

SUBJECT-OBJECT DETERMINERS IN THE SEMANTIC ASPECT OF THE MODERN UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE

Суб'єктно-об'єктні детермінанти у семантичному аспекті у сучасній українській мові

Oksana Heina

Candidate of Philological Sciences (PhD), Assistant Professor
Odesa National Economic University, Ukraine

E-mail: geyna-oksana@hotmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4754-2600

Researcher ID: H-9062-2018

Introduction.

In the content aspect of the sentence, as a communicative unit, the connection between language and thinking is clearly expressed. This causes, when studying the content aspect of the sentence, on the one hand, the appeal to the concepts of logic, and on the other hand, the correlation of linguistic categories with the facts of extralinguistic reality. The concept of the «substantive facet of the proposal is very broad». The content of the sentence not only reflects the connection of language to thinking and reality, but it also intersects and interacts with nominative, communicative, expressive, and other functions [Zaghnitko, 2014].

1. Communicative functions of subject-object determiners.

The process of forming a sentence begins with the speaker's desire to communicate some thought to a real or potential interlocutor. The speaker selects for this «the structural scheme of the sentence they need, determined by the degree of articulation of thought, fill this scheme with the necessary vocabulary and actualize one or another structural-semantic component of the sentence (one or more)» [Zaghnitko, 2014]. Therefore, a special position in the hierarchy of aspects of the sentence is occupied by the communicative one. The purpose of the

statement determines the choice of the functional type of the sentence, that is the planned realization of certain semantic components. Thus, the communicative aspect illuminates the very first stage of thought formation and accompanies all stages of sentence formation, it influences «the formation of structural and especially semantic properties of the sentence» [Zaghnitko, 2014] and is reflected in its actual division.

The theory of actual division as a special area of linguistic research emerged in the 1920s and 1930s 20th century, although many of the theses taken as a basis for the study of this phenomenon were put forward by F. I. Buslaev, F. F. Fortunatov, A. Weil, Sh. Bally and others.

Modern researchers most often relate the history of the formation of the views underlying the theory of actual division to the work of A. Weil «Word order in ancient languages compared to modern ones» [Weil, 1869]. The idea of a binary semantic division of the sentence, expressed by A. Weil, later became fundamental for a significant part of the work on actual division, however, the semantic elements into which a sentence is divided are defined differently by different researchers. Most often these are theme / rheme, given / new, known / unknown, definite / indefinite, psychological subject / psychological predicate, semantic subject / semantic predicate, defined / defining, presupposition / assertion, subjectum / dictum, topic / focus, topic / comment, and some others.

Czechoslovak linguists V. Mathesius, Fr. Travnicek and V. Ertl contributed significantly to the formation of the modern sentence division as a separate field of investigation. The term «actual division» belongs to V. Mathesius. He also suggested a binary division of the sentence into the «basis» and the «nucleus» and considered the interaction of these elements as a «functional (communicative) perspective of the sentence». According to the concept of Mathesius, what is known, or at least can be easily understood in a given situation, and what the speaker bases on is expressed by the theme (basis), and the rheme (nucleus) expresses what the speaker reports about the basis of the utterance. The theme, according to Mathesius, does not convey new information but is mainly a necessary element in the connection of the sentence with the content [Balli, 1955]. However, as noted in the Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary, «Mathesius's thesis on the obligatory clarity of the topic is weak, because the theme and rheme have only a lexical verbal meaning, and information is created by their dynamic combination, by the entire proposition. The topic is often determined by the content of the preceding sentence. However a previously unmentioned denotation can also serve as a theme, and a denotation that has been mentioned, but used

predicatively, as something that is stated about the theme, can turn out to be a rheme» [Zaghnitko, 2014].

There are several theories of communicative division based on the concept of the heterogeneity of the object under study.

V. Mathesius outlined the distinction between «given» / «new», on the one hand, and what he called the basis and nucleus, on the other, that is, «the starting point of the message and what the author of the speech says with these points» [Balli, 1955]. However, such a distinction is not made consistently, and later V. Mathesius abandons it. Apparently, «Mathesius considered the opposition of the initial and subsequent as purely formal, essential only for the «linking» of the text» [Zaghnitko, 2014].

In the works of other representatives of the Prague school, namely E. Benes and F. Danesh, a meaningful interpretation of the relationship between the initial and the subsequent is outlined. In general, these concepts are not defined but are explained with examples. Thus, interpreting the sentence «Prague is the capital of Czechoslovakia», E. Benesh writes that here a certain property «to be the capital of Czechoslovakia» is attributed to its bearer. On the contrary, in the sentence «the capital of Czechoslovakia is Prague» the bearer of the property is attributed to the property. Hence, «the relationship between «known / new» and «theme / rheme» was not quite clearly revealed. In addition, the unification of the oppositions «theme / rheme» and «given / new» was facilitated by the fact that F. Danesh still connects the concept of rheme with the expression of the new: the rhematic group, in his opinion, necessarily includes the new, although the theme can also express both the new and known information» [Zaghnitko, 2014].

Probably, as a result of all this, the offered meaningful interpretation of the relationship between the initial and the subsequent remained virtually unnoticed by other researchers. Thereby, M. Halliday does not at all consider those meaningful connections that exist between the initial and the subsequent, although probably it is in his works that the suggestion about the existence of two different phenomena described by the oppositions «theme / rheme» and «given / new» is most consistently put forward. The second opposition constitutes the informative structure of the utterance. This distinction is also accepted by J. Lyons, who at the same time did not necessarily connect the idea of the theme with the first position in the statement [Zaghnitko, 2014].

A description of this issue can also be found in I. I. Kovtunova. The terms «given» and «new» are often used in the same sense as theme and rheme. However, if these words are given a literal meaning, that is, if by «given» it is

understood something known from the immediate context or suggested by the context, and by «new» something new, not mentioned in the previous context, then it is easy to find that the concepts of «theme» and «rheme» do not coincide with the concepts of «given» and «new» [Vejl', 1869].

In practice, the theme often denotes the given, and the rheme denotes the new, but it is necessary to take into account all possible cases of discrepancy between these categories, since «the concept of the theme is in one respect wider than the concept of «given», in the other respect it is narrower» [Vejl', 1869].

«Given» is something known from the consituation, named in a previous context, or predetermined by the consituation. For example: *U mori kolo selyshcha lezhyt' velykyy hranitnyy valun. Na n'omu shche davno rybalky vysikly napys: «Na z-hadku vsim zahyblym u mori» (L. Riznyk); Staryy nezadovolenyy kit. Yomu nichym ne mozhna dohodyty (B. Sushyns'kyy).*

In practice, the theme of an utterance very often denotes the given. But it must be considered that the theme of the statement can also be unknown, new to the reader or listener. The beginning of the narration, a chapter, or a paragraph is often new, and for some authors, entire passages of the text are constructed in such a way that the theme of each sentence denotes the new.

On the other hand, the concept of the theme is a narrower concept than the concept of the given. The elements of the given in a sentence in some cases play an essential role in its actual division, although in other cases they turn out to be indifferent to the actual division. For example, the elements of the given, being dependent components of the phrase that makes up the rheme, may not play any role in the actual division, since the rheme as a whole contains a new part of the message: *YA z tsikavisty podyvyvsya na n'oho zi svoeyi zasidky (V. Solohub).* Consequently, the role of the given in the actual division depends on the place of the elements of the given in the syntactic structure of the sentence.

