

Reflection of the Dynamics of the Language Grammatical Sub-system through the Prism of the Notion of *Absence*

Olga Radchuk

*Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Professor, Professor at the Professor Mihaylo Hetmanec
Department of Foreign Literature and Slavic Languages;
H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University;
2 Valentynivska Str., Kharkiv, 61168, Ukraine;
e-mail: radchuk.o.v@ukr.net; <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0343-6796>*

The notion of *absence* is viewed as a linguo-cognitive phenomenon that has certain means of its representation in language. The purpose of the article is to trace the changes in the Russian grammar in correlation with the notion of *absence*, which is semantically heterogeneous and reveals the national specifics of the studied language. The research methodology is based on the principle of historicism. The tasks of distinguishing between past and present phenomena outlined in the study have been solved using the method of actualization. Explanation of the appearance of empty links in the structure of the Russian language is based on cognitive studies of the notion *absence*. Since asymmetric relations penetrate into all levels of the language system, and the theory of oppositions reflects the essential characteristics of language, the abstract notion of *absence* is foregrounded in explaining the privative nature of a language. Studies of the essence and the phenomenon of the notion of *absence* in the grammatical system resulted in the following ideas: manifestations of the notion of *absence* reflect grammatical lacunae that may correlate with different semantic types of the notion of *absence* in Russian grammar. Based on the historical facts of the Russian language and their cognitive interpretation, three semantic types of the notion of *absence* have been conventionally distinguished: *complete absence*, *recovered absence*, and *disappearance*. In the methodological aspect, the article combines psychological and socio-cultural vectors. The research methodological foundation made it possible to trace and describe lexical and grammatical mechanisms of forming the notion of *absence* at the grammatical level of the Russian language system.

Keywords: language history, lexical semantics, national and cultural specificity, cognitive interpretation.

Introduction. Grammar constitutes a very harmonious natural system, which makes it practically impossible to introduce an extraneous element into it, and if something like this happens, it leads to certain changes within the system. Moreover, the influence of external conditions on transformations in grammar does not occur directly. They are mediated by various lingual phenomena: phonetic, lexical, derivational and others. This indicates that the grammatical structure of language is the result of long-term abstract cognition of the human mind.

Despite the fact that the grammatical system of the language is strictly ordered and quite stable, changes nevertheless take place in it: new elements penetrate or get interspersed, some linguistic units become outdated and lost, leaving empty niches. The grammatical system has evident significant potential for internal improvement in order to transmit complex abstract notions. It is no coincidence that scholars' interest in the study of various aspects of morphological (Kubryakova 2004; Popov 2013; Skorobohatova 2012, 2017) [8; 11; 15; 16] and syntactic units (Zagnitko 2008; Kovtunova 2010; Palatovskaya 2019) [6; 7; 14] has increased nowadays.

The theory and practice of communication currently considers speech activity and discourse

within the framework of the theory of semiotics. In linguistics, there is the notion of *significant absence* introduced by R. Jacobson. In his opinion, the functioning of the language system is based on "the opposition of some fact to nothing", that is, according to the terminology of formal logic, on the contradictory opposition [18, p. 240]. R. Jacobson, as a representative of the structural direction in linguistics, considered linguistic units strictly in a synchronic aspect. He pointed out that the syncretism of morphological forms in some paradigms or in some grammatical categories, or, conversely, the removal of the opposition of meanings under the influence of a certain context emphasizes the importance of the problem of "zero opposition" for linguistic semiotics, which should investigate the complex relationships between the two notions – *sign* and *zero* [18, p. 283]. This approach remains relevant today. The notion of *grammatical zeros* has been actively used by linguists, opposing zero to a sign that has some material expression. This is how the correlation of grammatical indicators in the system of opposition is established: *absence vs presence* (features, characteristics, properties, etc.). We believe that the binary opposition *sign vs zero* corresponds to the oppositional pair *presence vs absence*.

In our opinion, it is impossible to consider any presence without turning it into a sign. Speaking about the signs of a language system that is open and

dynamic, one must emphasize that each element can be changed and studied in both synchronic and diachronic aspects. The language system is in continuous development. In language as a complexly organized system with an internal structure, there is a unity of three types of development – diachronic, ontogenic and phylogenic. As T. Givon notes, “these three processes are parallel, and they are connected not just by analogy, but by real common mechanisms” [5, p. 87]. In modern linguistic research, the study of language evolution in a cognitive aspect is foregrounded and acquires new features.

The purpose of the article is to trace the changes in the Russian grammar in correlation with the notion of *absence*, which is semantically heterogeneous and reveals the national specifics of the studied language.

