Asyndetic Complementation in the Light of Explicative Syntax (Exemplified with Bulgarian, Polish and Ukrainian)

Introduction

The subject of this article is the unresolved problem of explicative syntax, namely the implementation of propositional arguments in the form of asyndetic subordinate clauses: in other words, asyndetic sentential actants (or asyndetic complements). In the publications of the Polish School of Semantic Syntax, the asyndetic form of clausal actants was not previously taken into account. Perhaps that state of affairs arose under the influence of Karolak (2002, pp. 156–158), who did not consider asyndetic sentences as a form of realization of propositional argu-

---

1 This theory is presented in the following publications: Karolak (2002); Kiklewicz and Korytkowska (2010); Papierz (2013); Kiklewicz et al. (2019a) etc.
ments. A certain role in that might have been played by the fact that, according to a generally accepted opinion, asyndetic sentences are functionally correlated with complex sentences formed with conjunctions (Шведова, 1980, p. 648). This functional equivalence means that the transformation of that-constructions into ∅-constructions has nothing to do with the valence of verbal predicates, nor with the structure of complex sentences. A more careful study of language material convinces us of the fallacy of this point of view: the realization of the sentential actant in the asyndetic form depends on the verb (its lexical and grammatical meaning) and is one of its valence characteristics.

Kiklewicz (Киклевич, 2021) provides a detailed description of the features of asyndetic sentential complements in modern Russian. This article is a continuation of the cited publication. In the present paper, I will focus on the comparative aspect of constructions of this type, comparing the material of modern Slavic languages: Bulgarian, Polish and Ukrainian.

The material for the study includes syntactic constructions that feature a complex sentence structure with a basic (matrix) verbal predicate of thinking, cognition, emotion or perception in the main part. The empirical material was retrieved from corpora available on the internet, internet search engines, literary and journalistic texts, dictionaries and other sources.

1. Syntactic indicators of clausal complements

In the theory of explicative syntax, the formal-grammatical level is subordinate to the semantic one. This is also reflected in the nature of the linguistic description: the formal characteristics of syntactic representations are not fully described. Karolak (2002, p. 61) introduces the concept of syntactic indicators, wskaźnik syntaktyczny in Polish (in the form of morphemes or words), by means of which expressions with a semantic function enter syntactic relations with other autosemantic expressions. Karolak distinguishes several types of such indicators, including the structural type of expression that stays with a given word within the same syntagm. Karolak (2002, p. 72) states that the same verb is combined with complements from different grammatical categories containing different indicators; for example:

(1) Pol. (Ktoś) prosi, żeby (ktoś) napisał list.
   (Someone) asks (someone else) to write a letter.
(2) Pol. (Ktoś) prosi, żeby napisać list.  
(Someone) asks (someone else) to write a letter.

(3) Pol. (Ktoś) prosi o napisanie listu.  
(Someone) asks for a letter to be written. | (Someone) asks (someone else) 
   to write a letter.

Karolak omits another distribution option allowed by the system of con-
temporary Polish, namely a complex sentence without a conjunction:

(4) Pol. (Ktoś) prosi: napisz list.  
(Someone) asks: please, write a letter.

Publications in the field of explicative syntax discuss the issues of using 
these or other conjunctions in the structure of a clausal complement. M. Koryt-
kowska (2017, pp. 313–315) writes about the use of extensional conjunctions in 
sentences with an emotive matrix predicate. A. Kiklewicz (Киклевич, 2022) 
examines the semantic, grammatical and pragmatic conditions for the alter-
nation of the intensional conjunctions that and how in Polish and Russian 
compound sentences. Semantics-based syntax methodology should also be 
applied to the description of asyndetic sentences.

From the outset, it should be noted that explicative syntax introduces a new 
aspect of verb valence: while valence was traditionally understood in a horizontal 
aspect, i.e., as (semantic or formal) one component’s requirements of another, 
the approach proposed by Karolak has a vertical perspective in that each verb 
specifies possible alternations of its syntagmatic complements. For example, 
the Bulgarian verb мисля ‘think’ has three meanings, each of which corre-
ponds to different valence classes, i.e., assemblies of syntactic representations 
compatible with the verb (in one sense or another) see Kiklewicz et al. (2019b):

(5) МИСЛЯ1 = TO THINK1 ‘to have an opinion on something’  
Мисля (за това), че трябва да купиш ново жилище.  
I think (about) that you should buy a new house.  
Мисля за нея, че трябваше да направиш това, за което говорихме.  
I think for her, she should have done what we talked about.  
Не мисля за него като политик.  
I don’t think of him as a politician.