The rheme can completely denote the given. For example, the composition of an utterance can be given or known, and the communicative purpose of the utterance is only to confirm or deny an already known fact.

For the communicative task of each statement, first of all, the specific relationship that is established in it between what is being said (rheme) is important. But what is being said need not necessarily be known, and what is said need not necessarily be unknown. In the strict sense of the word, the relation between theme and rheme in every utterance is new. It is this attitude that constitutes the communicative goal of the utterance. Therefore, in itself, the rheme can mean something not new.

Thus, a theme does not always coincide with the given, and a rheme with the new. «Between these concepts, there is an almost frequent correspondence, but not a fundamental identity» [Vejl', 1869].

The given and novelty are reflected in the lexical composition of the sentence. There are special categories of words expressing the given – personal and demonstrative pronouns, proper names, and common nouns that name a specific individual or object.

In this study, the actual division of a sentence is understood as «the division of a sentence in the context into the original part of the message – the theme (given) and what is asserted about it – the rheme (new)» [Zaghnitko, 2014].

The theme is the subject of the message. The second part of the statement, containing what is reported about the topic, the rheme, «contains the main content of the message and is the communicative center of the statement» [Vejl', 1869].

The rheme as a communicative center of an utterance must necessarily be expressed in a sentence. A sentence without a rheme is not possible. The theme that is denoting the given may in some cases be omitted [Vejl', 1869]. In the Ukrainian language, there is a type of statements with a «zero» theme – so-called «undivided» statements.

The actual division is made out by a different word order. The meaning of the sentence and its communicative purpose turns out to be different with a different word order. The nature of the question to which the sentence answers clearly reveals this semantic difference, or, in other words, the difference in the actual division of the sentence.

It follows that the word order in the Ukrainian literary language serves to express the actual division of the sentence. The relation between word order to actual division is the relation between form and function. Therefore, it is necessary to study these two types of phenomena in close connection with each other. The direct order the *theme* – **the rheme** prevails and is called progressive, objective, non-emphatic. The reverse order, that is **the rheme** – *the theme*, is called regressive, subjective, emphatic, although the latter is not always determined by the targets of emphasis.

The placement of determiners, as well as the location of the main parts of the sentence – the subject and the predicate, obeys the rules dictated by the laws of the actual division of the sentence.

I. In objective word order:

1. Subject-object determiner – the theme is in the first place, before the rheme. For example: *U bat'kivs'komu domi zalyshylas' atmosfera hostynnosti ta*

pryvitnosti (O. Zyma); *U yoho slovakh* vyrazno zvuchav i inshyy zmist, vid yakoho Mariyu obdavalu sukhym zharom (R. Fedoriv); *U moyemu zhytti* buv dyvnyy period (R. Fedoriv); *Sered nykh* bulo bahato znayomykh oblych, lyudey vidomykh ne til'ky meni (N. Kovalyk); *U vsikh* svoiy sprav (N. Kovalyk); *Meni* stalo teplo ta spokiyne (N. Kovalyk); *Cherez tse u nas* kil'ka dniv shla raspriya, vyhrav Toshka pari chy ni (O. Zyma); *Yiy* potribna robota spokiyna, tvorcha, z tykhoyu radistyu (O. Zyma).

If the speaker reports what event occurs under given, known circumstances (that is, in a given place, at a given time, under certain conditions, etc.), then the actual division of the sentence is as follows: the theme – a subject-object determiner, the rheme – a predicate or predicate + subject.

The word order in these sentences is as follows: determiner – predicate + (subject).

The predicate together with the subject constitute an indivisible rhematic complex that indicates some integral fact, event. The predicate in such a rheme necessarily precedes the subject, as in undivided statements. For example: *U vukhakh* pochavsya dzvin (O. Zyma); *Na hlazakh* z'yavyl's' sl'ozy (O. Honchar); *U moyiy kroyi* teche haryacha struya (R. Fedoriv); *U nas* sklalysya dobri stosunky (YU. Shcherbak); *U n'oho* bula svoya istoriya (N. Omel'chenko); *Tsiy istyni Dzhona Dona* trysta rokiv (L. Riznyk); *U domi titky Hrani* skoro z'yavylasya zhyvnyist' (L. Zabashta); *Vid n'oho* nezminno vykhodyly duzhe aktyvni robochi toky (R. Fedoriv); *Meni* stalo yakos' niyakovo, i ya pishla zasmuchena. (N. Omel'chenko); *Tobi tak* lychyt' odyah kozaka (L. Zabashta).

Actual division scheme:

determiner – **predicate** + (**subject**)

theme *rheme*

If in sentences with an initial determiner reporting what happened under given circumstances (under given conditions) or in relation to a given subject, the subject is expressed by the indefinite pronoun *someone* or *something*, then the determiner is not followed by the «predicate + subject» group, as usual, but this is a pronominal subject + predicate. For example: *Za stinoyu* khtos' zaspivav (B. Sushyns'kyi); *Znyzu* shchos' hromykhnuło (R. Ivanychuk); *Za toboyu* khtos' pryshov (YU. Shcherbak); *Za mene* khtos' vidpoviv (N. Kovalyk); *U susidniy kimnati* khtos' chytav virshi (R. Ivanychuk); *U Tetyany* khtos' z'yavyvsya (L. V. Zabashta); *V sertsy* shchos' kol'nulo (N. Kovalyk).

The preposition of the subject – an indefinite pronoun in relation to the predicate in an undivided complex, conveying information about a holistic event,

fact, is explained by the fact that an indefinite pronoun is not very informative. Sometimes it is absolutely eliminated, and then there arises a series of two statements that have a different grammatical structure, but perform the same communicative task – to tell what event takes place in given, certain conditions (or in relation to a given subject). For example: *Za stinoyu khtos' zaspivav* (K. Motrych). – *Za stinoyu zaspivaly*; *Znyzu shchos' hrokhnulo* (YU. Shcherbak). – *Znyzu hrokhnulo*; *Za toboyu khtos' pryshov* (N. Okolitenko). – *Za toboyu pryshly*; *Za mene khtos' vidpoviv* (L. Zabashta). – *Za mene vidpovily*; *U susidniy kimnati khtos' chytav virshi* (N. Kovalyk). – *Za susidnim stolykom chytaly virshi*; *V sertsy shchos' kol'nulo* (N. Kovalyk). – *V sertsy kol'nulo*.

2. A subject-object determiner may be the first part of a complex theme (or the first theme), if the second part (the second theme) is either a subject or a subject-object determiner that indicates the person or the subject being reported. For example: *Dlya mene slovo Antona Petrovycha zavzhdy bulo zakonom* (N. Omel'chenko); *Pro vse vin hovoryv po-svoyemu i tak, shcho tse zapam'yatovuvalos' na vse zhyttya* (L. Riznyk); *V sertsy shchos' vorukhnulos' i obirvalosya vazhkym tyaharem* (N. Kovalyk).