Based on certain historical and synchronic comparisons, we propose to consider the notion of *absence* in the analysis of grammatical units within the *presence* vs *absence* coordinate system and to classify the grammatical phenomena of the Russian language depending on the semantic volume of the notion of *absence*. In this case, we distinguish the following three types:

Type I – **complete absence**, that is, those forms and phenomena that have never existed in the grammatical system of the Russian language;

Type II – **the compensated absence** of a grammatical category, an element or form of a word; the absence that used to be complete, but as a result of linguistic processes was replenished by the system or restructured within the system;

Type III – **the disappearance** of any grammatical forms or grammatical categories in the process of the language historical development.

The semantic classification demonstrates the dynamics in the development of the Russian grammatical system, which points to the simplification and economy of language categories and units at the grammar level. To correlate the semantic types of the concept of *absence* in grammar, we consider it necessary to involve certain historical comments.

Type I – complete absence. In the ancient Russian and modern Russian languages, there has never been a strict order of words in a sentence. In a sentence – *Отъць видитъ сынъ* (Ot’c’ vidit’ syn’) – an active person could be both father and son [11]. If the Old Russian language had a fixed word order, the establishment of the subject and object of action would have been easy (for example, the subject is always in the first place, and the object – in the second), but in Old Russian one could say *Отъць видитъ сынъ* (Ot’c’ vidit’ syn’), and *Сынъ видитъ отъць* (Syn’ vidit’ ot’c’), meaning exactly the same. Similar constructions are present in modern Russian – *Мать видит дочь* (Mat’ vidit doch’) and *Дочь видит мать* (Doch’ vidit mat’). The development of the grammatical category of the case helped to formally designate the object and subject of the action: the use of the

accusative case, which coincides with the genitive when denoting an animated object. The lack of a strict word order in a Russian sentence influenced the further development of syntax. The data from the written Russian language show that over the last millennium there has been a productive development of the syntax of complex structures, in particular, the proliferation of multicomponent complex sentences since the beginning of the 19th century.

The category of determination was not initially represented in Russian and did not have morphological ways of expression. The category of definiteness / indefiniteness indicates how the object is presented: as the only one in the described situation or as belonging to the class of similar ones. If in Germanic, Romance and some Slavic languages, the category of determination is expressed with the help of articles, then in Russian, in case of contextual necessity, demonstrative pronouns are used. It is important to note that demonstrative pronouns *этот, эта, это* (etot, eta, eto) appeared only in the second half of the 17th century by adding the pronominal particle *э* (e) to the demonstrative pronouns *тот, та, то* (tot, ta, to). In Russian, the function of the indefinite article can be also performed by the numeral *один* (odin) (eg, *Prishel odin chelovek*) [16]. However, the numeral *один* (odin) can also be used as a demonstrative pronoun. For instance, *Kakoe proizvelo sledstvie eto pribytie, chitatel’ mozhnet uznat’ iz odnogo razgovora, kotoryj proizshel mezhdru **odnimi** dvumya damami* (N.V. Gogol’, “Mertvye dushi”, 1842).

Single negation was already uncharacteristic for the Old Russian grammar. This difference from other languages of the Indo-European family can be traced back to ancient times. P.A. Lavrovskij highlighted isolated cases of single negation in ancient chronicles. The scholar noted that in later written documents, when a deviation from the popular language was clearly observed, such cases could sometimes be encountered: “Following the loss of the correctness and harmony of the chronicle language, words and phrases alien to the Russian language began to be found in it: ... moreover, contrary to the nature of the common Slavic language, instead of two negations, one is retained, following the Greek model adopted in later translations from Greek into Slavic” [9, p. 160]. This trend continues in modern Russian as well.

Type II – compensated absence. In Old Russian there were no adverbial participles (deyepriichastiy) and, accordingly, no constructions with them. The adverbial participle, as a special grammatical form, developed in the Russian language relatively late. The first to describe this verb form was M. Smotrickij, who invented the term. Having arisen from participles, they developed as detached members of the sentence, indicating an additional action and separate constructions, and began to be intensively used, reflecting the logic of linguistic phenomena, their interconnection and interdependence. In his research of ancient chronicle texts, P.A. Lavrovskij described this linguistic fact, which dated back to the beginning of the 14th century: “... the indefinite participles also began to lose their ability to change in numbers and cases, they

began to petrify, turn into adverbial participles...” [9, p. 151]. In modern Russian grammar, the function of the adverbial participle as an attributive form of the verb is reduced to the following: “In a sentence, a verbal participle conveys a certain relation of the action indicated by it to the time of the action indicated by the predicate” [13, p. 672]. In modern Russian, single adverbial participle and participial constructions perform the role of an adverb with all predicative forms of the verb, with the infinitive, and sometimes of the attribute with the noun and adverb.

