accompanied by the process of its synthesizing. It could not but cause a “conflict” between the limited possibilities of language means of expression and the infinity and uniqueness of the surrounding world, which man has already begun to realize and tries to express verbally.

The way out of this “deadlock” was found by language with the support of still the same thinking. We will try to show this process on the example of the class of units of substantive meaning (Nouns).

As we have already noted, this class, increasing in number fully responded to requests of thinking (as well as speech) of ancient man. In an “ancestor utterance” it played the part of “ancestor Subject”, pointing to this or that object of the surrounding world. But at some stage it becomes not enough. People begin to bestow indicators of substantiality on the whole fragments of objective reality and, sometimes, on the processes, the processes which are impossible to express in one word, being of a flow character and reflecting not so the natural logic but individual peculiarities of perception nature by Man.

The means of expressing it was found in abstraction from the lexical meaning of Nouns and in using in the speech process only the grammatical characteristics of the latter. In parallel with thinking Language brings into operation the mechanism of operations of “algebraic” character on the utterances, so that any stretch of speech (phrase, sentence, etc.) may be rethought as a substantial element x , and as such – be included into another utterance.

In the process of speech this stretch is modeled after the Noun – according to its morphological and syntactic indicators. There are many examples of it in various languages. Let us give a few examples: “*What the girls of her sort want is just a wedding ring*”[6:32]. “*Perhaps this what’s-his-name will provide the cocoa*” [8:228].

So, the Noun and the Subject are the notions, dialectically interconnected with each other. Thus, the ancestor Noun emerges out of non-dispersed utterance (predicativity), the Subject – an element of the structure of predication – is developed from the class of nouns by abstracting the lexical meaning of the latter.

Common to both notions is the fact that on the level of thinking they correlate with the concept of substantiality, while the Noun – correlates with the concepts, already established, accepted by the whole Language community (they are kept in memory and fixed in certain nominations), while the Subject reflects the process of thinking itself – spontaneous formation of the concept of “substantiality” under pressure of certain circumstances or real life.

Based on the above indicators, the Noun may be defined as a class of language units, which act as a lexical and grammatical means of expressing the established, conventional notion of “substantiality”. As for *the Subject* – it is a speech unit, which serves a grammatical means of expression of spontaneous, running concept of “substantiality”, as a subject of thought. *The Object* is also a grammatical means of expressing spontaneous concept of “substantiality”, but, unlike the Subject it acts as a complement (the closer) of the thought.

The difference between the Subject and the Object lies in the relative “weight” which the substantial components of propositions are endowed by our brain in the processes-relationships. The most significant, “meaningful” from the point of view of perception of Man, the substantial component acts as a subject of thinking (thought).

Speaking figuratively, this component is a sort of “cornerstone” of thought, for it is refracted through the prism of time, it is the specificity of its existence that is revealed by means of the Predicate. In a proposition this substantial component is full-faced, and in a sentence it takes shape of the Nominative case.

As for the Object, in a proposition, it correlates with “substance”, whose role is confined to conveying the specificity of existence of the main substance, embodied in the subject of a proposition. The specificity

of its existence in time is characterized as being in a certain relation with another substance. In other words, the Object semantically “finishes” the process of relationship. The minor, background role of a component of the proposition which corresponds to the Object is manifested in the fact that the specificity of its existence in the proposition is not determined. This substance cannot be projected on the time-line, its existence in time arises from the fact that it is being in certain relations with the main substance. The specificity of this, so to say, “secondary substance of a proposition” finds its expression in Language as well. It can be compared to the actions of a man who is turning some subject in different sides while processing it, so, in a proposition, the human brain, is imitating real forms of communication with the surrounding world, and presents “the substance- object” towards “the substance- subject” in various aspects, depending on the specificity of existence of the latter. In Language it corresponds to one of indirect cases.

Thus, the notions “the Noun”, “the Subject” and “the Object” have a common ontological, and, consequently, logical nature. They are united by the notion “substantiality”, they differ in representing this notion in Language, considering the dialectic character of its contradictions – in such oppositional subsystems of Language as Morphology (static subsystem) and Syntax (dynamic subsystem), and also, in such types of it as, an “established, conventional character” of perception as running, individual.