The sentence is divided into a complex theme and a rheme if the theme of the message is a person (object) included in any setting or situation, and the purpose of the statement is to report what happens to this person (object) in this situation (under certain conditions). The complex theme (in essence, to themes can be discussed) includes not only an indication of the situation (conditions, time, place, etc.), but also the name of the subject of a speech or the sign barrier. Consequently, when the subject is located after the determiner that begins the sentence, this subject necessarily acts as a topic, and the message about the action, state or attribute of this object or person becomes the rheme. The actual division in these cases is as follows: the determiner together with the subject (or the second determiner) constitutes a complex topic, and the predicate is a rheme.

The word order is as follows: determiner + subject (second determiner) – predicate. For example: *Z velykymy nachal'nykamy Karpu Ivanovychu hovoryty ne dovodylosya* (YU. Shcherbak); *Nishcho tut ne nahaduvalo pro Aziyu, i vid ts'oho meni bulo chomus' lehshe pysaty pro neyi* (B. Sushyns'kyi); *Vid tsiyeyi kartyny Karpu Ivanovychu stavalo nudno* (YU. Shcherbak); *Éks-pilotu Losevu tsi yamy podobalys', i shche, smishno komus' pryznatysya, podobalys' atraktsiony u vyhlyadi «virazhiv» ta inshoho* (I. Nemirovych); *Spochatku meni robota davalasya z trudom* (V. Chukhlib); *Meni tse ne spodobalos'* (V. Chukhlib). *U sertsy motyv vzhe brynyt'* (L. Zabashta); *A to u sertsy znenavyst' pala*, i ya svit za ochi pishla b

kudys' po svitu, shchob ne zitknulasya lyuds'ka khvala dushi moyeï (*L. Zabashta*).

With this word order, personal pronouns or proper names very often act as the subject. This is due to the fact that the subject of speech or object (the sign bearer) is already known to the speaker, and often to the addressee of the speech, has already been named before or became known from the situation.

Actual division scheme:

determiner + subject – **predicate**

theme1 theme2 **rheme**

Let's compare two sentences:

1) *Pered zasidannyyam kafedry zatelefonuvav Bekhtin* (*YU. Shcherbak*);

2) *Pered zasidannyyam kafedry Bekhtin zatelefonuvav*.

In the first sentence, the word order scheme according to the actual division is as follows: determiner – predicate + subject.

In the second sentence, the scheme of actual division and word order is different: determiner + subject – predicate.

A different word order forms a different actual division according to the different target setting of the speaker: in the first case, he reports *what happened* before the meeting of the department, and in the second, *what Vekhtin did* before the meeting of the department. Therefore, both sentences given here are true, but for different situations, in other words, the context in which these sentences can be found will be different, for example: 1) [YA zbyravsyia na zasidannyya kafedry] *Pered zasidannyyam kafedry podzvonyv Bekhtin*; 2) [Uchora my pro vse domovylys' z Bekhtynym ta vyrishyly zustrytysya, ale] *pered zasidannyyam kafedry Bekhtin podzvonyv*.

It is the context, characterizing the situation of using a particular sentence, that determines the variant of the actual division and word order that should be used by the speaker (writer).

3. Subject-object determiner – rheme is postpositive in relation to the theme. For example: *Bil'she ne zustrytysya nam z nym* (*N. Omel'chenko*); *I vlovyv yakus' nizhnu dyvnist' u yiyi pohlyadi* (*N. Omel'chenko*); *Vin hlyanuv na mene morozno-kholodno, i ya pobachyv myttyevyy spalakh nenavysti y pohordy v yoho ochakh* (*R. Ivanychuk*).

If the speaker (writer) wants to clarify any fact by pointing to the person with whom the action takes place, his place, reason, time of implementation, etc., then the actual division of sentences is as follows: the entire composition of the sentence, excluding one of the determiners is a theme and contains an already known fact, and this determiner is a rheme, it reports the main information as a

clarification of this fact.

The word order in such sentences is characterized by the fact that the determiner, which acts as a rheme, is always at the end of the sentence. For example: *Pry ts'omu spohadi shchos' nepryyazno zavorushylos' u yoho dushi, i vin raptom zrozumiv: yoho nepokoyit' rozmova z odnokashnykom* (V. Solohub); *Zalyshayet'sya vse, shcho bulo svyato dlya nashykh didiv, dlya nas* (K. Motrych); *Cholovik tsey zdavsya znayomym Karpu Yvanovychu* (V. Solohub); *Vydno zhinky ydut' za mors'koyu klasyfikatsiyeyu u tebe* (V. Yavorivs'kyi); *Nastya potyahnulasya rukoyu, shchob pohladyty syna po holovi, yak zavzhdy tse robyla v khvylynu prymyrennya, ta Mykola vidsakhnuvsya vid materi y vidchuv nezrozumilyy pekuchyy bil' v hrudyakh* (O. Zyma).

Actual division scheme:

The whole composition of the sentence, excluding determinative member	this determinative member
<i>theme</i>	rheme

Since the theme in sentences of this type usually consists of several parts of the sentence, it is possible to rearrange them within the theme, always keeping the final position behind the determiner, which is a rheme. The communicative meaning of the statement does not change, although the stylistic coloring may change. For example: *I vlovyy yakus' nizhnu dyvynu u yiyi pohlyadi* (V. Solohub). – *I yakus' nizhnu dyvynu vlovyy u yiyi pohlyadi*; *Vin hlyanuv na mene morozno-kholodno, i ya pobachyv myttyevyy spalakh nenavysti y pohordy v yoho ochakh* (R. Ivanychuk). – *Myttyevyy spalakh nenavysti i pohordy pobachyv ya v yoho ochakh*.

The sentences described in this section can be complicated by a prepositive determiner as part of a theme. For example: *Meni daly mistse u saloni na oblizlomu kleyonchatomu dyvani* (N. Omel'chenko); *Pislya rozmovy z synom vidlyahlo na dushi* (R. Fedoriv); *Vchora tsi dumky shche krutyls' u holovi* (YU. Shcherbak); *Til'ky vrantsi polehshalo na dushi* (N. Kovalyk).

II. The subjective word order (inversion) occurs when the logically consistent, «objective» development of thought from the initial to the reported, that is, from the theme to the rheme, is violated [Vintoniv & Bajurova, 2020].

Word order can be broken in two ways:

1. The direct order is reversed, where the rheme precedes the topic. Schematically, the reverse word order can be represented as follows: R – T.

Sentences built according to the scheme:

Determiner – **predicate + subject**

theme **rheme**

Reverse word order will be represented by the following options:

1) **predicate + subject** – determiner

rheme theme

For example: *Ale zalyshylas' bil' u samomu sertsy* (O. Honchar); *Utvoryuyet'sya atmosfera blahopoluchchya u neblahopoluchnykh sim'yakh* (YU. Shcherbak); *Vysokhly sl'ozy na shchokakh* (N. Kovalyk); *Z'yavyls' sl'ozy na ochakh* (N. Kovalyk).