The redistribution of nominative parts according to the types of their declension, depending on the nature of their stems, in most cases, was predetermined by the sound form of the word and its morphemic composition. At the most ancient stage, all nouns had similar endings, which were joined to the stem irrespective of the element the noun stem ended with. Subsequently, the morphemic composition of the word was decomposed, the result of which was frequent transformation of the final part of the stem into the ending. The reason for this recomposition was the insufficient semantic basis for distinguishing words by stems as well as some phonetic phenomena. It resulted in a distribution of nouns according to the types of declension depending on the nature of their stems. But even that state did not last long: further phonetic changes in the Slavic languages, monophthongization of diphthongs, the appearance and then transformation of nasal vowels, the loss of reduced vowels led to the fact that the former stems ceased to be stems, and the distribution of declension types in accordance with the types of stems became outdated. However, the gender category, which played a certain role in the restructuring of the declensions (for example, in the transformation of the former *i*-declension into an almost purely feminine declension), was not, apparently, sufficiently semanticized to completely subordinate the distribution of nouns by declension types to the gender. In most cases, in Slavic languages, the types of declension are insufficiently grounded semantically, which continues to serve as a source of possible changes in the distribution of names by types of declension, since the formal grounds for such a distribution are also vague.

The formation of a unified form of the past tense in the Russian language is fixed by historical grammars as a fact and correlates with the development of the category of aspect. In the bookish Old Russian language, four forms of the past tense were actually used: two simple (aorist and imperfect) and two complex (perfect and quamperfect). With the development of aspect relations, the system of past tenses became simpler, as it was reflected in church documents. The gradual loss of the auxiliary verb and the use of the subject, expressed by a noun or personal pronoun, led first to a restriction in use, and then to a complete replacement of the outdated forms of the past tense. Instead of the complex form of the past tense, just

participle in *-л-* (*-л-*) remained in modern Russian, which began to be interpreted as forms of the past tense of the verb. Contemporary research by M.L. Remnyova into everyday writing shows that in Old Russian everyday speech only the form of perfect was used. M.L. Remnyova comes to the conclusion that the “destruction” of the complex system of the past tenses in everyday Russian speech (or the initial absence of the forms of simple preterits in the languages of the Eastern Slavs), the awareness of the fact that simple forms of the past tense belonged to the bookish style of manuscripts, excluded the possibility of direct influencing of the everyday speech norm of using temporal forms on the Church Slavonic norm of tense use. The influence of the Russian language can be seen in mixing aoristic and imperfect forms, the use of the *-л-* form in aoristic and imperfect paradigms, the possibility of fixing the contaminated aoric-imperfect-perfect paradigm by grammar, which is especially vivid the inflection of the verb “БЫТИ” (“БЫТИ”) [12, p. 32]. New research in the field of historical grammar confirms the fact that the phenomena of linguistic economy and selection were inconsistent, as P.A. Lavrovskij noticed in the 19th century.

The developed system of the category of tense in Old Russian confirms the archaism of that language. In Old Russian, there was no aspect as a verb category, but alongside with a change in the language morphological structure, the simplification of the temporal paradigm, the category of aspect of the Russian verb was formed by the beginning of the 16th century. The category of tense as a more concrete one, gave way to the category of aspect as a more abstract one as the result of the language ontogenesis. Differentiation of three tenses for imperfective verbs and two tenses for perfective verbs exhausts the oppositions that distinguish the five temporal forms of the Russian verb. Synonymous terms for the category of aspect, used in modern Russian studies, *the way of verb action* and *the perfectness* are described without referring to the grammatical category of tense [1]. Note that this issue remains controversial in the theory of linguistics, since there is no consensus among linguists on the problem of the origin of the Russian verb aspect.

Due to the loss of their semantic distinctive ability after the disappearance of the reduced vowels (15th century), Russian consonants began to be opposed as palatalized and non-palatalized.

The disappearance of some forms of words, such as: *тамо* (tamo), *како* (kako), *тако* (tako) and their substitution with *там* (tam), *как* (kak), *так* (tak) were described by I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, who suggested calling the necessity for their disappearance as a *psychic stress*, understood as “the relative importance of a given place of pronunciation for morphological and semasiological associations [2, p. 40]. This fact proves that transformations at one language layer lead to reorganization at other levels of the language system. We believe that such transformations often have a psychological basis associated with apperception.