(6) МИСЛЯ2 = TO THINK2 ‘become aware of some facts, events, sensations 
and focus on them’  
Мисля (за това), че трябва да напишеш този текст още днес.  
I think that you should write this text today.  
Ваня често мисли за отношенията между жените и мъжете.  
Vanya often thinks about the relationship between women and men.
Непрекъснато мисля за нея.
I think about her all the time.

(7) МИСЛЯЗ = TO THINK3 ‘to intend to do something’
Мисля да пътувам.
I’m thinking of traveling. | I’m going to travel.
Мисля за нова работа.
I’m thinking about a new job. | I’m going to find a new job.
Мисля за нова кола (да си я купя).
I’m thinking about a new car (to buy). | I’m going to buy a new car.

I assume that the so-called zero complementation (for more on this concept, see Mazzola et al., 2022, p. 199) is an alternative form of representation of the sentential actant, whose presence is associated with the valence of the matrix verb. This and other conditions of asyndetic complements will be discussed in the following sections.

2. Asyndetic clausal actant

Asyndetic (in other terminology, conjunctionless or collocative) connections are regarded by some scientists in opposition to subordinating, coordinative and parental connections (see Аипова, 2008, p. 244), although it would be more correct to interpret this phenomenon as a type of expression of syntactic connection in a complex sentence because asyndetic sentences express both subordinating and coordinating relations see Bauer (1961). Asyndetic sentences are studied in several aspects: from the point of view of additional forms of realization of syntactic connection (such as intonation, word order, correlative words, forms of syntactic moods, parallelism of the syntactic structure); from the point of view of the nature of the connection, in particular, the coreference of the elements of the main and dependent clauses; as well as in terms of the areas of use (mainly in colloquial speech and fiction) and stylistic marking. From the point of view of explicative syntax, subordinate clauses

---

2 So, in Spanish, the use of asyndetic sentences (with a subordinating connection) is facilitated by the coreference between the object of the matrix verb in the main part and the subject of the subordinate clause (Lehmann, 1988, p. 21; Mazzola et al., 2022, p. 201).

3 In Slavic languages, asyndetic sentences are more characteristic of colloquial speech and artistic and journalistic texts, although, for example, in modern Spanish, asyndetic complementation is rare and is considered a hallmark of formal speech registers, in particular, administrative, legal and epistolary texts (see Girón Alconchel, 2005).
without conjunctions are alternative forms of expressing a certain sense; apart from them, there are other forms, including clauses with conjunctions, cf.:

(8) Bulg. Дияна знае, че той ще се върне.
    || Дияна знае: той ще се върне
(9) Pol. Dziewczyna wie, że Jan wróci.
    || Dziewczyna wie: Jan wróci.
(10) Ukr. Дівчина знає, що він ще повернеться.
    || Дівчина знає: він ще повернеться.

Whether or not conjunctionless clauses are a form of syntactic complements connoted by the matrix verb is interpreted in various ways in linguistic literature. In syntactic literature, attention is quite sporadically paid to asyndetic clauses as a form of realizing the valence of a verbal predicate and as a form of a subordinate clause in a complex sentence. Z. Klemensiewicz (1957, p. 72) distinguishes the articulatory indicators of connection (Polish: wymawianiowe wskaźniki zespolenia) in conjunctionless sentences (intonation, stress, pause), but he does not provide examples of sentences with a clausal complement. In his Basic Knowledge of Polish Grammar, Klemensiewicz (2001, p. 136) treats sentences with an indirect question as asyndetic.

S. Jodłowski (1968, p. 195) recognizes the asyndetic form of joining simple clauses in the structure of a complex sentence, but he considers only a case of joining non-connoted (i.e., extensional) clauses, in particular clauses with the meaning of the cause, cf.:

    || Poczuł się szczęśliwie, gdyż umiał latać.

H. Wróbel (2001, p. 285) distinguishes not only syndetic sentence patterns connoted by a matrix verb, but also alternative syntactic constructions, including conjunctionless ones. Wróbel writes that complex sentences of this kind have a “looser structure”. This Polish author evokes the verbs mówić ‘to speak’, powiedzieć ‘to tell’, twierdzić ‘to claim’, prosić ‘to ask (for)’, pytajć ‘to ask (about)’, all of which allow for a clausal complement without the use of a conjunction, for example:


---

4 In German, asyndetic sentences express the meaning of a condition, and the dependent part usually occurs in the preposition, cf.: Besuchst du mich, koche ich etwas Leckeres. || Wenn du mich besuchst, koche ich etwas Leckeres (If you visit me, I will cook something delicious).
Wróbel (2001), however, is limited to so-called direct speech, not to mention the regular use of Polish asyndetic constructions with matrix verbs of other lexical-semantic groups, e.g., with mental and emotional verbs, as indicated by example (9), as well as the Polish examples provided below:

(13) W pewnym momencie widzę: idzie człowiek.
(14) Aż tu raz słyszę, ktoś do okna kałacze.
(15) Myślę: niech się odsunie, niech stanie dwa metry dalej.
(17) Czulem, ktoś za mną podąża.
(18) Mam nadzieję, nie będzie to ostatnia wygrana.
(19) Mam przeczucie: ona nie jest szczera ze mną.
(20) Uznalem: trzeba o tym powiedzieć.
(21) Wierzę, Bóg nie jest jak my.