2) **subject + predicate** – determiner

rheme theme

For example: *Tse bulo nayvazhchym dlya n'oho* (L. Riznyk); *Vony oznachayut' bezmezno bahato dlya mene* (N. Okolitenko); *Talanovyta molod' pryshla u nashi teatry* (O. Honchar); *Strashna dumka spalakhnula u moyemu mozku* (N. Omel'chenko); *Tryvozhe khvylyuvannya poshyrylos' po vs'omu domu* (V. Solohub); *Novi idei vzhe roilysia v holovi* (O. Honchar).

In one-member sentences, with the reverse arrangement of the components of the actual division, the preposition of the main member and the postposition of the determiner can be observed. For example: *Duzhe pohano bulo Karpu Ivanovychu* (YU. Shcherbak); *Sumno bulo vdoma* (V. Solohub); *Tosklyvo yakos' na dushi* (L. Riznyk); *Tyazhko na sertsy* (I. Nemyrovych); *Shumyt' u holovi* (O. Honchar); *Soromno pered lyud'my Serhiyu* (N. Kovalyk).

Inverted word order can also occur when the theme and rheme do not change places, but the predicate + subject sequence in the rheme is violated.

Schematic of this option:

determiner – **subject + predicate**

theme **rheme**

For example: *U n'oho ruky tremtily* (B. Sushyns'kyi) (Porivnyayemo: *U n'oho tremtily ruky*); *U nykh shchoky byly zalipeni snihom* (YU. Shcherbak); *U mene ochi zakryvayut'sya* (N. Omel'chenko); *U mene druh z'yavyvsya* (K. Motrych); *U mene zhyttya ne sklalos'* (R. Fedoriv); *Hlukho khrusnuly suhloby, do lytsya krov prylynula i ozvalasya davkym bolem u skronyakh* (N. Kovalyk).

Inversion gives these statements the expression of colloquialism.

In sentences that are built according to the scheme:

the entire lexical composition of a sentence, besides some secondary determinative member – **determinative secondary member**

theme **rheme**

the reverse word order occurs when the rheme is transferred to the beginning of the sentence. The secondary member – the rheme – is emphasized by emphatic stress.

Compare: [Kudy vy pospishayete?]

a) – *My pospishayemo na zbory* (L. Riznyk). (The word order is objective, direct; the statement is stylistically neutral);

б) – *Na zbory pospishayemo*. (The word order is inverted, reverse; the statement is expressive).

2. Direct word order changes to distant, in which parts of one component of the actual division (parts of the theme or part of the rheme) are separated from each other by the second component of the actual division. Schematically, the distant word order can be denoted as follows: R – T – R.

Setting the determiner – the theme – in the middle of the sentence creates an inverted word order with a distant location of the components of the rheme, for example: *Pal'tsi u n'oho tremtily* (N. Omel'chenko); *Koalitsiyi na kafedri khoch i vynykaly ta pomyrally ne kozhnoho dnya, ale protses transformatsiyi buv permanentnym, tobto bezperervnym* (V. Solohub); *Ale til'ky maynula u n'oho dumka pro tse, vin z usiyeyu rishuchisty pohnav dumku het'* (V. Yavorivs'kyi); *A inodi, ne ziznayuchys' sama sobi, kolysala v dushi zazdryst'* (N. Kovalyk); *Nu, ta khto yoho znaye, shcho lyudyna v dushi nosyt'!* (N. Kovalyk).

As a result of the research on subject-object determiners in the communicative aspect, it was found out that these units in the process of actual division in the objective word order can act as the theme, occupying a preposition in relation to the rheme expressed by a predicate or an indivisible complex predicate + subject. Also, the subject-object determiner can be the first theme, together with the subject (or the second determiner) – the second theme – a complex topic and be in preposition next to the predicate – the rheme. The subject-object determiner can act both as a rheme and be in a post-position.

In the subjective word order, the subject-object determiner in the role of the theme occupies the postposition, while the determiner – the rheme is in the preposition.

Setting the determiner – the theme in the middle of the sentence also creates an inverse word order with a distant location of the components of the rheme.

Apparently, the location of the determining members can be considered normal not only at the beginning, but also in the middle, and at the end of the sentence. However, such positions are atypical for this type of sentence. The analysis of the factual material shows that the vast majority of cases where the

determinative member is located at the absolute beginning of a sentence. The initial position is stylistically unmarked, not related to the actualizing of certain speech segments or a special communicative purpose. However, the determiner can change its place «under the influence of the rules of word order, which are determined by the actual division of the sentence» [Vojcekhovska, 1969: 158].

Thus, the characteristic and predominant position of subject-object determiners in the modern Ukrainian language is the position at the absolute beginning of a sentence. The main communicative function of the studied units is their use as a theme.

2. The role of subject-object determiners in the modal-nominative plan of expression.

One can notice the similarity between the phenomena of the actual division of the sentence and the *modus-dictum*. However, in our opinion, they cannot be unified. The theme and rheme reflect the communicative essence of verbal communication, they represent the starting point of the statement, that is, what is known in a given situation (theme), and the nucleus of the statement, that is, what the speaker reports about the basis of the statement (rheme). The division of the statement into *dictum* and *modus* is based on a comparison of objective and subjective meanings [Ghrozjan, 2018].

The specificity of the sentence as the main syntactic unit is manifested in the complex of obligatory subjective meanings in which the communicative intention is realized and the attitude of the speaker to the fragment of reality displayed in the sentence is conveyed. The speaker, first of all, actualizes the objective content conveyed in the sentence, that is, «binds» it to the situation of speech, and also fills the sentence with other obligatory subjective meanings.

Modus and *dictum* require consideration «directly in terms of nominative derivation, that is, the nomination of an event, fact or situation of reality in close connection with the process of grammatical structuring» [Danesh, 1964]. The analysis of *modus* and *dictum* in the structure of a sentence through the prism of the communicative activity of speakers is directly related to the theory of syntactic nomination.

When determining the informative-referential content of a sentence, it is necessary to take into account the role of subjective-pragmatic factors associated with the personality of the speaker. It is «through the communicative-pragmatic

intentions of the speaker on a generalized representation of the actual object of speech that the meaning of identifying or characterizing this object is projected on the part of the speaker» [Danesh, 1964]. Thus, in the content of the sentence, two plans of expression are formed – nominative-representative (dictum) and modal-communicative (modus), which have different, but at the same time correlated ways of expression in the language.

Taking into account all of the above, it is considered appropriate to designate the modus / dictum division of the statement as a **modal-nominative aspect**.

The analysis of modus and dictum in the structure of a sentence «makes it possible to gain a deeper understanding of the originality of their systemic organization, to determine the features of grammatical semantics, potential, functional and stylistic possibilities» [Danesh, 1964].

In the linguistic interpretation, the term «modus» has undergone many changes, Sh. Bally himself did not clearly define the essence of this concept, but limited its structure to two components – a modal verb (thoughts, the expression of will, sensory perception) and a modal subject [Ghrozjan, 2018]. This has led to conflicting interpretations of the term. So, in the concepts of N. D. Arutyunova and T. B. Alisova, modus is used to denote subjective-modal or modal-evaluative values [Zaghnitko, 2014]. O. V. Trunova, going by the meaning of the word «modus» in Latin, considers it primarily a way of introducing modality into a sentence. The interpretation of the mode by E. Benvenist is interesting. According to his concept, the whole complex of subjective relations of the phenomenon reflected in the sentence to reality is defined as modus [Zaghnitko, 2014].