In a word, the notions “the Noun”, “the Subject” and “the Object” are dialectically interconnected, both from the point of view of their historic development, as well as in the plane of synchronic cross-section of Language (Speech). The fact, that schoolchildren and, sometimes, students perceive these notions as such, is an evidence of “substantial” common between these notions. They often mix up the Noun and the Subject (or Object). The common “substantial” nature of these notions was not ignored by the linguists. This idea was clearly expressed by G. Zolotova, who defines the Subject as: «the Subject of the sentence ...is syntactically independent “substantial” component of a Subject – Predicate structure which denotes the bearer of a predicative indication. This definition means the integrity and mutual conditionality of semantic, syntactic and morphological signs of the subject, implies expressing it by means of a Noun with the meaning of “substantiality”» [3, p. 133–134]. In expressing her view, she refers to G.Lions and O. Potebnya [ibid.]. The definitions of B. Ilyish are close in meaning to this one. These notions are linked through the word “thing”(an object) with which, as the author sees it, they correlate in the real life [9, p. 28, 199, 211].

However, most linguists attribute such property as “substantiality” only to the Noun, which is defined either as a substance in the broadest sense of this word [8, p. 14], or by means of a list of particular “substances”, which it may express (names of things, places, living beings, materials, processes, states, properties, etc. [6, p. 180]. As for the Subject or the Object, their relationship with the concept of “substantiality” remains unnoticed, or intentionally ignored. The most typical definition of the Subject is, in particular, defining it as an independent part of the sentence, with which agree in number and person.[8, p. 225; 7, p. 30]. The substantial character of the Object is also “hidden”.

But no matter how much the authors of the grammar manuals were reluctant to admit it, no matter how precautionary they were, they could not but avoid the substantial nature of these parts of the sentence. This fact manifests itself in other parts of the grammar books, particularly in the definitions of the Predicate and the category of Voice. Thus, defining the Predicate, V.L. Kaushanskaya et al. point to the fact that this part of the sentence expresses action, state and property of a *person* or a *thing* which is denoted as the Subject [8, p. 229]. In the definitions of active and passive voice *the Subject* can denote a *thing* or a *person* [ibid. p. 82]. N.A. Kobrina et al., in their definition of voice, also mention the ability of the Subject to express a *person* or a *non-person*, that is a *thing*.

The above mentioned authors, though subconsciously, recognize the relationship of the concept of “substantiality”(a “thing” or a “person” in their terminology) with not only the Noun but also dialectically connected with its members of the sentence – the Subject and the Object. The relations analogous to those of the Noun, the Subject and the Object can be traced in the relationship of the Adjective and the Attribute. Similar to the Noun, the Adjective is a lexical and grammatical device. It expresses the established, conventional concept of “property”.

The Attribute similarly to the Subject and the Object is purely grammatical, and speech means which serves for the spontaneous, running concept of property. It should be noted that the Noun and the Adjective which serve as lexical and grammatical means of corresponding concepts, are kept in memory of a certain language community irrespective of a concrete substance. As for the Subject, Object and Attribute, they are being formed spontaneously in the process of speaking, and, only grammatical sets of their presentation are fixed in memory. There is, as we see it, a very interesting regularity in the relationship of the parts of speech

and the members of the sentence: the more specified on the Language level is this or that means (“cohesion” of lexical and grammatical components is proper, as it is known, to parts of speech) the less flexible, which means less “concrete” it is on the speech level, and vice versa, the more a language tool abstracts itself (is detached) from vocabulary, the more free, more “concrete” it conveys in speech all the nuances of perception of the surrounding world by man.

Summing up the above analysis, we should note that Language is a complicated system of subsystems, dialectically interconnected. It is proved by the relationship of the morphological and syntactic levels of Language – the parts of speech and the members of the sentence, which, embodying the dialectical oppositions of matter itself – the unity of the general and the individual, abstract and concrete, static and running (flow character), provides, alongside with other linguistic means, “objective” reflection of the material world in the subtlest nuances and in all its most complicated manifestations.

