Уманець А. В.,
Кам'янець-Подільський національний університет імені Івана Огієнка

THE WORD-GROUP THEORIES

У статті розглядаються різні тенденції теорій словосполучення у зарубіжній та вітчизняній лінгвістиці, аналізуються проблеми визначення статусних характеристик словосполучення як поліномінативної синтаксичної одиниці, що відтворює у реальності комплексну ситуацію та реалізує певні структурні схеми на синтаксичному рівні.

Ключові слова: *словосполучення, речення, синтаксична одиниця, номінативна одиниця, комунікативна одиниця.*

В статье рассматриваются различные тенденции теорий словосочетания в зарубежной и отечественной лингвистике, анализируются проблемы определения статусных характеристик словосочетания как полиноминативной синтаксической единицы, которая отображает в реальности комплексную ситуацию и реализует определенные структурные схемы на синтаксическом уровне.

Ключевые слова: *словосочетание, предложение, синтаксическая единица, номинативная единица, коммуникативная единица.*

The article envisages different trends in the word-group theory in foreign and home linguistics, some problems of defining the status of a word-group as a polynomination syntactic unit which denotes a complex referent situation and renders the language system by definite syntactic patterns.

Key words: *word-group, sentence, syntactic unit, nominative unit, communicative unit.*

As early as the 18th century some conceptions of a word-group have been first mentioned in practical grammar books. A pure scientific theory of a word-group was worked out by home scholars F.F. Fortunov, A.A. Shakhmatov, A.M. Peshkovsky. Any syntactically arranged unit, irrespective of its composition and types of syntactic relations between its constituents was considered a word-group. This point of view is accepted by many linguists of our school nowadays. But it is not the only one adopted in home linguistics and abroad [2; 4; 5; 7; 8; 9].

Many scientists put forward a profoundly grounded idea that language represents some binary focused system with two centres – "sentence vs word", and all other language levels and sub-levels insofar come to lexical or sentential levels and are derived from them as a result of segmenting processes. Conversely, there appeared the problem of sentence and word-group correlation. This problem is related to the levels of language strata, which are called "phrasemic" and "sentential" levels. One of the problems of defining the status of a word-group consists in responding to the question: which is a primary level among the mentioned above, that is whether we define sentence as a unit built up from a phrasemic structure or, we define a phrasemic structure as resulting from sentence segmenting. The answer to this question seems not to be too complicated: similar to the fact that a phrasemic structure is a combination of words, a sentence is represented by a combination of word-groups. But it turns out that a sentence cannot be considered an extended word-group (phrase) or a group of word-groups as it has quite different qualitative characteristics and fulfils quite different from word-groups functions. As matter of fact, we separate a word-group from a sentence by the process of segmenting. This allows some scientists to define sentence as a primary unit compared to word-group.

Scholars are of the opinion that the nominative meaning of a syntagmatically complete average sentence (an ordinary proposemic nomination) reflects a processual situation or event that includes a certain process (actional or statal) is its dynamic centre, the agent of the process, the object of the process, and conditions or circumstances of the realization of the process. This content of the proposemic event builds up the basis of the traditional syntactic division of the sentence. Therefore the word-group is defined as a nominative unit which fulfils the function of polynomination denoting a complex referent, while the sentence is a unit of predication which performs not one, but two essential signemic functions: sentence-naming (nominative) and reality-evaluating (predicative) functions. Between the sentence and the substantive word-group of the full nominative type direct transformational relations are established. The sentence realizes paradigmatic relations and is transformed into the substantive or nominalized word-group while losing its processual-predicative character [3, p. 246-247].

In the 50s of the 20th century the Soviet linguistic tradition adhered to another treatment of the term "word-group", where this term became very narrow and included only subordinate word-groups. This point of view was worked out by the Academician Vinogradov V.V. and supported by many Soviet linguists. Though it was criticised by many prominent Soviet linguists, it was widely acknowledged in the 20th century.