T. V. Shmeleva interprets modus as «a complex of such subjective meanings that the speaker can and must express when entering into one or another mode of communication and becoming the author of statements built according to the laws of a given language» [Lajonz, 1978].

Most researchers believe that the concept of mode combines a fairly large range of meanings, the common feature of which is subjectivity: the focus is on the speaker and his attitude to what is being discussed in the sentence.

The expression of the dictum is based on the content similarity of correlative forms with differences in the method of nomination, structuring the content. At the same time, it is very important to take into account the communicative-pragmatic intentions of the speaker, given that the meaning of a language unit, «sign information» is made up of «meaningful, stylistic, expressive and configurative features» [Ghrozjan, 2018].

Covering the dictum in the semantic structure of a sentence «requires that

three main aspects to be taken into account:

- significative, the meaning of a linguistic sign as a unit of nomination;
- referential, meaning that is acquired in the context of speech;
- communicative-pragmatic meaning, which is added to the main propositive meaning» [Zaghnitko, 2014].

The first aspect is related to the concept of dictum, which reflects the general meaning of the sentence (its conceptual base). The second aspect combines the semantic analysis of the sentence with the situation of speech, the context and the referential correlation of its parts. In the communicative-pragmatic aspect, such phenomena as the purpose of the message, communicative tasks, the intentions of the speaker, actual division, etc. are considered. Therefore, «when analyzing the dictum in the semantic structure of a sentence, it is necessary to take into account semantic factors, formal means, and pragmatic ones that provide a communicative act» [Danes, 1964].

The dictum relations in the sentence are established as a result of the variable linguistic semantic interpretation of conceptual categories (referents). Hence, «dictum forms the informative-referential content of the sentence and is a constructive carrier of objective meanings, a reflection of objective reality» [Danesh, 1964].

In linguistics, dictum is most often called that part of the sentence that conveys the main content of the message [Ghrozjan, 2018; Matezius, 1967; Zaghnitko, 2001].

The syntactic distinction between *modus* and *dictum* was proposed by N. D. Arutyunova. Analyzing proposals «*Dumayu, shcho vzhe pizno*» she notes that its main part is *modus*, and the subordinate part is *dictum* [Matezius, 1967]. The dictum in a certain way refers to reality, that is, it contains a certain modality, which is most often called objective.

Similar observations are presented by L. Y. Maksimov, who, comparing sentences, notes that «In the first case, the combination «*Vin dumav pro pohodu*» and «*Vin dumav, shcho zavtra bude harna pohoda*», expresses an objective attitude», while in the second one «the main part, which correlates with the subordinate clause, gives a modal characteristic to the message in the subordinate clause» [Zaghnitko, 2014].

M. I. Cheremisina and T. O. Kolosova define dictum «as the main message, the referent of which is the state of affairs in the reality that is expressed in speech» [Rusanivskyj, 1988].

Exploring the semantic-syntactic structure of the sentence in the modern

Ukrainian language, A. P. Zagnitko believes that the dictum is the nominative aspect of the sentence [Zagnitko, 2014].

In modern linguistics, certain ideas have developed that make it possible to assess the theoretical significance of the dictum in the structure of a sentence. The concept of content, semantics, and meaning of a sentence is quite broad. It is necessary to single out that part of the meaning from it, which Sh. Bally called dictum and «which it is convenient for a modern linguist to call nominative, considering that its purpose is the nomination of a certain fragment of reality» [Danesh, 1964].

The representative content of the sentence is «the main (denotative) content of the sentence, the essence of which is the nomination, the representation of the relation of the reported to a specific referent of the reality, the subject of thought, etc. Dictum is qualified as a nominative-representative unit of syntax» [Danesh, 1964].

Semantic-syntactic categories of dictum are heterogeneous in nature. They are divided into two groups: predicate categories of dictum and substantial categories of dictum. Substantial categories «transmit the meaning of real objectivity. They are distinguished on the basis of substantial relation of substantial syntaxes to the corresponding class of predicates» [Danesh, 1964].

Statements containing explicit modus categories, according to N. I. Bolshakova, should be divided according to semantics and syntactic structure into constructions **de re** and **de dicto** [Zagnitko, 2014].

There is no explicit division of the utterance into modus and dictum parts in **de re** constructions [Seliverstova, 1976]. Statements with the **de dicto** structure are «modus-dictum» constructions, in which the explicit modus appears independently and attaches the dictum to itself. In this regard, V. D. Shinkaruk notes that «in the analysis of the modal-communicative aspect of the utterance, scientists distinguish a different number of modus categories («operations» or «transformations»). In addition, the dictum part can, in turn, undergo transformations, so it is sometimes difficult to separate the transformation that belongs to the dictum from the one that concerns the mode» [Danesh, 1964]. Differences can be generated by the linguistic material used by the researcher, but more often by different grammatical concepts of the authors.

Let us consider the functioning of subject-object determiners as part of these structures.

I. Subject-object determiners as part of the **de re** construction:

Meni *duzhe podobayet'sya pivnich* (N. Kovalyk); Materi *podobalas' robota*

syna (O. Honchar); Yikh dyplomatychna vytonchenist' Serhiyevi navit' troshky podobalas' svoeyu nevynnisty (R. Ivanchuk); Yomu duzhe spodobalas' tsia tsyfra (N. Omel'chenko); Serhiyu zrazu spodobalys' yiyi ochi (R. Ivanchuk); Ne sudzhenno tobi, kraso, vesillya (L. Zabashta); Yiy khochet'sya moloden'koho (I. Nemyrovych).

II. Subject-object determiners as part of the **de dicto** construction:

1. As part of the modus part:

Meni stalo lehshe zhyty u ts'omu sviti (B. Sushyns'kyi); **Yomu bulo zruchno** maty taku blahorodnu, blahoprystoynu, peresichnu zovnishnist' (V. Yavorivs'kyi); *I dyvyty's' yomu v ochi **meni bulo vazhko** (V. Chukhlib); **Veselo meni znaty**, shcho my vyyshly z lisu, chy z'yavyl's' iz suhroba, abo vynykly z doshchu (M. Omel'chenko); **Meni tsikavo bulo** povernutysya do nashoyi superechky, i ya rada s'ohodni vidchuty u n'omu shchos' zhyve ta horyache (V. Solohub); **Ale meni podobayet'sya** zaymatysya domashnimy spravamy (O. Honchar); **Meni podobalos'** rozbyvaty kryhu, dostavaty tsi zamerzli lystya ta prynosyty yikh dodomu (N. Kovalyk); **Meni tak khochet'sya** chymos' dopomohty vam (I. Nemyrovych); **Meni shche khochet'sya** dyvytysya na perelyvy tsykh farb (YU. Shcherbak); **Meni khochet'sya** plakaty vid ts'oho zvuku i tykho smiyatysya u vidpovid', i v prirvu klyche mene solodka muka, yakiy nazvy nemaye (N. Okolitenko); **A v mene takyy nastriy** – yarmarkuvaty y hrishmy ne skupyt'sya (O. Zyma); **Andriyevi stalo yasno:** Maksym pishov na polyuvannya (N. Kovalyk); **Mykoli kortilo** zaraz zbihaty do hrushky, polokhnuty vepriv abo malykh smuhastykh porosyatok (O. Zyma).*