J. Podracki (1997, pp. 143–145) cites examples of complex sentences in which there is – according to his definition – a relative connection, i.e., a conjunctionless one:

(22) Pol. Mam żal do ciebie: naraziłeś mnie na kłopoty.
    || Mam żal do ciebie, ponieważ bo naraziłeś mnie na kłopoty.
(23) Pol. Nie śpię od dwóch godzin, za ścianą wciąż hałasują.
    || Nie śpię od dwóch godzin, gdyż za ścianą wciąż hałasują.

This researcher writes that complex sentences in which the subordinate relationship is indicated by intonation, and by punctuation marks (a colon or a comma) in writing, are rare in modern Polish.

M. Grochowski, in the chapter of The Grammar of the Modern Polish Language (Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego) on polipredicative sentences (Grochowski, 1984, pp. 213–215), does not specifically address the issue of asyndetic constructions, although he touches on this problem when he writes about parenthesis. This researcher rejects the concept that parenthetic expressions occur only within a sentence. In his opinion, they can also occupy a position both before and after the main text (Grochowski, 1984, p. 248), for example:


---

5 In Mitkovska and Bužarovska (2021, p. 287), parenthesis is also considered within the asyndetic relationship.

Treating construction (24) and similar ones as implementing the structure of the “parenthesis + main text” type seems doubtful, as is indicated by two arguments. Firstly, in sentence (24), the first part is pronounced with a rising intonation, similarly to the syndetic sentences, while the parenthesis is characterized by a falling intonation see Moroz (2010, p. 96), cf.:

(27) Muszę przyznać, Piotr bardzo wydoroślał.
(28) Muszę przyznać, że Piotr bardzo wydoroślał.
(29) Piotr, muszę przyznać, bardzo wydoroślał.

Secondly, the first clause is sometimes combined (as indicated by the conjunction in the preposition) with another clause that is not parenthetical, so it is obvious that we are dealing with the following arrangement: “clause1 + (conjunction) clause2 + (no conjunction)) clause 3”:

(30) Pol. Grałem w Undead Clash i muszę przyznać nic z tego nie będzie.
(32) Pol. Wielu menadżerów „liniowych” zadawało mi to pytanie i muszę przyznać, jest ono niełatwe.
(33) Pol. Kończę z warzeniem piwa, gdyż muszę przyznać, pomimo czytania wątków na forum […] mnie filtracja po prostu przestać.

Thus, in sentences (30) and (31), it is natural and reasonable to recognize the coordinate relationships:

(34) grałem i muszę przyznać
(35) zajrzałem do ciebie i muszę przyznać

not the relationships:

(36) grałem i nic z tego nie będzie
(37) zajarzałem do ciebie i sytuacja nietypowa

---

6 ~gracz [103.232.121.*] (2022).
7 chemik Krzysztof Kragel (2008).
8 Mistrz Gemba (n.d.).
9 Prynt (2008).
Similarly, in sentence (32), there is a coreference between the several actants of the first two clauses, which gives grounds to claim that there is a syntactic relationship between them:

(38) wielu zadawało MI pytanie i JA muszę przyznać

In sentence (33), the nature of the syntactic relationships is obvious: we are dealing with successive subordination:

(39) kończę … gdyż muszę przyznać (że) filtracja mnie przeraża

It can therefore be concluded that in constructions of type (24), there is a subordinate relationship, realized in a non-conjunctive form (for a similar approach see Moroz, 2010, pp. 93–94): the first part has a matrix character, and its verb connotes a clausal complement, like in constructions with a conjunction:

(40) (muszę) przyznać, że S
     (muszę) przyznać, S

At the same time, it should be admitted that the first component sentence in an asyndetic relationship may have a parenthetic character. We observe this, for example, in sentences with the verb widzisz ‘to see’ in the 2nd-person singular when it has a hesitation function, and then an alternative form with the conjunction is not possible (i.e., it is not semantically equivalent). Below are some examples from Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz’s novel Fame and Glory:

(41) Widzisz, ja chciałem powiedzieć – ciągnął dalej Gołąbek i opuścił wzrok – ja chciałem ci powiedzieć, że jeżeli chcesz, to niech tak będzie, jak jest…
(42) Widzisz, kiedy mi czytała Sienkiewicza, to mi się wtedy wydawało niemożliwe.
(43) Widzisz, Walraku, nie odpowiem ci na te wszystkie pytania, które mi zadaleś.