With the emergence of the accusative in the Russian language, not only the division of functions

between the nominative and accusative cases occurred, but also the verb meanings began to differentiate according to the category of transitivity and intransitivity of the action of the main subject. For some period, those forms of the verb are syncretic, but later, they became distinguished and opposed by the above-mentioned characteristic. In the process of evolution, a number of Russian verbs began to lose the signs of transitivity and became intransitive. This was due to the new status of the postfix *-ся* (*-s'a*), which was attached to transitive verbs. For example, to such verbs as: *бороть, каять, сомневать, отчаивать, трудить, ленить, стремить* (*borot', kayat', somnevat', otchivat', trudit', lenit', stremit'*). Such forms were preserved in the literary language at the beginning of the 19th century (for example, *Chtob ne trudit' sebe uma...* (A.S. Griboedov, "Gore ot uma", 1824). However, in modern Russian, there have been some objective tendencies to expand the functions of the category of transitivity of the verb, and as a result, a return to transitivity [4]. Despite the fact that the use of intransitive verbs in the meanings of transitive and the formation of occasional combinations is mainly of a conventional nature, the frequency of these uses indicates the widespread occurrence of the phenomenon of transitive verbs in Internet communication, which in recent years has become one of the types of discourse. Although such examples as *гулять кого-то, танцевать кого-то, прослезить кого-то, понравить кого-то, соприкасать что-то, улыбаться кого-то от что-то* (*gulyat' kogo-to, tancevat' kogo-to, proslezit' kogo-to, ponravit' kogo-to, soprikasat' chto-to, улыbat' kogo-to ili chto-to*), refer to a greater extent to anomalous phenomena, nevertheless, they take place in modern language. Here are some examples: *Mog li Vitek vzjat' sebe v golovu, chto byl tret'im chelovekom na zemle, sposobnym proslezit' Noru na rovnom meste i srazu* (G. Shcherbakova, "Aktrisa i milicioner", 1999); *I kogda aplodismenty nachali zatuhat', devushki povernulis' k kulisam i stali merno soprikasat' svoi rozovye ladoshki* (S. Aleshin, "Vstrechi na greshnoj zemle", 2001); *Ya dejstvitel'no hochu sebya tebe ponravit'* (I. Bahtina, "Zachem ya tebe?", 2007); *«Ulybajte svoe lico», – uchil ih kapitan-psiholog na kratkosrochnyh kursah* (G. Spcerbakova, "Aktrisa i milicioner", 1999). There are quite a lot of such contexts.

The above and similar examples are used by native speakers not only for a word play, thus indicating certain trends in the development of the grammatical subsystem of the Russian language. The reasons for this, apparently, are associated with the influence of extralinguistic factors on the development of the Russian language, among which, first of all, the influence of the English language as a means of international communication, computerization and globalization of society.

In modern Russian, there are numerous participles devoid of a derivational connection with

the verbs to which they historically go back. Such isolated formations were formed in the language system as a result of the disappearance of corresponding verbs. The absence of an infinitive from which the participle was formed, led to the adjectivization of participles and their transition to the category of adjectives. For instance: *предыдущий, неимущий, вопиющий, сведущий, неменяемый, одержимый, ископаемый, окаянный, прирожденный, врожденный, расхлябанный, изможденный, излюбленный, напыщенный, сокровенный, вылитый* ("very similar"), *предвзятый* (*predydushchij, neimushchij, vopiyushchij, svedushchij, nevmenyaemyj, oderzhimyj, iskopaemyj, okayannyj, prirozhdennyj, vrozhdennyj, raskhlyabannyj, izmozhdennyj, izlyublennyj, napyshchennyj, sokrovennyj, vylityj* ("ochen' pohoziyj"), *predvzyatyj*) etc.

The noted adjustments in the language system are associated, in our opinion, with the principle of language economy. In the process of adjectivization, participles lose their verbal character and all the verb properties (tense, aspect, voice, ability to govern nouns) and begin to denote only the property. In some cases, such adjectives can be used as substantivized ones and develop the meanings of a thing or person, but at the same time they lose the meaning of the attribute. Such grammatical shifts, when there is a lack of a direct derivational connection, nevertheless preserve the original semantics of the words and thereby reveal the linguistic and national originality of the language.

