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**I. Traditional conceptions of phrases in home linguistics and abroad.**

Investigations of phrases have a long history. It dates back as early as the 18th century and it has been first mentioned in practical Grammar books. The first really scientific conception of phrases appeared in the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th. The phrase theory has been started by home linguists, such as Ph. F. Fortunatov, A. A.Shakhmatov, A. M. Peshkovskiy. They termed phrase as any syntactically arranged group of words. This conception tested the course of time and now it is shared by the majority of linguists. But it is not the only one adopted in home linguistics.

In the 50th V. V.Vinogradov introduced another conception of phrase. He termed phrase as a group of notional words which are syntactically unequal that is one dominates the other, e. g.: to make notes, an interesting book. Coordinated words, e. g.: run and jump, sister and brother, were considered as a sequence of separate words in speech. This point of view was widely spread and acknowledged in the middle of the 20th century. Nowadays the majority of linguists accept the first broad interpretation of phrase as any syntactically arranged group of notional words.

M. Y. Bloch suggested that one should distinguish between combinations of notional words alone (notional phrases), those of a notional and a functional word (formative phrases), and combinations of functional words alone (functional phrases):

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

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

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

Theoretical investigation of phrase in foreign linguistics was started much later, in the 30th of the 20th century. It was greatly promoted by L. Bloomfield. He termed phrase in the broad sense of the word, i. e. as any syntactically organized group of words. According to this conception all phrases of any language fall into 2 main groups:

1)  endocentric ( исходящий изнутри, центробежный)

2)  exocentric ( исходящий с поверхности внутрь, центростремительный).

The first group includes phrases any element of which can be used separately instead of the whole phrase, e. g.: daughter and son. If in the sentence “I will never forget my daughter and son once said it.” we omit “and son” it would be grammatically correct. The phrases no element of which can substitute the whole group in the sentence L. Bloomfield referred to the second group, e. g.: to write a book. We can not use any element of the phrase separately in a sentence instead of the whole phrase.

L. Bloomfied’s theory of phrase was developed by his followers. Thus, one of them Ch. Hocket suggested a more detailed structural description of endocentric-exocentric phrases taking into consideration the position of the head word (for details see: , , Почепцов грамматика современного [английского языка](https://pandia.ru/text/category/anglijskij_yazik/)., 1981.).

One more specification of foreign conceptions concerned the type of connection of phrase-elements. It was suggested that all phrases in all languages should be first divided into phrases with hypotaxis (subordination) and those with parataxis (coordination). The following subdivision repeats L. Bloomfield’s classification of phrases into endocentric and exocentric. One of the serious drawbacks of such like classification is that it lacks uniformity of principles of classification. Every other stage of classification is based upon another principle either syntactical or structural.

**II**. **Types of syntactic relation in phrases. Types of phrases**.

Traditionally coordination and subordination are viewed upon as the basic types of syntactic relations.

Coordination is the connection of equal and relatively independent parts, words, sentences, or sentence parts. It can be realized with or without conjunctions, i. e. syndetically and asyndetically respectively, e. g.: 1) desks and chairs (syn),

2) cars, buses, lorries (asyn), 3) The water was warm and the sun was shining (syn).

This is a traditional view point on this type of syntactic relation, yet it is not shared by all linguists here and abroad.

As for subordination it was defined by all linguists as syntactically unequal connection of parts, words, sentences, sentence parts. M. Y. Bloch terms syntactically equal connection of words as equipotent (равнопотенциальный) type of syntactical relation and syntactically unequal connection as a dominational type of syntactical relation.

Dominational (or subordinational) connection, as different from equipotent connection is effected in such a way that one element of the dominational or subordinational phrase is principal (dominating) and the other is subordinate (dominated). The principal element is also called “kernel” or “head word”, the subordinate element – the “adjunct” or “expansion”.

Subordination (or domination) can be of two main types: bilateral (or two-way or reciprocal – двусторонняя или взаимная) and monolateral (or one-way – односторонняя).