REFERENCES

1. Галкина-Федорук Е.М. Суждение и предложение. М., 1956. 76 с.
2. Жаборюк О.А. Категорія стану в сучасній англійській мові та індоєвропейський синтаксичний процес. Одеса, 1998. 208 с.
3. Золотова Г.А. Коммуникативные аспекты русского синтаксиса. М., 1982. 368 стр.
4. Золотова Г.А. Синтаксический словарь. Репертуар элементарных единиц русского синтаксиса. М. 1988. 439 с.
5. Ярцева В.И. Предисловие. R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik. A University Grammar of English. М., 1982. 4 p.
6. An English Grammar. Morphology / N.A. Kobrina, E.A. Korneyeva, M.I. Ossovskaya, K.A. Guzeyeva. М., 1985. 287 p.
7. An English Grammar. Syntax / N.A. Kobrina, E.A. Korneyeva, M.I. Ossovskaya, K.A. Guzeyeva. М., 1986. 159 p.
8. A Grammar of the English Language / В.Л. Каушанская, Р.Л. Ковнер, Щ.Р. Кожевникова и др. Л., 1967. 319 p.
9. Пыш В.А. The Structure of Modern English. 2-е изд. Л., 1971. 378 p.
10. Leech G., Svartvik J. A Communicative Grammar of English. М., 1983. 303 p.
11. A University Grammar of English. R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik. М., 1982. 390 p.

О. А. Жаборюк, **І. А. Жаборюк. Іменник, підмет і додаток (особливості взаємовідношень).** – *Стаття.*

Анотація. *Не існує єдиної класифікації частин мови, як і не існує загального розуміння синтаксичної організації мови. Не існує і ясності щодо питання про взаємовідношення між «рівнями» мови і, зокрема, про взаємовідношення між такими їх «репрезентантами», які в традиційній термінології іменуються іменник та підмет, дієслово та присудок, прикметник та означення тощо. Одним словом, немає ясності в питанні про співвідношення між окремими частинами мови та членами речення.*

За нашим глибоким переконанням рішення проблеми треба шукати в поняттях «предикація» та «предикативність», адже саме ці поняття фокусують у собі саму сутність природної мови, слугуючи ланцюжком, яким вона поєднується з мисленням, а через нього і з об'єктивним світом. Лише пропустивши досліджувані «парні» частини мови і речення крізь призму предикації та предикативності, ми зможемо наблизитися до з'ясування сутності їх взаємовідношення. Тим більше, що підмет та додаток є безпосередніми складовими структури предикації, а іменник є саме тією частиною мови, яка в процесі мовлення реалізується в цих синтаксичних функціях.

Підсумовуючи аналіз, відзначимо, що мова – це складна система підсистем, діалектично взаємопов'язаних між собою. Свідченням цього є взаємовідношення між одиницями морфологічного та синтаксичного рівнів мови – частинами мови та членами речення, яке, уособлюючи в собі діалектику суперечностей самої матерії – єдність загального і окремого, абстрактного і конкретного, сталого і плінного, забезпечує, разом з іншими засобами мови, «об'єктивне» віддзеркалення матеріального світу в усіх його найскладніших виявах, найтонших нюансах.

Ключові слова: *мова, синтаксична організація мови, «рівні» мови, синтаксис, морфологія, дієслово, іменник, підмет, присудок, додаток.*

Е. А. Жаборюк, **И. А. Жаборюк. Существительное, подлежащее и дополнение (специфика взаимоотношений).** – *Статья.*

Аннотация. *Не существует единой классификации частей речи, как не существует общего понимания синтаксической организации языка. Нет и ясности в вопросе о взаимоотношении между «уровнями» языка и, в частности, о взаимоотношениях между такими их «репрезентантами», которые в традиционной терминологии именуются подлежащее и сказуемое, прилагательное и т.д.*

По нашему глубокому убеждению решение проблемы следует искать в понятиях «предикация» и «предикативность», ведь именно эти понятия фокусируют в себе самую суть естественного языка, будучи цепочкой, которая соединяет его с мышлением, а посредством его и с объективной реальностью. Лишь пропустив «парные» части речи и предложения сквозь призму предикации и предикативности, мы сможем приблизиться к выяснению