III type – disappearance. In modern Russian, there are practically no traces of the vocative case of nouns that disappeared from everyday Old Russian in the 14–15 centuries, being preserved as a respectful appeal to the boyars and princes: *Хощем вси, княже, праведно служити тебе и самодержцем имети тя* (*Hoshchem vsi, knyazhe, pravedno sluzhiti tebe i samoderzhcem imeti ty*) (*Hrestomatiya po istorii russkogo yazyka*, 1990, p. 279). The remnants of that form – *господи, боже* (*gospodi, bozhe*) – turned into interjections, but, most often, the vocative form was replaced by the nominative case. Some writers use ancient vocative forms for stylization purposes, and frequent uses are found in modern poetry. We come across some new ideas about the vocative form in the research by E. A. Skorobohatova, who writes that in the Russian poetic discourse, the vocative case is a marker of Christian and historical discourse and supplies illustrative examples: *Разницы, жено, нет. Сын или Бог, я твой!* (*Raznicy, zhen*, *net. Syn ili Bog, ya tvoj!*) (I.A. Brodskij, "Natyurmort", 1971); *Помоги нам выжить, святой снеже, падай белый, падай, золотой!* (*Pomogi nam vyzhit', svyatyj snezhe, padaj belyj, padaj, zolotoj!*) (B.A. Chichibabin, "Elegiya fevral'skogo snega", 1977). In a poetic appeal to contemporaries it was replaced by the nominative case form [16, p. 41]. Vocal appellatives can be used to create a comic effect. For example, *Человече! Когда же ты возьмешься за ум?* (*Cheloveche! Kogda zhe ty voz'mesh'sya za um?*). because of the laws of dialectics the disappearance of some forms and their absence at a certain stage of expressing certain meanings is replaced by the appearance of other grammatical forms capable

of expressing the lost meaning, or it leads to the restoration of previous ones (for example, the vocative case).

In the Russian language, in contrast to the Ukrainian and Polish languages, although all the three belong to the Slavic languages and are linked by ties of kinship, there is traced an interruption in the connection between the category of animate nouns and the category of a person. The formation of the category of animation in the Russian language was proceeding gradually. Initially, it was a category of a person, i.e. it embraced just the words denoting people. “Qualifying animation as a category, V. V. Kolesov claims that in modern Russian it is presented in an incomplete form, in contrast to the Northern Russian dialects, where the process of this category formation is completed, and contrasted to the Polish and Ukrainian languages, where the category of noun animation has developed towards the category of a ‘person’, while in the literary language, this development was interrupted by the system normalization” (quoted from: [15, p. 157]. In the Russian language, there is no symmetry between the notion of *living being* and the category of animation. A vivid example is presented with the words *мертвец* (mertvec) and *покойник* (pokojnik), which belong to animate nouns, although they denote dead people.

In *мертвец* (mertvec) the suffix does not render the meaning of *absence of life*, the root morpheme already contains the notion of *absence*. The derivative *смерть* (smert') means *cessation of the organism vital functions* and comes, like the word under analysis, from the Proto-Indo-European language [3, p. 386]. For example, in Sanskrit there was a word *амрита* (amrita), which meant *nectar that can revive a person*. Associatively, a dead person, i.e. deprived of any signs of life, is possible to be reincarnated, though it cannot be done with a corpse, and, as a consequence, the word *мертвец* (mertvec), together with the word *покойник* (pokojnik), belongs to the nouns denoting living beings, while the word *труп* (trup) is considered inanimate: the form of the accusative case I see (who?) *мертвеца, покойника* (mertveca, pokojnika), but I see (what?) *труп* (trup). For Russian speakers, this grammatical fact is one of the most incomprehensible, and it is usually attributed to anomalous phenomena. The above-mentioned oxymoron created by N. V. Gogol' in the title of his poem, *мертвые души* (mertvye dushi), to some extent provides the possibility of transforming the soul into a living one, as it is from the very beginning embedded in the semantics of the word *душа* (dusha).

Substantiated adjectives can appear through the gradual loss (ellipsis) of the noun they modify as a result of long-term historical use of such phrases as: *портной мастер, горничная прислуга* (portnoj, master, gornichnaya, prisluga). Some researchers distinguish the substantivizing ellipsis as a separate, historical type of substantiation. According to V. M. Markov, “the very concept of substantiation

