Уманець А.В.

HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE PHRASE CONCEPTIONS IN FOREIGN AND HOME LINGUISTICS

At the end of the XIXth and at the beginning of the XXth centuries a pure scientific theory of the phrase was worked out by home scholars F.F. Fortunatov, A.A. Shakhmatov, A.M. Peshkovsky. For a long period of its advancing the phrase theory has been changed much. As late as the 1950s there existed a wide treatment of the term "phrase", and any syntactically arranged unit, irrespective of its composition and types of syntactic relations between its constituents was considered a phrase. 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 [4; 6; 8; 9; 11; 13].

In the 50s of the XXth century the Soviet linguistic tradition adhered to another treatment of the term "phrase", where this term became very narrow and included only subordinate phrases. This point of view was worked out by the Academician Vinogradov V.V. and supported by many Soviet linguists. He termed phrase as a group of notional words which are syntactically unequal, that is one dominates the other. Though it was criticised by many prominent Soviet linguists (Academician Zhirmunsky V.M., Professor Ilyish B.A.), it was widely acknowledged in the XXth century. M.Y. Blokh suggested the following classification of phrases:

1. combinations of notional words, such as *a sudden arrival, extremely difficult,* which have a clearly pronounced nominative destination and denote complex phenomena;

2. combinations of notional words with a function word, such as *can swim, of my sister,* which are equivalents to separate notional words by their nominative function. Functionally they may be compared to notional words used in various marked grammatical forms: *of my sister – my sister's;*

3. combinations of function words, such as *as far as, such as, from behind,* which are equivalents to separate functional words and are used as connectors and specifiers of notional elements of various status.

Scientifically grounded phrase 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 phrase in a very wide sense, following the point of view of the Soviet scholars of the beginning of the XXth century.

The terms "endocentric" and "exocentric" for syntactic constructions were introduced by L.Bloomfield. "Every syntactic construction shows us two (or sometimes more) free forms combined in a phrase, which we may call the resultant phrase. The resultant phrase may belong to a form-class other than that of any constituent. For instance, *John ran* is neither a nominative expression (like *John*) nor a finite verb expression (like *ran*). Therefore we say that English actor-action construction is exocentric: the resultant phrase belongs to the form-class of no immediate constituent. On the other hand, the resultant phrase may belong to the same form-class as one (or more) of the constituents. For instance, *poor John* is a proper-noun expression, and so is the constituent *John;* the forms *John* and *poor* have, on the whole, the same functions. Accordingly we say that the English character – substance construction (as in *poor John, fresh milk* and the like) is an endocentric construction" [L. Bloomfield. Language, 194].

"Endocentric" and "exocentric" phrases are also called "headed" and "non-headed" (*e.g. John and Mary, fresh fruit* – endocentric, *John studied* – exocentric). In endocentric phrases we can always find the head and the adjunct (subordinate endocentric phrases) (*e.g. poor John, skimmed milk*), or a head, represented by a group subject (coordinate endocentric phrases) (*e.g. John and Mary, the rich and the poor*). Adjunct always qualifies or defines the head. L. Bloomfield refers to endocentric phrases all phrases where the function of the head coincides with the function of the whole phrase. Therefore, the head of the phrase can substitute it in a larger syntactic unit. Exocentric phrases have no head, and the functions of their constituents do not coincide with the function of the whole phrase. Thus, in exocentric phrases no constituent can substitute the whole phrase in a larger syntactic unit. To exocentric phrases belong phrases with primary predication, secondary predication and prepositional phrases. But L. Bloomfield does not differentiate between primary and secondary predication. E. Kruisinga differentiates between "close and loose phrases". "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, 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, 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, 222]. Other scholars operate with the term "phrase", as a combination of two or more words which is a grammatical unit but is not an analytical form of some word [5, 171]. There also exists a point of view of some scholars who consider the term "word combination" [1; 7]. "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, 196].

H. Sweet criticised the term "phrase". But L. Bloomfield retained the term "phrase". Besides, L. Bloomfield defined hypotactic and paratactic relations. Some scholars use the term "syntactic group". "A syntactic group is 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, 177].