When pronouncing this type of construction, a longer pause is required between the verb in the parenthetic position and the main clause.

The issue of asyndetic complementation is also marginalized by the authors of syntactic dictionaries. In K. Polański’s Dictionary (Polański, 1980–1992, vol. 4, p. 524, vol. 5, p. 30) there are illustrations of the implementation of the propositional argument in sentential or nominalized form, for example:

(44) Pol. UZNAWAĆ
     Widać nawet oni uznali mnie za swego przyjaciela.
On bynajmniej nie uznał nas za swoich wrogów.
Uznał moje milczenie za zgodę.
Uznali ten wyrok za nieważny.
Uznaj tę sytuację za niebyłą i wszystko będzie w porządku.

(45) Pol. WIERZYĆ
Moja żona wierzy we wszystko, co jej ludzie powiedzą.
Wierzę w zwycięstwo idei pokoju.
Pan wierzy w przyszłość elektroniki.
Chrześcijanie wierzą w istnienie Boga.
Moja teściowa do dziś nie wierzy w to, że ziemia jest okrągła.

(46) Pol. WIEDZIEĆ
Andrzej wiedział wszystko.
Wiedziałem, że przyjedziesz.
Wiem, kto otrzymał nagrodę.
Nie wiem, czy wiesz, ile kosztował ten dom

As we can see, asyndetic representations, which, as indicated by examples (13) – (21), are acceptable for the verbs uznać ‘to recognize’, wierzyć ‘to believe’, wiedzieć ‘to know’, are not included here. A similar situation can be observed in other dictionaries: Andrejewicz et al. (2016); Mędak (2005).

In Ukrainian linguistics, conjunctionlessness is considered one of the types of formal realization of syntactic relationships within a complex sentence. Thus, A. Zahnitko (Загнітко, 2001, pp. 332–334); see also Chubań (Чубань, 2018, p. 249) writes that asyndetic constructions are ambivalent in terms of content plane – the nature of the relationship between the parts depends on their semantic content, as well as on the sender’s intentions. Zahnitko maintains a wide use of asyndetic constructions in modern Ukrainian, including such uses when the second part realizes the position of the supplementary element required by the matrix predicate in the first part (Загнітко, 2001, p. 431), for example:

(47) Ukr. Думав: є великé право одпочити під лавром свиту всім, хто в тій війні ніс страждання на плечах.
|| Думав, що є великé право одпочити під лавром свиту …

A. Gradinarova (Градинарова, 2015, pp. 85–87) states that asyndetic constructions implement several syntactic relations quite widely in contemporary Bulgarian: cause, consequence, condition, consent, juxtaposition, generalization, explanation, etc. This also applies to object clauses connoted by the matrix verb with the meaning of thought, perception, or speech; such clauses occur in various styles of speech, for example:
(48) Bulg. Дръжката беше от кована мед и аз чух: от същата мед бе и гласът ми.
(49) Bulg. И ми се стори: съвсем ясно видях увитата в тънката тъкан на тази усмивка дума.
(50) Bulg. Казах: човек трябва да бъде верен на Христос.
(51) Bulg. Та вие разбирате – постигнахме определени успехи.
(52) Bulg. Надявам се, не бихте възразили да уведомите пресата за това.

Gradinarova (Градинарова, 2015, p. 88) points out that the Bulgarian language contains all types of asyndetic sentences that have been distinguished in the grammars of East Slavic languages, although the frequency of use of some construction types in Bulgarian is lower (see also Котова & Янакиев, 2001, p. 721). Using the parallel Russian-Bulgarian corpus (https://ruscorpora.ru/search), Gradinarova (Градинарова, 2015) shows that there are cases where an original sentence in Russian is syndetic and its Bulgarian translation is asyndetic, cf.:

(53) Russ. Я видел: некоторые дворяне уже открыто прогуливаются перед своими домами.
    Bulg. = Аз видях, че някои дворяни вече открито се разхождат пред домовете си.
(54) Russ. Тут Колька услышал: возки гремят впереди.
    Bulg. = В този момент Колка чу, че някъде напред трополят каруци.
(55) Russ. Думаю, ты веришь, и потому новая тебе работа.
    Bulg. = Мисля, че вярваш, и затуй ще ти бъде възложена нова работа.