presupposes a historical approach to the material” (quoted from [10, p. 108]). In modern Russian, there is a group of words that have nothing to do with substantiation from the point of view of existing word-formative connections. Those words include nouns of the adjective declension, for which there are no homonymous adjectives in the language system or which are not derivationally correlated with such adjectives: nouns *мостовая* (mostovaya) – adjective *мостовой* (mostovoj), noun *пирожное* (pirozhnoe) – adjective *пирожный* (pirozhnij), nouns *легкие* (legkie) – adjective *легкий* (legkij). The system of the adjective inflections does not play a derivational role in those nouns. They can be considered as substantivized forms only in a diachronic aspect. From a historical point of view, those nouns have resulted from various linguistic phenomena and processes (most of them were simplified, some were borrowed directly as nouns or created as loans). Here is a small list of such words: *запятая, целковый, вселенная, насекомое, зодчий, подданный, хорунжий, подлежащее, сказуемое, сохатый* (zapyataya, celkovyj, vselennaya, nasekomoe, zodchij, poddannij, horunzhij, podlezhashchee, skazuemoe, sohatyj) etc. The list also includes some semantically related words used in phraseological units: *попятный, подноготная, окольная* (popyatnyj, podnogotnaya, okolesnaya).

In modern Russian, the nominal declension of possessive adjectives has been completely lost, and now it is a category of only the noun. The remnants of the nominal declension of adjectives have survived only in the form of individual cases, and not as a whole paradigm of possessive adjectives with suffixes *-ов-* and *-ин-*. Describing the complexity of the development of the language system, T. Givon states that “the main factor that leads to the withering away of grammatical structures is phonological erosion that occurs due to sound assimilation. The loss of syntactic constructions primarily occurs in connection with the loss of the associated morphology” [5, p. 102].

The ‘correctness’ of the forms of the *achievable aspect* was no longer observed by the end of the 13th – the beginning of the 14th centuries. The *achievable* form (supin or infinitive of purpose) was a special form of the verb that existed in the Proto-Slavic language and was inherited by all Slavic languages, including Old Russian. It was an unchangeable form of the verb, formed from the stem of the infinitive with the help of the suffix *-ть*. In Old Russian, supin was used to indicate the purpose of movement, denoted by another verb of the imperfective aspect. As the scholars note, the regular use of supine in written documents had been observed until the beginning of the 13 century, then it began to be used irregularly and was gradually replaced with the infinitive. P.A. Lavrovsky, who studied the language of the chronicles of the period, points out that Old Russian was no longer characterized with harmony and constancy, that the ancient forms already experienced a certain ‘shock’. The linguist writes: “The most characteristic properties of the ancient language, which first began to perish in everyday communication, dominated invariably throughout the entire list until 1200. Thus, the strict and correct use of voiceless

vowels ъ and ѣ, ... the appropriate domination of the dual number, ... the correctness of the forms of the achievable aspect, which totally disappeared in the late 13th and the early 14th century ... – all that directly and convincingly proves that ... constancy could not exist at that time ... “ [9, p. 150]. In the annals where the narration ended in 1334, new forms were already clearly traced, as the researcher notes: “The achievable aspect, which was formerly accompanied with the ancient ending *тъ*, sometimes ends here in *ть* (т’): *воевать* (voevat’)” [9, p. 152]. A careful analysis of the observed data indicates to certain linguistic changes that occurred under the influence of the spoken language and were reflected in written records.

The loss of the attributive syntactic function by short adjectives led to the destruction of the declension system of short adjectives. At the beginning of the development of writing, short adjectives that were of common origin with nouns were declined in a similar way. But even in the Proto-Slavic period, as G.A. Haburgaev claims, short adjectives were combined into an declensional paradigm based on their generic character [17, p.179]. Short nominal declined forms were still found in East Slavic documents until the beginning of the 16th century, while short declined forms were almost completely replaced by the full ones. Naturally, the process began much earlier and lasted for about two centuries. This was due to the gradual loss of the attributive function by short adjectives. The short forms differed from the full ones not only by the meaning of the definiteness vs indefiniteness of the property in the attributive function, but also by the syntactic function of the predicate. Therefore, syntactic functions between short and full forms were different. Short adjectives preserved the role of the nominal part of the predicate, and the role of an attribute was assigned to full adjectives. The conclusion is based not only on the predominant use of full forms in the attributive function in ancient Russian documents (for example, G. A. Haburgaev provides statistics according to which up to 75% of all agreed attributes are represented by full adjectives [17, p.182]), but also on the fact that business and everyday documents, not subject to the written tradition, almost exclusively contained

only full forms. As a result of the loss of the function of the attribute, qualitative adjectives in a short form have lost the ability to decline.

Conclusions. Our analysis of linguistic facts made it possible to trace the dynamics of changes in the language at the grammatical level, which reflect the constant development of the language as a system. The driving force behind the development of the language system is the antinomies of various means of expressing semantics (lexical and grammatical), the antinomies of communicative need and lack of that (nominative units and grammatical forms).