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

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

One more specification of foreign conceptions concerned the type of connection of phrase elements [10; 12 − 14]. It was suggested that all phrases in all languages should be first divided into phrases with hypotaxis (subordination) and those with parataxis (coordination). "When two words are associated together grammatically, their relation may be one either of coordination or of subordination. Coordination is shown either by word-order only, or by the use of form-words, as in *"men"*, *"women"*, and *"children"*, where the first two full words are connected only by their position, while the last two are connected by the form-word *and*. Subordination implies the relation of head-word and adjunct-word. But there are degrees of subordination. When the subordination of an assumptive (attributive) word to its head-word is so slight that the two are almost coordinate, the adjunct-word is said to be in opposition to its head-word" [H.Sweet. A New English Grammar, 16].

This subdivision reflects L. Bloomfield's classification of phrases into endocentric and exocentric. One of the main drawbacks of such classification is that it lacks uniformity of principles of classification. Every other stage of classification is based upon another principle either syntactical or structural.

It is not settled yet whether the phrase is a specific unit of syntax. Three interpretations have been put forward:

− the phrase is not a specific unit of syntax; syntax studies nothing but sentences;

− the phrase is the only unit of syntax;

− the phrase 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. The eliminating of phrases from the sphere of syntax, according to A. I. Smirnitsky, causes a disregard of the rules of joining words that exist irrespective of the fact whether a phrase makes part of a sentence or not.

F. F. Fortunatov and A. M. Peshkovsky, on the contrary, were of the opinion that the phrase is the only syntactic unit. If the phrase 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 phrase.

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

One of the most important terms in L. Bloomfield's syntactic theory is immediate constituents. A further development of the immediate constituents theory is found in the book *Immediate Constituents* by Wells published in 1947. According to Wells' syntactic theory of immediate constituents, successive morphemes in a sentence are divided into certain types and classes. The classes are defined in the following way: if there is sequence S, then the class where sequence S belongs to is defined as class that includes all sequences whose successive morphemes belong to the same classes as the morphemes of sequence S. All the elements of the class, therefore, contain an equal number of morphemes. An important peculiarity of Wells' classes is that a sequence belonging to a certain class may be replaced by a sequence of a different class. Therefore, two sequences of morphemes may be found in similar distribution, though their internal form may differ. The relationship between these two sequences is interpreted as follows: if one of the sequences is not shorter than the other (i.e. contains the same number of morphemes) and differs structurally, i.e. does not belong to the same class, the second sequence is called "extension of the first sequence", while the first is called "model". Thus, if we compare *John worked* and *The king of England opened the parliamentary session,* then *The king of England* may be the extension of *John,* while *opened the parliamentary session* is the extension of *worked.*

The notion of extension is extremely important for Wells, since, in terms of his theory, to define immediate constituents means actually pointing out extension that makes up a certain sequence of morphemes. It is the principle of extension that allows to break the sentence *The king of England opened the parliamentary session* into *The king of England + opened the parlia-mentary session.* It is impossible to divide the sentence into *The king + of England opened the parliamentary-session,* since *of England opened the parliamentary session* cannot be regarded as extension of anything shorter.

Phrases are classified according to some principles. Thus, according to the character of their syntactical arrangement we distinguish: subordinate phrases, coordinate phrases and predicative (or "nexus") phrases.

In terms of grammatical organisation, subordinate phrases are binary structures in which one of the members is syntactically the leading element of the phrase. No matter how complicated this twofold or binary structure may be, it can always be divided into two immediate constituents, one functioning as head and the other as modifier. Adjuncts serve to describe, to qualify, to select, to complete, to extend or in some other way to affect the meaning of the head, *e. g.: fresh air, stone wall, writing a letter, perfectly right, awfully tired,* etc.

Coordinate phrases consist of two or more syntactically equivalent units joined in a cluster which function as a single unit. The units so joined may be any of the parts of speech or more complex structures taking part in grammatical organisation. The joining may be accomplished by word order and prosody alone, or with the help of conjunctions, *e.g.: girls and boys, pins and needles, sooner or later, now and then,* etc.