сущності їх взаємотношення. Тем більше, що подлежащее и дополнение являются непосредственными составными структурами предикации, а существительное именно той частью речи, которая в процессе говорения реализуется в этих синтаксических функциях. Подытоживая анализ, отметим, что язык – это сложная система подсистем диалектически связанных между собой. Свидетельством этого является взаимоотношение между единицами морфологического и синтаксического уровней языка – частями речи и членами предложения, которое, воплощая в себе диалектику противоречий самой материи – единство общего и отдельного, абстрактного и конкретного, постоянного и изменчивого, обеспечивает, вместе с другими средствами языка, «объективное» отражение материального мира во всех его сложнейших проявленных, тончайших нюансах.

Ключевые слова: язык, синтаксическая организация языка, «уровни» языка, синтаксис, морфология, глагол, существительное, подлежащее, сказуемое, дополнение.

УДК 81'373.46:665.6

В. В. Жигулін

магістр гр. ГФ 311м

Національний університет «Запорізька політехніка»

м. Запоріжжя, Україна

І. В. Кузнєцова

доцент кафедри теорії та практики перекладу

Національний університет «Запорізька політехніка»

м. Запоріжжя, Україна

ІСТОРІЯ РОЗВИТКУ АНГЛОМОВНОЇ НАФТОГАЗОВОЇ ТЕРМІНОЛОГІЇ

Анотація. У статті розглядається проблема еволюції англomовної нафтогазової термінології. Установлюються п'ять основних періодів розвитку нафтогазової промисловості в цьому процесі згідно з класифікацією Р. Форсета. Вважається, що кожен період відповідає появі термінів у мові, досліджується вплив соціальних, культурних, економічних факторів на розвиток нафтогазової термінології. Аналізується підготовчий етап формування нафтогазової терміносистеми, який почався набагато раніше ніж перший. Наголошується на необхідності аналізу для систематизації термінів цієї галузі, створення чіткої терміносистеми та встановлення закономірностей та специфіки розвитку.

Доведено, що англomовна нафтогазова терміносистема побудована за гетерогенною моделлю, тобто є результатом взаємодії кількох галузей людського знання, що є причиною появи великої кількості міжгалузевих термінів. Однією з особливостей нафтогазової термінології є велика кількість метафор. Здатність метафори висвітлювати нові аспекти змісту звичних понять допомагає розкрити сутність нового наукового явища. Зазначається, що поповнення нафтогазової термінології відбувається одночасно з розвитком науково-технічної думки і, як наслідок, появою нових способів та технологічних прийомів нафтогазової промисловості. Доведено, що з'ясування загальних і специфічних закономірностей організації терміносистеми нафтогазової промисловості на різних етапах становлення, аналіз процесів творення термінів, дослідження їхнього складу з погляду походження допоможе при впорядкуванні всієї терміносистеми, її стандартизації, дозволить прогнозувати тенденції подальшого розвитку, водночас сприятиме досягненню належного рівня мовного забезпечення нафтогазової промисловості, виділити зв'язки з іншими терміносистемами.

Ключові слова: термін, терміносистема, нафтогазова термінологія, етапи розвитку, метафоричні терміни, запозичення, міжгалузеві терміни, терміни-фразеологізми.

Нафтогазова галузь як галузь наукового знання впродовж останніх років дозволяє сучасній цивілізації розвиватися наростаючими темпами. Розвиток нафтогазової справи в другій половині ХХ-го століття спричинив посилення ролі термінології практично у всіх аспектах її використання. На розвиток термінології вплинули також і різні внутрішньомовні та лінгвістичні процеси, у результаті чого відбулася інтернаціоналізація та гармонізація терміносистем, з'явилися багатокомпонентні термінологічні словосполучення, скорочення. Вивчення місця спеціальної лексики в нафтогазовій галузі стає все більш важливим для розвитку мови. Питанням дослідження сутності цієї термінології, її лінгвістичної природи було присвячено чимало праць відомих українських та іноземних авторів, серед яких виділяють розвідки І. В. Гошовської, О. Гриша, С. О. Царук, О. В. Подвойської, Х. Ліу та інших.