We correlate the established facts representing the notion of *absence* at the grammatical level with three semantic types: *complete absence*, *compensated absence*, *disappearance*. Indeed, on the time axis, one can clearly see the results of linguistic changes, which reflect the semantic types of the notion of *absence* we have identified in the grammatical section of the Russian language. It is necessary to specify that those types are conventional, since it is not always possible to clearly distinguish between those changes that occur in the language system and unambiguously attribute them to a certain type. For example, the examples related to replacement and restructuring within certain grammatical categories, in which the notion of *absence* is presented in different ways, are referred to the type of compensated absence. When studying grammatical units it is necessary to rely on factors of a historical and cultural nature, since without taking them into account, it is impossible to fully understand and describe grammatical categories and grammatical meanings.

The described semantic types of the notion of *absence* at the level of Russian grammar (complete absence, compensated absence, disappearance) prove that the dynamics of the grammatical system of the Russian language is associated with the dialectical exchange of *absence* versus *presence* of certain forms when it is necessary to convey specific grammatical meanings. This confirms once again that the grammatical system of the Russian language is dynamic, and its development is conditioned by socio-cultural factors. In the future, the proposed research vector and methodology can be used in diachronic studies of other Slavic languages, Ukrainian, in particular.

References

1. Beloshapkova, T.V., 2008. *Kognitivno-diskursivnoe opisanie kategorii aspektual'nosti v sovremennom russkom yazyke. [Cognitive-discourse description of the category of aspect in modern Russian]:* diss. dokt. filol nauk. M.: Gosudarstvennaya akademiya slavyanskoj kul'tury. 395 p. [In Russian]
2. Boduen de Kurtene, I.A., 1963. *Chelovechenie yazyka. [Humanization of the language].* Izbrannye trudy po obshchemu yazykoznaniju. T. 1. M.: Izd-vo AN SSSR. P. 258–264. [In Russian]
3. Cyganenko, G.P., 1989. *Etimologicheskij slovar' russkogo yazyka. [Etymological dictionary of the Russian language].* 2-e izd., pereab. i dop. K.: Rad. shk., 511 p. [In Russian]
4. Epshtejn, M.N., 2007. *O tvorcheskom potenciale russkogo yazyka. Grammatika perekhodnosti i tranzitivnoe obshchestvo. [On the creative potential of the Russian language. Grammar of Transition and Transitive Society].* Znamya. № 3. URL: <http://magazines.russ.ru/snamia/2007/3/ep18.html>. [In Russian]
5. Givon, T., 2015. *Slozhnost' i razvitie. [Complexity and development].* Yazyk i mysl': Sovremennaya kognitivnaya lingvistika / Sost. A.A. Kibrik, A.D. Koshelev; red. A.A. Kibrik, A.D. Koshelev, A.V. Kravchenko, Yu.V. Mazurova, O.V. Fedorova. M.: Yazyki slavyanskoj kul'tury. P. 89–122. [In Russian]
6. Zagnitko, A.P., 2008. *Teoriya suchasnogo sintaksisu [Theory of the modern syntax]:* monografiya. Donec'k: DonNU. 294 p. [In Ukraine]