3. Conditions of asyndetic complementation

The alternation of forms of syntactic representation of the propositional argument Conj – S || ∅ – S does not consist only in the presence or absence of a conjunction. There are distributional differences between the two forms. On the one hand, the asyndetic form of the syntactic relationship entails a certain modification in the structure of the dependent clause. This is well illustrated by the example of direct speech:

Various components of direct speech must undergo transformation or removal, because now they are reported indirectly by the speaker of the quoted sentence; they are not quoted as the words of the sender of direct speech. If the quoted sentence
refers to the sender or the recipient, the person (or mood) of the verb and the pronominal nouns associated with it are changed (Wróbel, 2001, p. 287).  

On the other hand, there are contextual conditions for the occurrence of asyndetic clauses. For example, one of them is the lack of a correlative word in the main part, cf.:

(56) Pol. Piotr wierzy w to, że szczęście osiąga się dzięki wiedzy i edukacji.
    || Piotr wierzy: szczęście osiąga się …
    || *Piotr wierzy w to: szczęście osiąga się …

However, a correlator in asyndetic clauses is possible, provided that it correlates with the entire dependent clause; in such sentences the correlator is stressed, cf.:  

(57) Pol. Tak sobie myślę: niech strajkują, niech walczą, niech wytrzymają.
    || Myślę sobie: niech strajkują …
    || Myślę sobie, że niech strajkują …
    || *Tak myślę sobie, że niech strajkują …

(58) Pol. Mocno w to wierze: będzie dobrze.
    || Mocno wierzę: będzie dobrze.
    || Mocno wierzę, że będzie dobrze.
    || *Mocno w to wierzę, że będzie dobrze.

    || Jestem pewien, że ona będzie moja.
    || *Jednego jestem pewien, że ona będzie moja.

Restrictions on the asyndetic syntactic form apply to both the main clause and the dependent clause. Each condition type will be discussed in a separate section.

### 3.1. Requirements for the main clause

Observations show that the transformation Conj – S > ∅ – S is not always admissible, so there are limitations to the use of conjunctionless complementation that are related to, among other things, the nature of the main clause. Consider the examples below:

---

10 Original: „Przekształceniulub usunięciu muszą ulec różne składniki mowy niezależnej, teraz bowiem są relacjonowane pośrednio przez nadawcę zdania przytaczającego, a nie cytowane jako słowa nadawcy wypowiedzi niezależnej. Jeśli zdanie przytoczone dotyczy nadawcy lub odbiorcy, zmianie ulega osoba (eventualnie tryb) czasownika oraz rzeczownik zaimkowe z nim związane”.

11 For Ukrainian sentences of this type, see Загнiтко (2001, pp. 431–433).
As can be seen, the admissibility of an asyndetic phrase depends on both the matrix verb and its modification. I will discuss the first type of conditioning first, then the second one.

### 3.1.1. Matrix verb

The asyndetic form of the syntactic connection is largely due to the matrix predicate. This characteristic of the asyndetic syntactic connection is common not only Slavic but in most European languages, for example, Germanic or Romance (see Mitkovska & Bužarovska, 2021; Petrova, 2020, pp. 564–566; Киклевич, 2021). On the one hand, there are lexical-semantic classes of verbs that allow the conjunctionless implementation of the propositional argument. These are verbs of speech and mental, emotive, and perceptual verbs (see example (13) and those that follow it). On the other hand, causative, relative and optative verbs, as well as verbs with the meaning of display and reproduction, do not allow the conjunctionless form of the sentential actant, cf.:

(60) Pol. Wierzę, że przyjdzie lepszy czas.  
     || Wierzę – przyjdzie lepszy czas.
(61) Pol. Łudzi się, że przyjdzie lepszy czas.  
     || *Łudzi się – przyjdzie czas.
(62) Pol. Nie wierzy mi się, że przejdzie lepszy czas.  
     || *Nie wierzy mi się: przejdzie lepszy czas.

Within individual lexical-semantic classes, there are differences among verbs in terms of their compatibility with an asyndetic sentential actant. In this regard, several factors can be distinguished. Firstly, the sentential actant
appears only with 2-argument verbs. In the case of 3-argument verbs, the asyndetic realization of the propositional argument is not allowed, cf.:

(70) Pol. DOPATRYWAĆ SIĘ | DOPATRZYĆ SIĘ (ktoś, w czymś, coś)
Lekarz dopatrzył się w stanie pacjenta, że jest chory na białaczkę.
|| *Lekarz dopatrzył się w stanie pacjenta: jest chory na białaczkę.

Secondly, the asyndetic realization of the sentential actant depends on the particular meaning of the verb. For example, among mental verbs (usually 3-argument, see above), verbs of choice, definition and verification have a lesser predisposition to this type of syntactic connection.