Two-way subordination is realized in predicative connection of words, uniting the subject and the predicate. The reciprocal nature of this connection is consists in the fact that the subject dominates the predicate, determining the person of predication, while the predicate dominates the subject, determining the event of predication, ascribing to the person of predication some action, or state, or quality (cр: отношение интердепенденции (взаимообусловленности) у Л. Ельмслева). Compare the following sentences:

1)  The man ran up to the house (action);

2)  The man smokes (quality);

3)  The cup has been broken by the child (action);

4)  The cups break easily (quality - the use of the decausative construction);

5)  The car rattled down the road (action + process);

One-way subordination is realized in the attributive, objective and adverbial connections.

Objective connection reflects the relation of the object to the process, and subdivided into non-prepositional (actualized by word-order) and prepositional, e. g.:

1) He regretted the event;

2) I forget about the event.

From the semantico-syntactic point of view objective connections are classed as direct and indirect (or oblique). Direct object constructions reflect immediate transition of the action to the object. Indirect (oblique) object constructions reflect the indirect relation of the object to the process, e. g.:

1) Will you give me the book (direct object)?

2) He ran up to the house.

Attributive connection unites a substance with its attribute expressed by an adjective or a noun, e. g.: a nice picture, a woman of means, a man of his word.

Adverbial connection can be of two types: primary and secondary. Primary connection is established between the verb and its adverbial modifiers, e. g.: to come late; to do (smth.) with enthusiasm.

Secondary adverbial connection is established between the non-verbal head word expressing a quality and its adverbial modifiers, e. g.: no longer attractive (head word), appallingly alike (head word).

Subordination is expressed by means of:

agreement – e. g.: these books – when the subject agrees with the head word grammatically in the categories of number, person;

government – prepositional or non-prepositional – e. g. follow him, listen to him – when the head word determines the grammatical form of the adjunct;

adjoining – prepositional or non-prepositional – e. g.: come up to the point, very nice – when words are connected by their meaning, word order and intonation;

enclosure – e. g.: at a great reduction, must have been already done – is realized by means of functional words, which together with the head word make up a framing construction.

To sum it up, classification of types of phrases can be based upon various principles:

- L. Bloomfield divides all phrases into endocentric (any element of which can substitute for the whole phrase in its function) and exocentric (neither element of which can substitute for the whole group in its function in a major group);

- M. Y. Bloch distinguishes between notional phrases, formative phrases, functional phrases;

- traditional classification is based upon the types of syntactic relations between the phrase components, distinguishing the coordinate and subordinate phrases.

Coordinate phrases are divided according to:

a) their structure (simple or complex);

b) their manner of connection (syndetic or asyndetic).

Subordinated phrases are divided according to:

a) their structure (simple or complex);

b) types of subordinate relations (predicative, attributive, objective, adverbial phrases);

c) manner of subordination (phrases with agreement, government or adjoining, enclosure);

d) morphological nature of the kernel – noun, verbal, adjectival and adverbial phrases.

**III**. **Phrase theory in cognitive linguistics (J. R. Taylor’s conception).**

Classifications of types of phrases introduced within traditional (structural) approaches are primarily based on the study of their formal (structural) properties. The investigation of phrases within a cognitive approach presupposes that the analysis of syntactic units should be performed in terms of conceptual integration. The syntagmatic relations in this case are viewed in terms of mechanisms which allow the combination of units with each other. Thus, J. R. Taylor in his book “Cognitive Grammar” introduces generalized schemas which reflect the mechanisms of conceptual combination (the mechanisms that govern the production of syntactic units) and groups phrases of different types as mapped onto these schemas. J. R. Taylor terms these schemas constructional schemas.

Constructional schemas belong to the conceptual level, they show what different types of phrases have in common at the semantic level. For example, the prepositional phrase with the structure [Prep + [Noun phrase]] – *on the table, on* *the mat, under the bed, etc*. and the verb phrase with the structure [V + [Noun phrase*]]- leave the office, drive the car*appear to map onto one of the four types of constructional schemas, proposed by J. R. Taylor, - the head-complement schema, as these two types of phrases are headed by the relational u nit (preposition and verb)- the head of the phrase, which is elaborated by a nominal part of the phrase - the complement of the phrase.