7. Kovtunova, I.I., 2010. "Nesobstvenno pryamaya rech'" v yazyke russkoj literatury konca XVIII–pervoj poloviny XIX v. [*Inappropriately direct speech" in the language of Russian literature at the end of the in the late 18th – first half of the 19th century*]. Publikacija A.G. Grek. M.: Izdatel'skij centr «Azbukovnik». 285 p. [In Russian]
8. Kubryakova, E.S., 2004. *Yazyk i znanie: Na puti polucheniya znanij o yazyke: Chasti rechi s kognitivnoj tochki zreniya. Rol' yazyka v poznanii mira. [Language and Knowledge: Towards the Knowledge of Language: Parts of Speech from a Cognitive Perspective. The language role of in the world cognition of].* Ros. Akademiya nauk. In-t yazykoznanija. M.: Yazyki slavyanskoj kul'tury. 560 s. [In Russian]
9. Lavrovskij, P.A., 1852. *O yazyke severnyh Russkih letopisej. [About the language of the northern Russian chronicles].* Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaya Akademiya nauk. 160 p. [In Russian]
10. Lopatin, V.V., 2007. *Mnogogrannoe russkoe slovo: Izbrannye stat'i po russkomu yazyku. [The Multifaceted Russian Word: Selected Articles on the Russian Language].* Rossijskaya akademiya nauk. Institut russkogo yazyka im. V.V. Vinogradova. M.: "Izdatel'skij centr "Azbukovnik". 743 p. [In Russian]
11. Popov, S.L., 2013. *Kognitivnye osnovaniya evolyucii form russkogo sintaksicheskogo soglasovaniya [Cognitive foundations of the evolution of forms of Russian syntactic agreement]: monografiya.* Har'kov: "NTMT". 150 p. [In Russian]
12. Remnyova, M.L., 2015. *Kategoriya vremeni v predstavlenii russkih knizhnikov XVI–XVII vv. [The category of tense in the view of Russian scribes of the 16th – 17th centuries].* M.: Filologicheskij fakul'tet MGU imeni M.V. Lomonosova. №6 (14). P. 10–35. [In Russian]
13. *Russkaya grammatika. [Russian grammar].* [Gl. red. N.Yu. Shvedova]. V 2-h t. T. I. Fonetika. Fonologiya. Udarenie. Intonaciya. Slovoobrazovanie. Morfologiya. M.: Nauka, 1980. 784 p. [In Russian]
14. Palatovskaya, E.V., 2019. *Slozhnoe predlozhenie v kognitivno-diskursivnom aspekte. [Complex sentence in cognitive-discursive aspect]: monografiya.* Kiev: PP «Firma «Granma». 400 p. [In Russian]
15. Skorobogatova, E.A., 2012. *Grammaticheskie znacheniya i poeticheskie smysly: poeticheskij potencial russkoj grammatiki (morfologicheskije kategorii i leksiko-grammaticheskie razryady imeni) [Grammatical meanings and poetic meanings: poetic potential of Russian grammar (morphological categories and lexico-grammatical categories of the name)]: monografiya.* Har'kov: NTMT. 480 p. [In Russian]
16. Skorobogatova E.A. *Formy obrashcheniya v russkoj poezii XX–XXI vekov. [Forms of address in Russian poetry of the 20–21 centuries].* Russkaya filologiya. Vestnik Har'kovskogo nacional'nogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta imeni G.S. Skovorody. Har'kov, 2017. № 1 (60). P. 38–42. [In Russian]
17. Haburgaev, G.A., 1990. *Ocherki istoricheskij morfologii russkogo yazyka: Imena. [Essays on the historical morphology of the Russian language: Names].* M.: Nauka. 296 p. [In Russian]
18. Jakobson, R., 1985. *Izbrannye raboty. [Selected works].* M.: Progress. 456 p. [In Russian]

Надійшла до редакції 24 лютого 2024 р.
Прийнята до друку 28 березня 2024 р.

Submitted February 24, 2024.
Accepted March 28, 2024.

Ольга Радчук, доктор філологічних наук, професор, професор кафедри зарубіжної літератури та слов'янських мов імені професора Михайла Гетманця, Харківський національний педагогічний університет імені Г. С. Сковороди (вул. Валентинівська, 2, м. Харків, 61168, Україна); e-mail: radchuk.o.v@ukr.net; <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0343-6796>

Відбиття динаміки граматичної підсистеми мови крізь призму поняття «відсутність»

Поняття «відсутність» розглянуто як лінгвокогнітивний феномен, який має певні засоби репрезентації в мові. Мета статті - простежити зміни російської граматики у співвідношенні з поняттям «відсутність», яке є семантично неоднорідним і виявляє національну специфіку досліджуваної мови. В основу методології дослідження покладено принцип історизму. Окреслені в дослідженні завдання розмежування явищ минулого та сьогодення розв'язано через застосування актуалістичного методу. Пояснення появи порожнин у структурі російської мови базується на когнітивних дослідженнях поняття «відсутність». Оскільки асиметричні відношення пронизують усі рівні мовної системи, а теорія опозицій відбиває істотні характеристики мови, абстрактне поняття «відсутність» висувається на перший план у поясненні привативної природи мови. Дослідження сутності та феномену поняття «відсутність» у граматичній системі сприяли появі наступних ідей: вияви поняття «відсутність» віддзеркалюють граматичні лакуни, що відповідають різним семантичним типам поняття «відсутність» у російській граматиці. На підґрунті історичних фактів російської мови та когнітивної інтерпретації умовно виокремлено три семантичних типи поняття «відсутність»: *повна відсутність, відновлювана відсутність і зникнення*. У методологічному аспекті в статті поєднано психологічний та соціокультурний вектори. Методологічна база дослідження уможливила простежити та описати поняття «відсутність» на граматичному рівні російської системи мови.

Ключові слова: історія мови, лексична семантика, національно-культурна специфіка, когнітивна інтерпретація.