Thirdly, the asyndetic connection is typical for verbs that allow for an explanatory-objective dependent clause with a conjunction in the initial position. At the same time, sentences containing an indirect question are not converted into an asyndetic construction (for some exceptions, see section 2.2). In this regard, let us compare the Ukrainian verbs знати ‘to know’ and цікавитись ‘to be interested’:

(71) Павло знає, що хтось у цій справі замішаний.
|| Павло знає, хто в цій справі замішаний.
|| Павло знає: у цій справі хтось замішаний.

(72) *Павло цікавиться, що хтось у цій справі замішаний.
|| Павло цікавиться, чи хтось у цій справі замішаний.
|| Павло цікавиться, хто в цій справі замішаний.
|| *Павло цікавиться: у цій справі хтось замішаний.

Fourthly, as noted by S. Petrova (2020, p. 566), in addition to the fact of the compatibility of one or another semantic class of verbs with the ability to attach an asyndetic sentential actant, there is a greater or lesser ability of individual lexemes to act in constructions of this type. Thus, according to the corpus of the modern Polish language (Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego, 2008–2012), the verb wiedzieć ‘to know’ appears most regularly among mental verbs in asyndetic sentences, less frequently the verbs czekać ‘to wait’, uważać ‘to think’, myśleć ‘to think’ and wierzyć ‘to believe’, while the verbs domyślać się ‘to work out’ and wnioskować ‘to conclude’ are not in the asyndetic constructions in the corpus.

Fifthly, the grammatical structure of the main clause, namely the nature of the verbal diathesis, also affects the possibility of joining an asyndetic sentential actant. In principle, the asyndetic clause is possible in the conditions of
both the main the derivative diathesis (naturally, in those languages in which there are corresponding derivative diatheses), cf.:

(73) Ukr. Я думаю, вони не дуже добре це уявлляють.
(74) Ukr. Мені здається, вони не дуже добре це уявлляють.

However, an obstacle to the asyndetic connection is affective diathesis in sentences with emotive verbs (the semantic subject is realized in the form of a noun in the accusative case), cf.:

(75) Ukr. Я боюся, хтось може це використати.
    || Я боюся, що хтось може це використати.
    || Мене лякає, що хтось може це використати.
    || *Мене лякає, хтось може це використати.

F. R. Higgins (1979, p. 132) writes about the possibility of attaching sentence compliments to components with predicative semantics in the form of nouns, cf.:

(76) John’s anger that he was not chosen.
    || John is angry that he was not chosen.
(77) Mary’s insistence that we should leave.
    || Mary insists that we should leave.

Similar constructions also occur in Slavic languages (see Krapova & Cinque, 2016), cf. the Polish example below:

(78) Czujesz gniew, że lata mijają i nikt z tym nic nie robi.

It is worth noting that the removal of the conjunction in such expressions containing a matrix noun is very limited. For an asyndetic construction to occur under these conditions, a long pause is necessary, which in writing corresponds to a colon or dash:

(79) Pol. Czujesz gniew: że lata mijają i nikt z tym nic nie robi.
(81) Pol. Moje marzenie – domek z ogródkiem.

3.1.2. Compression

Let us compare two Ukrainian asyndetic sentences:

(82) Ukr. Раптом бачу: хтось іде.
(83) Ukr. Озираюся – нікого немає.
Despite the apparent similarity, these sentences differ in their structure: the first one is a direct reflection of the asyndetic transformation of the sentence with the conjunction, while the second one is the result of a more complex transformation:

(84) Ukr. Раптом бачу, що хтось іде.
(85) Ukr. Озираюся та бачу, що нікого немає.
    || *Озираюся, що нікого немає.

As we can see, the asyndetic connection can be realized under the conditions of compression of the matrix predicate, namely the contraction of the coordinative series. This kind of usage is typical of the Ukrainian verb придивимися ‘to observe’ (examples from the internet):

(86) Ukr. Я придивився: як тільки вчений, так і голодранець.
    || Я придивився і зрозумів, що як тільки вчений, так і голодранець.
(87) Ukr. Придивився уважніше – дичка росте!
    || Придивився уважніше і бачу, що дичка росте!
(88) Ukr. Придивилася уважніше: чоловік був не сам.
    || Придивилася уважніше і побачила, що чоловік був не сам.

A similar phenomenon is also observed in Bulgarian and Polish, cf.:

(89) Bulg. Погледни наоколо – всички те са се събрали.
    || Погледнах наоколо и видях, (че) всички са се събрали.
    || Гледам наоколо и виждам, (че) всички са се събрали.
    || Obejrzał się i zobaczył, że nikogo nie ma.
    || Obejrzał się i zobaczył – nikogo nie ma.