2. As part of the dictum part:

YA rozumiyu, shcho u zhinok zaraz bahato problem (R. Fedoriv); **Naspravdi**, khovaty bulo nichoho, i yomu nabrydlo lovyty na sobi spivchutlyvi pohlyady (M. Omel'chenko); **YA znay**, shcho u Korneyeva ye til'ky prizvyshche (L. Riznyk); **Zvisno**, u nas buly napysani za tsi roky harni i navit' prekrasni virshi (YU. Shcherbak); **Nazhal'**, do 35 rokiv u mene z'yavyvsya dostatniy zhytlyevyy dosvid, shcho ne zavzhdy skladavsya z pryemnykh vlasnykh perezhyvan' (V. Yavorivs'kyi); **YA rozumiyu**: u vas hirshi umovy (YU. Shcherbak); **Lessinh mav ratsiyu**, lyudyam vlastyvo pomylyatysya (R. Ivanychuk).

As follows from the analysis of the presented material, subject-object determiners actively function in sentences that are both **de dicto** constructions and **de re** constructions.

At the present stage of development of syntactic science, the subject is qualified mainly as a semantic-syntactic unit of a sentence (a component of the semantic-syntactic structure of a sentence). It plays an important role in the content

organization of the sentence. Its main proper semantic (associated with the extralinguistic world) function is to identify the object of reality in question [Zaghnitko, 2014].

The subjective syntaxeme is a necessary component of the semantic-syntactic structure of a simple sentence. It, together with the predicate, forms all types of sentences. The subjective syntaxeme has various forms of expression and can act both as a dependent component of a phrase and as a determiner.

In the constructions ***de re*** and ***de dicto***, when using a determiner in the modus part of a statement, the subject-object determiner plays the role of a subject that specifies the doer of the predicative feature and participates in the formation of the semantic-syntactic structure of a certain type of sentence. In the ***de dicto*** structure, when the subject-object determiner functions in its dictum part, it acts as a substantive category of the dictum.

Some modern researchers also associate dictum with the concept of valency. This concept was introduced into Western European linguistics by the French linguist L. Tenier to denote the compatibility of a verb and defined it as the number of actants that a verb can attach. He distinguished between verbs avalent, monovalent, bivalent, trivalent.

Such a qualification brings the concept of valence closer to the concept used in the logic of predicates, about one-place, two-place, three-place predicates and is connected with the verbocentric theory of the sentence.

As known, in the history of linguistics there were three theories of the hierarchy of sentence parts (and, accordingly, parts of speech). According to the first of them, which supporters were, for example, O. Jespersen and G. Guillaume, the subject in the sentence and the noun are the absolutely dominant members among the parts of speech. This point of view finds endorsement in the logic of concepts: the name denotes the substance, while the verb and adjective denote display matter, signs of the substance and, therefore, are called upon to determine the name. The second point of view, the most common in the grammatical tradition, assumes the equality of the two main parts of the sentence – the subject and the predicate. This point of view is also supported logically, but already by the logic of the judgment: the two main members of the judgment – the subject and the predicate – in the structure of the sentence correspond to two main mutually complementary parts. L. Tenier adheres to the third, verbocentric theory, according to which the verb (predicate) is the absolutely dominant member of the sentence. This concept focuses on the communicative aspect of the sentence: the primacy of the predicate is emphasized by the fact that it is the carrier of

predicative categories (time, modality, etc.) and acts as the organizing node of the sentence: other members of the sentence are related through the verb – subjects, objects, adverbial modifiers). The verbocentric view of syntax was developed even before L. Tenier. But L. Tenier made the leading principle of his syntactic theory out of the verbocentric concept. Substantiating it, L. Tenier emphasized that it has the advantage over the traditional subject-predicate theory, that the latter is a logical theory, while verbocentric theory is purely linguistic. However, according to V. G. Gak, this is not entirely true. «The verbocentric concept also finds a logical justification, but not in subject-predicate logic, but in the logic of relations, according to which the center of the statement is a predicate that establishes relations between substantive members dependent on it – arguments, according to the formula aRb. The logic of relations, which has been developed since the end of the 19th century, has taken a significant place in syntactic studies, opposing not the components of the judgment – the subject and the predicate, but the components of the structure of the situation with which the judgment is correlated – the substance and the relationship between them» [Ten'er, 1988]. By equating the subject with other actants, L. Tenier went too far, and most syntactic concepts do not share this extreme verbocentrism. For a number of reasons, the subject cannot be equated with other actants; it is the initial element of the thought that is framed by a sentence.

The theory of valence has been adopted by modern linguistics. In particular, the question of obligatory and optional valency began to be developed: here the theory of valency joined with the problem of strong and weak control, developed in Ukrainian syntactic science, with the problem of determiners.

The concept of L. Tenier reflects the oral activity of the speakers. He distinguishes between structural and linear (formal) word order in the speech chain, he is the first who defines the relationship between words, their interdependence. Linear order is inevitably one-dimensional, structural order is multidimensional. «To speak means to transform the structural order into a linear one, to understand speech means to do the opposite» [Ten'er, 1988].

Three aspects interact in the organization of sentences: the form of expression (morphology, the formal word order that make up «the clothes of thought»), the form of content (structural syntax that displays hierarchical relationships between words; L. Tenier compares it with the internal form of language by W. Humboldt), the substance of content is semantics in the proper sense of the word. The first two aspects form the structure of the language, semantics remains outside of it and must be studied by logic and psychology.

In the work of L. Tenier, the sentence is presented as a «verbal knot», the center of which is the verb, and the elements directly subordinate to the verb are called actants and circonstants.

Actants are persons or objects participating in the process to one degree or another. Actants, as a rule, are expressed by nouns and are directly subordinate to the verb. Actants differ in their nature, which in turn is related to their number in the verb knots. The question of the number of actants, therefore, is decisive in the entire structure of the verb knot.

Verbs have different numbers of actants. Moreover, the same verb does not always have the same number of actants. There are verbs without actants, verbs with one, two or three actants.

Verbs without actants express a process that unfolds on its own and in which there are no participants. This applies primarily to verbs denoting atmospheric phenomena.

Verbs with one actant express an action in which only one person or object is involved (*Al'fred padaye*).

Verbs with two actants express a process in which two people or objects participate (of course, without duplicating each other). An action with two actants could not be carried out if both actants, each for their part, did not take part in it (*Al'fred vdaryaye Bernara*).

Verbs with three actants express an action in which three people or objects participate (naturally, without duplicating each other). An action with three actants could not be carried out if all three actants, each in their role, did not take part in it (*Al'fred daye knyhu Sharlyu*).

Different actants perform different functions in relation to the verb they obey. From a semantic point of view, the first actant is the one that performs the action. Therefore, the first actant in traditional grammar is called the subject. L. Tenier adheres to the same name. The second actant is the one that experiences the action. The second actant has long been called the direct object. L. Tenier calls it an object. The third actant – from a semantic point of view – is the actant, in whose favor or to the detriment of which the action is performed. Therefore, the third actant in traditional grammar was once called the indirect object. The presence of other actants does not affect the third actant [Ten'er, 1988].