According to the mechanisms of combining simpler units into more complex structures there are 4 types of constructional schemas: schemas with head-complement relation, schemas with head-modifier relation, schemas of appositional relation, schemas with parataxis. While investigating the mechanisms of conceptual combination J. R. Taylor uses notions “profile” and “base” – the basic notions in Cognitive Grammar analysis of meaning.

The profile and base constitute the concept. The semantics of any linguistic expression resides on the combination of profile and base (compare: Figure and Ground, cognitive anchoring – terms adopted by L. Talmy for analysis of the conceptual level of the sentence, mechanisms of sentence production, and types of sentences; for details see: Talmy L. Toward a cognitive semantics. 2000). The concept consists in knowledge of the profile against the base: the profile picks out one aspect of the base and renders it particularly prominent. Consider the concept *father*. The word *father* profiles an adult male human and invokes, as its base, the notion of relation between a profiled individual and his offspring. The notions of profile and base are essential for the constructional schemas.

Head-complement schemas include the head of the expression and the complement of the expression, e. g.: on the table*.* The preposition *on* designates the spatial relation, that one of support and contact, and determines the profile of the complex concept *on the table*, it means that the semantics of the expression is relational in character. Both *on*and *on the table* designate the same relation, but with different degree of specificity. *On* is the head, it needs specification, which is achieved in the *on the table*; *the table* is the complement, it elaborates an entity already present in the semantic structure of the head. The head is conceptually more dependent (needs specification), the complement is more autonomous.

Head-modifier schemas include the head of the expression and the modifier of the expression, e. g.: the book on the table. The expression profiles a thing, *the book*, which is determined by the profile (the semantics) of *the book.* *The book* is the head of the phrase, and *on the table* is a modifier. The modifier provides additional conceptual content to the head. The head in this case is conceptually more autonomous, the modifier is more dependent.

Appositional schemas include components which designate one and the same entity, but does it in different ways. They combine to form a more elaborate conception of the entity, e. g.: my neighbour, the butcher. In this case one and the same person is characterized in terms of a relation to the speaker as “my neighbour” and in terms of his profession as “the butcher”. In this kind of schemas each component profiles one and the same entity. It is as if it has two heads, each component contributes its profile to the phrase.

Parataxis schemas can be viewed in linguistic expressions (phrases or sentences) where the components occur one after another, without conceptual integration, e. g.: the sun, the sea, the water; I came, I saw, I conquered. The relations between the components are not overtly marked and have to be inferred by the hearer.

To sum it all up, within a cognitive approach different kind of phrases, as well as the syntagmatic relations which they reveal, are studied in accord with the mechanisms of conceptual integration, i. e. mechanisms of combining words into phrases. J. R. Taylor proposes four such like mechanisms and constructional schemas which correspond them:

-complementation - the mechanism, where one component conceptually specifies the other component elaborating an entity already present in the semantic structure of the latter (head-complement schema); this type of conceptual integration can be observed, for example, in the traditional analysis of the obligatory valency of the verb: subject and direct object, e. g.: I left the office;

- modification – the mechanism, where one component provides some additional conceptual content to the other component (head-modifier schema) (compare the optional valency of the verb: adverbial modifiers);

- apposition – the mechanism, where both the components elaborate one and the same entity but profile its different aspects (appositional schema);

- parataxis – the mechanism, where the relations between the components are not overtly marked by the speaker (parataxis schema). (For details see: Taylor J. R. Cognitive Grammar. 2002; Further Readings on English Syntax (this book, pp.53-56). It is necessary to mention that the discussed mechanisms of conceptual integration reveal the essence of syntagmatic relations in general, as the basis of speech and thinking processes, and can be successfully applied to the study of sentence types (simple sentences, composite sentences and semi-composite sentences as an intermediary sentence type) within a cognitive approach.