M.Y. Blokh uses the term "equipolent" to mark syntactically equal relation of words and "dominational" for syntactically unequal arrangement of words. Coordinative word-groups differ from subordinate in the following:

1. Coordinate word-groups embrace elements equal in their status. The elements of subordinate word-groups are not equal in their rank.

2. Coordinate word-groups are used to expand the sentence constituents without building-up its structure. Subordinate word-groups buildup the structure of the sentence.

3. Coordinate word-groups are builtup either with the help of conjunctions with coordinate means or asyndetically. Subordinate word-groups are built up with a help of prepositions which express subordination, or asyndetically.

Predicative (or "nexus") phrases are such structures in which the syntactic functions of the constituent parts differ from the function of phrase as a whole, *e.g.: him run, circumstances permitting, this done, for them to come,* etc.

The phrases are classified according to the manner of connection (syndetic and asyndetic), and according to the principle of identity of syntactical functions of the whole phrase and its constituents (endocentric and exocentric).

According to morphological nature of the head-word phrases are subdivided into:

a) noun phrases with preposed modifier and postposed modifier *(a French teacher, time immemorial);*

b) verb phrases *(crying loudly, read a book);*

c) adjective phrases *(typically Ukrainian, quite handsome);*

d) adverb phrases *(high in the sky, late at night);*

e) proronoun phrases *(something to read, nothing special).*

Scientists differentiate between structural peculiarities of phrases, classifying them into:

a) simple phrases *(cold water, late at night);*

b) complex phrases (three or more constituents) *(saw him there, politically active youngster)*;

c) phrases with continuous immediate constituents *(a handsome boy* – the constituents come uninterrupted*)*;

d) phrases witl discontinuous immediate constituents *(went, unhappily, there)*.

And according to the position of the adjunct (before or after the head) phrases are subdivided into prepositional phrases and postpositional phrases *(ancient time – time immemorial)*.

In accordance with their structure and complexity phrases may be also subdivided into elementary and compound. Elementary are such phrases in which only one type of syntactic connection is represented (but they may be rather lengthy): *an old house; an old wooden house; an extremely furiously barking dog* (in these phrases only subordination is observed); *women and children; clever but uneducated* (coordination only); *for me to go* (predicative connection). Compounds are such phrases that contain two or more types of syntactic connection at a time.

A minimum subordinate phrase which consists of two words may be enlarged by adding a third, fourth, etc. element, forming the 3^d, 4th, etc. levels of subordination. "In any composite denomination of a thing or person [...] we always find that there is one word of supreme importance to which the others are joined as subordinated. This chief word is defined (qualified, modified) by another word, which in its turn may be defined (qualified, modified) by a third word, etc. We are thus led to establish different "ranks" of words according to their mutual relations as defined or defining. In the combination *extremely hot weather* the last word *weather*, which is evidently the chief idea, may be called primary; *hot*, which defines *weather*, secondary, and *extremely*, which defines *hot*, tertiary. Though a tertiary word may be further defined by a quaternary word, and this again by a quinary word, and so forth, it is needless to distinguish more than three ranks, as there are no formal or other traits that distinguish words of these lower orders from tertiary words" [O.Jespersen. The Philosophy of Grammar, 96-97; 107].

When words are joined together grammatically and logically without forming a full sentence, we call the combination a phrase [H. Sweet. A New English Grammar, 19]. *E.g. man of honour, going away, his going away* are phrases.

Like all phrases, the constituents of the English noun phrase can be analysed into both functional constituents and formal constituents. From a functional point of view the noun phrase has four major components, occurring in a fixed order. It consists of:

1. determiner;
2. premodifier;
3. head;
4. postmodifier.

Determiner is the constituent which determines the reference of the noun phrase in its linguistic or situational context; embedding that we are able to take a finite number of forms (words and phrases) and construct an infinite number of expressions. Furthermore, embedding also allows us to construct a structure.

For example, the nursery rhyme *"The House That Jack Built"* plays on the process of embedding in English. The nursery rhyme is one sentence that continuously grows by embedding more and more relative clauses as postmodifiers in the noun phrase that ends the sentence.

E.g. This is the house that Jack built.

This is the malt that lay in the house that Jack built.