Scientifically grounded word-group theory appeared abroad much later than in our country. Theoretical interpretation of this problem had been worked out by foreign scientists only by the 1930s, and is mostly known from the works of the American linguist L. Bloomfield. He considers the word-group in a very wide sense, following the point of view of the Soviet scholars of the beginning of the 20th century.

The terms "endocentric" and "exocentric" for syntactic constructions were introduced by L. Bloomfield.

"Endocentric" and "exocentric" word-groups are also called "headed" and "non-headed" (*e.g. John and Mary, fresh fruit* – endocentric, *John studied* – exocentric). In endocentric word-groups we can always find the head and the adjunct (subordinate endocentric word-groups) (*e.g. poor John, skimmed milk*) or a head, represented by a group subject (coordinate endocentric word-groups) (*e.g. John and Mary, the rich and the poor*). Adjunct always qualifies or defines the head. L. Bloomfield refers to endocentric word-groups all word-groups where the function of the head coincides with the function

of the whole word-group. Therefore the head of the word-group can substitute it in a larger syntactic unit. Exocentric word-groups have no head and the functions of their constituents do not coincide with the function of the whole word-group. Thus, in exocentric word-groups no constituent can substitute the whole word-group in a larger syntactic unit. To exocentric word-groups belong word-groups with primary predication, secondary predication and prepositional word-groups. But L. Bloomfield does not differentiate between primary and secondary predication. E. Kruisinga differentiates between "close and loose word-groups". "We speak of a close group when one of the members is syntactically the leading element of the group. We speak of a loose group when each element is comparatively independent of the other members. Examples of close groups are nouns with an attributive noun or adjective, or with an article or a possessive pronoun; also the groups of nouns and pronouns with a verb stem or participle or a verbal *ing*. The loose groups, on the contrary, leave the individual words unaffected by their membership of the group, as in *men* and *women* [E. Kruisinga. A Handbook of Present-Day English, p. 177].

For many scientists the term "словосполучення" was the equivalent for "word-group", "phrase", "word cluster", "word-collocation", "syntactic group", "word combination". When words are joined together grammatically and logically without forming a full sentence, we call the combination a word-group. Thus, *"man of honour"*, *"the roundness of the earth"*, *"the round earth"*, *"going away"*, *"his going away"* are word-groups. When words come together without there being any special connection between them, they may be said to constitute a word-collocation [H. Sweet. A New English Grammar, p. 16]. Some scientists differentiate between syntagmatic groupings of notional words alone, syntagmatic groupings of notional words with functional words, and syntagmatic groupings of functional words alone [2, p. 222]. Other scholars operate with the term "word-group", as a combination of two or more words which is a grammatical unit but is not an analytical form of some word [6, p. 171]. There also exists a point of view of some scholars who consider the term "word combination" [1; 8]. The word combination, along with the sentence, is the main syntactic unit. The smallest word combination consists of two members, whereas the largest word combination may theoretically be indefinitely large though this issue has not yet been studied properly [1, p. 196].

H. Sweet criticised the term "word-group". But L. Bloomfield retained it. Besides, L. Bloomfield defined hypotactic and paratactic relations. Some scholars use the term "syntactic group". A syntactic group represents a combination of words that forms a distinct part of a sentence. If the definition of the terms "word" and "sentence" could be regarded as settled, the definition of the term "syntactic group", and its delimitation with respect to the other terms, might be perfectly clear. In many cases it is by no means a simple matter, however, to decide whether a given number of syllables is to be looked upon as a single word or as a group of words [E. Kruisinga. A Handbook of Present-Day English, p. 177].

L. Bloomfield's theory of word-group was developed further. Ch. Hocket suggested a more detailed structural description of endo-exocentric word-groups. L. Hjelmslev developed a theory of syntactic relations, defining three types: relations of independence, relations of dependence, relations of interdependence.