3.1.3. Negation

The factor that prevents an asyndetic connection is the presence of a negative particle in the main part of the matrix verb, cf.:

(91) Pol. Widzę, zostały przeniesione.
    || Widzę, że zostały przeniesione.
    || *Nie widzę, zostały przeniesione.
    || Nie widzę, że zostały przeniesione.

This phenomenon can have a logical-semantic explanation: the asyndetic dependent clause expresses the authentic (mental, emotional, sensory) state of the subject. It is no coincidence that this syntactic form is used in quoting. In a situation where the matrix verb is negated, the possibility of expressing
the authentic state-object is also automatically excluded: it is impossible to report on an authentic object of thought or experience if the thought or experience did not take place.

This characteristic also applies to internal negation, which is contained in the lexical meaning of the matrix verb. For example, the Polish verbs *przeoczyć* ‘to overlook’, *wątpić* ‘to doubt’, *zapomnieć* ‘to forget’, *zmartwić się* ‘to be worried’ have negative semantics, which explains the absence of asyndetic complements in their valence class, cf.:

(92)  Pol. Przeoczyłem, że piszą o nas na Vice.  
     || *Przeoczyłem: piszą o nas na Vice.
(93)  Pol. Wątpi, że poradzimy sobie.  
     || *Wątpi: poradzimy sobie.
(94)  Pol. Zapomniała, że mamy lato.  
     || *Zapomniała: mamy lato.
(95)  Pol. Zmartwiła się, że nie będzie mogła jej pomóc.  
     || *Zmartwiła się: nie będzie mogła jej pomóc.

If the verb has a “built-in” negative meaning, putting a negative particle means a double negation, i.e., it translates into the affirmative meaning of the main clause. We see this, for example, in sentences with the verb *zaprzeczać* | *zaprzeczyć* ‘to deny’:

     || Zaprzeczam, że mogli wycofać ten pomysł.  
     || Nie zaprzeczam: mogli wycofać ten pomysł.  
     || Nie zaprzeczam, że mogli wycofać ten pomysł.

As we can see, in sentences with this verb the use of an asyndetic complement is not provided for, but the negation of the verb makes it possible to use this form of representation of the propositional argument.

### 3.2. Requirements for dependent clauses

In section 2.1.1, I wrote about the fact that an indirect question is not converted into an asyndetic form. This restriction is connected not only with the valence of the matrix verb, but also with the structure of the dependent clause. So, the Polish verb *rozważać* ‘to consider’ is used in two ways: in explanatory-objective sentences and in sentences with an indirect question:

(97)  Pol. Dziś rozważamy, że warto mieć swoje zdanie na ten temat.
(98)  Pol. Dyrektor rozważa, czy warto organizować w szkole wolontariat.
Removing the conjunction in both examples is not possible, but there is an exception: the dependent question can be attached to the main clause in an asyndetic way if there is a disjunction in it:

(100) Pol. Rozważam: warto, nie warto.

Another peculiarity of dependent clauses connected to a main clause without a conjunction concerns the ellipse. On the one hand, the possibilities of elliptical sentence modification in the case of an asyndetic compound are limited, especially when it comes to removing the grammatical subject, cf.:

(101) Ukr. Я подумав, що (я) не повинен цього робити.
|| Я подумав: я не повинен цього робити.
|| *Я подумав: не повинен цього робити.

On the other hand, the conjunctionless relation allows for a more radical compression of the dependent clause when it comes to the verb predicate and its dependent complements. This is well illustrated by the following sentences:

(102) (Ukr. Взяв листівку на вулиці, придивився – повістка.
|| Взяв листівку на вулиці, придивився і бачу, що це повістка.
|| *Взяв листівку на вулиці, придивився і бачу, що повістка.
|| Pomyślałem, że zaczęła wojna.
|| Pomyślałem, że wojna.
(104) Bulg. Мисъл – краят.12
|| Мисля – това е краят.
|| Мисля, че това е краят.
|| *Мисъл, че краят.

With an asyndetic relationship, the dependent clause has greater pragmatic autonomy or authenticity (as discussed in section 2.1.3). This is manifested in the presence of the expressive modal and evaluative elements that are characteristic of live speech and, on the contrary, are not characteristic of sentences with a conjunction. In such cases, an alternative form with a subordinating conjunction is not possible, cf.:

(105) Ukr. Я дуже здивувалася: мало того, що ми працюємо на одній лінії, та ще й на одному автобусі їздимо.
|| *Я дуже здивувалася, що мало того, що ми працюємо на одній лінії …

12 Валентина Соловьов господар, когато връща откраднатите пари (2023).
(106) Ukr. Я вразився, який він блідий.
|| *Я вразився, що який він блідий.
(107) Ukr. Діти боялися, як би він не загарчав.
|| *Діти боялися, що як би він не загарчав.
(108) Ukr. Думаю, чорт, хоч убийте мене!
|| *Думаю, що, чорт, хоч убийте мене!
(109) Ukr. Думаю: дай спробую.
|| *Думаю, що дай спробую.