Sirconstants express the circumstances in which the action unfolds. The function of a circonstant is always taken by a word belonging to the category of an adverb, or a group of words equivalent to an adverb [Ten'er, 1988].

In this study, in contrast to the extreme verbocentrism of L. Tenier, it is

adhered to the opinion about the binarity of the sentence. However, due to the fact that there are many points of contact between L. Tenier's theory and the theory of determination, having considered the determining members of the sentence through the prism of L. Tenier's «Structural Syntax», it has been come to the following analogies:

1. Subject-object determiners (monosemic and disemic) in the system of L. Tenier can correspond to the third actant most often in the absence of other actants in the verb. «It is highly possible that there are verbs with a single actant, which is the third actant. In particular, such verbs are found in expressions like «I'm warm» [Ten'er, 1988].

2. Isemic determiners can also correspond to circonstants.

3. Circumstantial determiners can only be circonstants.

L. Tenier's attitude to the question of defining the boundary between actants and circonstants is interesting.

«At first glance, the boundary between actants and circonstants is clear. But if you look closely, you can see that it is not easy to accurately set it. The actant with the highest serial number, that is, the third actant, already has some of the characteristics of a circonstant. At the same time, analogies are observed in some circonstants and actants, which make it necessary to consider more carefully the criteria that allow one to separate actants from circonstants» [Ten'er, 1988]. As L. Tenier notes, there are two such criteria: one refers to the form, the other to the meaning of the syntactic element.

From the point of view of form, the actant, as a rule expressed by a noun, is sufficient on its own as an element dependent on the verb, cf.: *Al'fred vdaryaye Bernara*. A circonstant, which can only be expressed by an adverb, in case it is expressed not by an adverb, but by a noun, must first acquire the features of an adverb with the help of a preposition, *Al'fred krokuye z trostynoyu*.

From the point of view of meaning, the actant forms such a unity with the verb that often the meaning of the verb would be incomplete without it. In contrast, the circonstant is an element that is completely optional.

Because of this, it becomes clear that in languages that have a case system, and in particular dative and accusative cases, the third and even the second actant in their form, without any doubt, are actants; on the contrary, in languages where these actants are framed by prepositions, they unexpectedly approach circonstants.

So, defining the boundary between the actant and the circonstant, L. Tenier suggests looking for it between the third actant and the circonstants expressed by nouns with prepositions [Ten'er, 1988].

In the theory of determination, the issue of the boundary between subject-object and circumstantial determiners is also controversial, in connection with which «transitional» groups of determining members are singled out: subject-objective and object-objective.

In this study, disemic determining groups are classified as subject-object determiners, since, as noted above, we consider subjective or objective meaning to be predominant in them. However, under the influence of certain factors (place in a sentence, preposition of a subjective or objective determiner), these transitional structures can become adverbial determiners.

Conclusions.

In the structure of a simple sentence in the modern Ukrainian language, subject-object determiners are distinguished as independent distributors of the sentence.

The main features of the units under study include: connection with the predicative stem using the «free attachment» connection, the definition of the predicative center as a whole, the ability to transform into the subject, the absence of a direct syntactic relation between the verb and the determining part of the sentence, their distant location in relation to the predicate, attachment to different grammatical structures. Particular features of this semantic-syntactic category are the ability to spread on the basis of word associations, as well as the formation of determiner rows.

The listed features make it possible to distinguish subject-object determiners – distributors of the entire composition of the sentence – from verbal distributors, realized as a result of the valence abilities of the words. The determiner is a «sentence» category.

As a result of the structural analysis of this category in the texts, the functioning of different semantic groups of subject-object determiners in a simple sentence of the modern Ukrainian language was revealed, which are combined into 2 types, taking into account their functional and semantic similarity (the presence of a common seme): monosemic determiners and disemic determiners. The basis for such a union is the number of semantic components in one determining part of the sentence. A monosemic determiner includes one semantic component. It is either a subject or an object. Subjective or objective meaning may be present in the determiner, adverbial in form – spatial or temporal. Such determiners, containing

two semantic components (in one case, these are the meanings of subject and adverbial, in the other – object and adverbial) are called disemic determiners. Each type of subject-object determiner includes semantic groups, and the groups, in turn, are divided into subgroups, the difference between which is derived from the semantic features underlying this or that variety. The type of monosemic determiners includes the following groups: a) monosemic determiners with subjective meaning; b) monosemic determiners with objective meaning. The type of disemic determiners is subdivided into: a) disemic determiners with an undivided subjective circumstantial meaning; b) disemic determiners with an undivided object-adverbial meaning.

The highest degree of productivity is revealed by the determination of a sentence by subjective determiners, which make up 44% of the total number of subject-object determiners in the Ukrainian language. The determination of the sentence by subject-adverbial determiners, represented by 38% of the sample in the Ukrainian language is also productive. The determination of the sentence by object determiners, which amounted to 15% – in the Ukrainian language is less productive. object-adverbial determiners – 3% of the sample in the Ukrainian language is an unproductive group of subject-object determiners. Subject-object relations find their expression in language categories. The main means of expressing the analyzed units are case and prepositional case forms – substantive models. At the same time, disemic determiners, unlike monosemic ones, also use adverbs as a means of expression, which is predetermined by the presence of adverbial meaning in the disemic determiner, since as known the syntactic function of circumstances is the main one for an adverb. The use of adverbs as a means of expressing disemical determiners is scarce (8,5%), compared with the use of prepositional case forms of the name (91,5%). Firstly, this is due to the presence of a subjective or objective meaning in the disemical determiner, the morphologized means of expression of which are the prepositional-case forms of the name, and secondly, to the process of expanding the meaning of the cases of nouns, with their gradual and increasing polysemy. Prepositional forms express the ever-complex and indirect logical-grammatical relations.

The role of the core component of the prepositional case form is played by pronouns of various lexical and grammatical categories, as well as nouns, both concrete and abstract. The composition of prepositional case constructions can also include substantiated lexemes (pronouns, adjectives, participles, numerals).

For the purpose of concretization, clarification, case and prepositional-case forms of a name, can be distributed by adjectives (qualitative, relative, possessive,

pronominal), nouns, pronouns in accordance with distributive possibilities.

The process of functioning of subject-object determiners in speech is reflected in the semantic aspect. A special position in the hierarchy of aspects of the sentence is occupied by the communicative one. The communicative structure of the utterance is conveyed by the actual division of the sentence. With an objective word order, subject-object determiners can be a theme, occupying a preposition in relation to a rheme that is expressed by a predicate or an indivisible complex subject + predicate. Also, the unit under study can act as the first theme, composing together with the subject (or the second determiner) – the second theme – a complex theme and act in preposition with the predicate – rheme. The subject-object determiner can also be a rheme in a postposition.

In the subjective word order, the subject-object determiner in the role of the theme occupies a postposition, while the determiner – rheme is in the preposition.

Setting the determiner – the theme in the middle of the sentence also creates an inverse word order with a distant location of the components of the rheme.