The problem of the word-group pattern "N + V_{fin}" is controversial for scholars. Some grammarians treat them together with other types of word-groups (L. Bloomfield, P. Roberts), the majority point out that they are sentences, and have the status of communicative units.

It is not settled yet whether the word-group is a specific unit of syntax. Three interpretations have been put forward:
– the word-group is not a specific unit of syntax; syntax studies nothing but sentences;
– the word-group is the only unit of syntax;
– the word-group is one of syntactic units.

F.I. Buslaev, M. Ganshina and N. Vasilevskaya, V.L. Kaushanskaya and her co-authors are of the opinion that syntax deals with sentences only. Taking away word-groups from the syntactic level, according to A.I. Smirnitsky, causes a disregard of the rules of joining words that exist irrespective of the fact whether a word-group makes part of a sentence or not.

F.F. Fortunatov and A.M. Peshkovsky, on the contrary, were of the opinion that the word-group is the only syntactic unit. If the word-group were the only syntactic unit, it would not be clear how to treat one-word sentences. A.M. Peshkovsky looks upon them as a specific kind of word-group.

However, the existence of one-word sentences is not the most important argument against restricting the sphere of syntax to word-groups. The main drawback of the conception lies in the fact that it does not differentiate between the word-group and the sentence. And they have different status as the word-group represents a naming unit of language (V.V. Vinogradov, N.Y. Shvedova, M.Y. Blokh), and the sentence is a communicative unit (O. Jespersen, A. Gardiner, Y.M. Skrebnev).

Due to their nominative meaning, both the sentence and the word-group enter the language system by their syntactic patterns. The traditional linguistics presents the main types of syntactic patterns: predicative (subject + predicate), objective (verb + object), attributive (attribute + noun), adverbial (verb/adverb/adjective + adverbial modifier).

Cognitive approach to word-group studies mechanisms of conceptual integration. J.R. Taylor envisages constructional schemas which belong to the conceptual level: schemas with head-complement relations, schemas with head-modifier relation, schemas with appositional relations, schemas with parataxis. He uses the basic notions of cognitive grammar analysis "profile" and "fuse" interpreting the mechanisms of conceptual word combination.

Thus, we envisaged some trends in the word-group theory in foreign and home linguistics, analysed some problems of defining the status of a word-group as a polynomination syntactic unit denoting a complex referent which enters the language system by definite syntactic patterns.

We focus our future work on typological research of word-groups in English and Ukrainian considering their valance properties.

Література:

1. Алєксєєва І. О. Курс теоретичної граматики сучасної англійської мови : навчальний посібник / Ірина Олексіївна Алєксєєва. – Вінниця : НОВА КНИГА, 2007. –328 с.

2. Блох М. Я. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка : учебник / Марк Яковлевич Блох. – [3-е изд., испр.] – М. : Высш. школа, 2000. – 381 с

3. Блох М. Я. Практикум по теоретической грамматике английского языка : [учеб. пособие] / М. Я. Блох, Т. Н. Семёнова, С. В. Тимофеева. – М. : Высш. шк., 2004. – 471 с.

4. Волкова Л. М. Theoretical Grammar of English : Modern Approach : [навчальний посібник] / Лідія Михайлівна Волкова. – К. : Освіта України, 2010. – 256 с.

5. Иванова И. П., Бурлакова В. В., Почепцов Г. Г. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. – М. : Высш. школа, 1981. – 285 с.

6. Ильиш Б. А. Строй современного английского языка / Борис Александрович Ильиш. – [2-е изд.] – Л. : Просвещение. – 366 с.

7. Харітонов І. К. Теоретична граматика сучасної англійської мови : навчальний посібник / Іван Кирилович Харітонов. – Вінниця : НОВА КНИГА, 2008. – 352 с.

8. Biber D., Johansson S., Leech G., etc. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. – L. : Pearson Education, 2000. – 1204 p.

9. Muir J. A. A Modern Approach to English Grammar : An Introduction to Systematic Grammar. – L. : Batsford, 2001. – 289 p.