This is the mouse that ate the malt that lay in the house that Jack built.

This is the cat that scared the mouse that ate the malt that lay in the house that Jack built.

This is the dog that chased the cat that scared the mouse that ate the malt that lay in the house that Jack built.

This is the boy who loves the dog that chased the cat that scared the mouse that ale the malt that lay in the house that Jack built, etc.

In theory, we could go on forever because language relies so heavily on embedding.

The adjective phrase in English has four functional constituents:

1. premodifiers, those modifying, describing, or qualifying constituents which precede the head;
2. the head, which is an adjective or participle serving as the focus of the phrase;
3. postmodifiers, that modify the constituent which follows the head;
4. complementation (the major subcategory of postmodification here) that has a constituent which follows any postmodiflcation and completes the specification of a meaning implied by the head.

The order of constituents in the adjective phrase, like all other phrase structures in English, is relatively fixed, helping us determine the constituent elements: *so extremely sweet; too good to be true; unusually sunny for this time of the year*.

The adverb phrase in English is nearly identical to the adjective phrase, with expected changes in form. In the adverb phrase, an adverb functions as head, and we find such constituents as "premodifier", "head", "postmodifier". *E.g. more easily than ever; very hard indeed*.

The prepositional phrase is a "non-headed" construction in English since no one constituent functions as the centre of the phrase, the centre on which the other elements depend. Instead, the structure is divided into two functional components – the preposition followed by its complement. In general, a prepositional phrase expresses a relationship between the complement of the preposition and some other constituent of the sentence.

The verb phrase in English has a noticeably different structure, since the information it carries about mood, tense, modality, aspect, and voice is quite different from the information carried by a noun phrase. *E.g. might have been waiting, were hired, do believe,* etc. The verb phrase has two functional parts:

1. the auxiliary, a grammatical morpheme carrying information about mood, tense, modality, and voice;

2. the main verb, a lexical morpheme carrying its lexical information and, usually, an inflection.

Thus, we considered historiography of phrase conceptions in foreign and home linguistics, described principles of phrase classifications and, consequently, correlation of syntactic and semantic elements in phrases.

We focus our future work on describing some specific instances of employing valence properties in phrase forming, and on typological research of phrases in English and Ukrainian.

Список використаних джерел

1. Алексєєва І.О. Курс теоретичної граматики сучасної англійської мови: навчальний посібник / Ірина Олексіївна Алексєєва. – 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. Иванова И.П., Бурлакова В.В., Почепцов Г.Г. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. – М.: Высш. школа, 1981. – 285 с.

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

6. Проблемні питання синтаксису: [зб. наукових статей / наук. ред. Гуйванюк Н.В. та ін.]. – Чернівці, 1997. – 228 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. Brazil D. A Grammar of Speech. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. – 264 p.

10. Crystal D.T. Who cares about English usage? – London: Penguin Books, 2002. – 128 p.

11. Fettes M. Linguistic Ecology. Towards an Integrative Linguistic Science [Електронний ресурс] // Режим доступу: http: //www.esperantic.org./~mfettes/home.html.

12. Fillmore C.J., Atkins B.T. Toward a Frame-Based Lexicon: The Semantics of Risk and its Neighbours // Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization. – Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992. – P. 75-102.

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

14. Ruthrof H. The Body in Language. – London; New York: Cassell, 2000. – 193 p.

Анотація. У статті подається історіографія розвитку концепцій тлумачення словосполучення у зарубіжних та вітчизняних лінгвістичних теоріях. Стаття ґрунтується на аналізі різних точок зору іноземних та вітчизняних граматистів.

Представлені принципи класифікації словосполучень, інтерпретації теорії ІС та проаналізовані типові фразові моделі у англійській мові.

Ключові слова: словосполучення, синтаксична одиниця, синтаксичні відношення, синтаксичні зв'язки.

Summary. The article envisages historiography of phrase conceptions in foreign and home linguistic trends. The subject matter of the article is based on the analysis of different points of view of foreign and home linguists.

We defined some principles of phrase classifications, presented interpretation of IC theory, and analysed typical phrase models in English.

Key words: phrase, syntactic unit, syntactic relations, syntactic connections.