Thus, for determining members, their location can be considered normal not only at the beginning, but also in the middle and at the end of the sentence. However, the characteristic and predominant position of subject-object determiners in the modern Ukrainian language is the position at the absolute beginning of a sentence, and the main function of the studied units is their use as a theme.

When studying the subject-object determination in the modal-nominative aspect, their role is determined in the modus / dictum division of the sentence. If the determiner is used in the modus part of the utterance, the subject-object determiner plays the role of a subject that specifies the agent of the predicative feature and participates in the formation of the semantic-syntactic structure of a certain type of sentence. In the dictum part of the statement, the subject-object determiner acts as a substantive category of the dictum.

Considering the theory of determination through the prism of L. Tenier's «Structural Syntax», one can draw some parallels: subject-object determiners (monosemic and disemic) most often correspond to the third actant (in the absence of the first two) in L. Tenier's system; disemic determiners can also correspond to circonstants, while in general circonstants correspond to adverbial determiners. In this regard, the boundary between actants and cironstants is as fuzzy as the boundary between subject-object and adverbial determiners, as a result of which transitional groups with undivided subject-adverbial and object-objective meanings are singled out in the theory of determination. These groups are

classified as subject-object determiners, but under certain conditions (place in a sentence, preposition of a subject or object determiner) they turn into adverbial determiners.

Thus, subject-object determiners, as a semantic-syntactic category of the sentence level, actively and productively function in a simple sentence of the modern Ukrainian language.

References:

1. Batićić, T. (1972). *Lokativ u savremenom srpskohrvatskom književnom jeziku*. Beograd: Naučno delo. 212 p. [in Serbian-Croatian].
2. Bulakhovskyi, L.A. (1958). *Pytannia syntaksysu prostoho rechennia v ukrainskii movi* [The question of the syntax of a simple sentence in the Ukrainian language]. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
3. Daneš, Fr. (1964). *A three-level approach to syntax*. Prague [in Czechoslovakia].
4. Fries, Ch. (1959). *The structure of English: An introduction to the construction of English sentences*. London: Longmans, Green and Co. Vol. XI. 304 p.
5. Ghrozjan, N.F. (2018). Fonovi determinanty v ukrajinsjkij movi [Background determinants in the Ukrainian language]. *Fylologhycheskyj aspekt – Philological aspect*. №2(34). P. 67–73 [in Ukrainian].
6. Īvanenko, Z.Ī. (1978). Semantychna struktura pryimennykovykh konstruktzii [Semantic structure of prepositional structurestwo-syllable sentence]. *Movoznavstvo – Language studies*. № 3. P. 13–22 [in Ukrainian].
7. Īvanytska, N.L. (1986). *Dvoskladne rechennia v ukraĭnskii movi* [Twosyllable sentence in the Ukrainian language]. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola. 166 p. [in Ukrainian].
8. Melnychuk, O.S. (1972). Slovospoluchennia [Phrases]. *Suchasna ukraĭnska literaturna mova: Syntaksys – Modern Ukrainian literary language: syntax*. Vol. 2. P. 51–117. Kyiv: Naukova dumka [in Ukrainian].
9. Mezhov, O.H. (1998). Sub'iektni syntaksemy u strukturi prostoho rechennia [Subject syntaxes in the structure of a simple sentence] *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Luts'k: VolynU [in Ukrainian].
10. Mirchenko, M.V. (2001). Struktura syntaksychnykh katehorii [Structure of syntactic categories]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Luts'k: VDU [in Ukrainian].
11. Pashkivskyi, A.M. (1937). Funktsii pryimennykiv u suchasnii ukraĭnskii literaturnii movi [Functions of prepositions in modern Ukrainian literary language]. *Movoznavstvo – Language studies*. № 12. P. 37–65 [in Ukrainian].
12. Pliushch, M.Ya. (1986). *Katehoriia sub'iekta i ob'iekta v strukturi prostoho rechennia* [Category of subject and object in the structure of a simple sentence]. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola. 175 p. [in Ukrainian].
13. Rudenko, L.M. (1996). *Obstavynna determinatsiia v strukturi tekstu (semantyko-syntaksychnyi i stylistychnyi aspekty)* [Circumstantial determination in the structure of the

- text (semantic-syntactic and stylistic aspects)]*. Kyiv: Ukraïna-Vita. 213 p. [in Ukrainian].
14. Rusanivskyi, V.M. (1983). Spivvidnoshennia semantychnoï i formalno-hramatychnoï struktury rechennia [The relationship between the semantic and formal-grammatical structure of a sentence]. *Semantyko-syntaksychna struktura rechennia – Semantic and syntactic structure of a sentence*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. P. 99–125 [in Ukrainian].
 15. Rusanivskyi, V.M. (1988). *Struktura leksychnoï i hramatychnoï semantyky [The structure of lexical and grammatical semantics]*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. 236 p. [in Ukrainian].
 16. Selivanova, O.O. (2001). Kohnityvnyi aspekt kontrastyvnoï onomasiolohii [Syntax of modern Ukrainian: problematic issues Cognitive aspects of contrastive onomasiology]. *Movoznavstvo – Language studies*. № 1. P. 71–77 [in Ukrainian].
 17. Shynkaruk, V.D. (2002). *Kateghorii modusu i dyktumu u strukturi rechennja [Categories of mode and dictum in the sentence structure]*. Chernivci: Ruta. 272 p. [in Ukrainian].
 18. Slynko, Ī.Ī. (1980). Paradyhmatyka prostoho rechennia ukraïnskoï movy [Paradigmatics of the first sentence of the Ukrainian language]. *Movoznavstvo – Language studies*. № 2. P. 92–93 [in Ukrainian].
 19. Slynko, Ī.Ī. (1985). Chy ye odnoskladni rechennia? [Are there monosyllabic sentences?]. *Movoznavstvo – Language studies*. № 4. P. 48–53 [in Ukrainian].
 20. Slynko, Ī.Ī., Huivaniuk, N.V., & Kobyljanska, M.F. (1994). *Syntaksys suchasnoi ukraïnskoï movy: Problemni pytannia [Syntax of modern Ukrainian: problematic issues]*. Kyiv: Vyshcha shkola. 670 p. [in Ukrainian].
 21. Vintoniv, M.O., & Bajurova, M.Gh. (2020). Temporaljni determinanty u suchasnij ukraïnsjkiï movi: struktura, funkclji [Verbal government in the modern Ukrainian literary language: Word combinations with prefix-prepositional correlation]. *Mizhnarodnyj filologhichnyj chasopys – International Philological Journal*. № 4. P. 19–26 [in Ukrainian].
 22. Vykhovalnets, Ī.R., (1992). *Narysy z funktsionalnoho syntaksysu ukraïnskoï movy [An essay on the functional syntax of the Ukrainian language]*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. 224 p. [in Ukrainian].
 23. Zaghnitko, A.P. (2001). Teoretychna ghramatyka ukraïnsjkoï movy. Syntaksys [Theoretical grammar of the Ukrainian language Syntax]: *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Donetsk: DonNU. 662 p. [in Ukrainian].
 24. Zaghnitko, A.P. (2014). Teoriia hramatyky i tekstu: monohrafiia [Theory of grammar and text: monograph]. Donetsk: DonNU. 480 p. [in Ukrainian].