Conclusion

It can be concluded that the asyndetic form of clausal complements in Bulgarian, Polish and Ukrainian is an important characteristic of the verb valence of several lexical-semantic classes: verbs of knowledge, cognition, thinking and speech, as well as emotive and perceptual verbs. Verbs of other lexical-semantic classes do not allow for the asyndetic realization of the sentential actant. Despite the fact that the ability to attach an asyndetic subordinate clause is determined by the lexical-semantic class the verb belongs to, there are more particular factors that determine this type of syntactic connection. These include, in particular, the quantitative characteristic of the valence of the verb: the asyndetic sentential actant does not appear with 3-actant verbs. Some particular lexical meanings of verbs do not contribute to the asyndetic connection, and in some cases such a connection is a characteristic of the lexical compatibility of a particular lexeme. The asyndetic variant of the clausal complement is also not possible with verbs governing indirect questions.

It has been shown that in asyndetic sentences there is a more radical syntactic compression, namely the elimination of the verbal predicate from the main or dependent part. In addition, asyndetic complementation is possible only under the condition of the affirmative content of the main part. This explains the fact that such a clausal complement is not used with verbs containing negation (such as doubt). An asyndetic connection is impossible if certain types of derivative diathesis are realized in the main part, particularly in affective diathesis with the name of the experiencer in the position of direct object.

The use of an asyndetic connection is also associated with the composition and structure of the dependent clause. In sentences with an indirect question,
the absence of a conjunction is compensated for by the presence of a disjunctive syntactic connection in the dependent part. In addition, in asyndetic clauses there is a possibility of using various kinds of modal and pragmatic elements that directly reflect the states and attitudes of the subject of thought, speech, emotion, or perception.

In the analyzed languages (Bulgarian, Polish, and Ukrainian), all types of asyndetic connection are presented, but they are realized with different frequencies: in Bulgarian and Polish, asyndetic connection appears more rarely than in Ukrainian and, in general, in East Slavic languages.
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Komplementacja asyndetyczna w świetle składni eksplikacyjnej (na przykładzie języka bułgarskiego, polskiego i ukraińskiego)

Przedmiotem badania są bułgarskie, polskie i ukraińskie konstrukcje składniowe, w których pozycja dopełnienia klauzulowego jest realizowana w sposób asyndetyczny. Analiza materiału językowego opiera się na teorii składni eksplikatywnej, której podstawy opracował S. Karolak. Autor pokazuje, że dopełnienie asyndetyczne jest jedną z form realizacji argumentu propozycjonalnego, uwarunkowaną walencją czasownika matrycowego. Dana forma składniowa stanowi charakterystykę walencyjną ograniczonej grupy semantycznej czasowników, a mianowicie czasowników mentalnych, emotywnych, percep cyjnych i deliberatywnych. Autor pokazuje również, że istnieją inne czynniki, które sprzyjają lub odwrotnie nie sprzyjają użyciu dopełnień bezspójnikowych, takie jak: negacja, elipsa, koreferencja. Autor dochodzi do wniosku, że częstość występowania konstrukcji asyndetycznych w językach słowiańskich jest większa lub mniejsza.

Słowa kluczowe: składnia eksplikacyjna; walencja; składnia czasowników; aktant syntaktyczny; spójnik; dopełnienie asyndetyczne; język bułgarski; język polski; język ukraiński

Asyndetic complementation in the light of explicative syntax (exemplified with Bulgarian, Polish and Ukrainian)

The subject of the study is Bulgarian, Polish and Ukrainian syntactic constructions in which the position of the clausal complement is realized in an asyndetic manner. The analysis of language material is based on the theory of explicative syntax, the foundations of which were developed by S. Karolak. The author shows that the asyndetic complement is one of the forms of realization of the propositional argument that is conditioned by the valence of the matrix verb. A given syntactic form is a valence characteristic of a limited group of semantic classes of verb, namely mental, emotive, perceptive and deliberative verbs. The author also shows that there are other factors that favor or, conversely, do not favor the use of conjunctionless sentences, such as negation, ellipsis, coreference, and others. The author concludes that the frequency of asyndetic constructions in Slavic languages can vary.
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