

РОЗДІЛ 2 СЛОВ'ЯНСЬКІ МОВИ

UDC 81-112.2

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2022.26.1.13>

THE PARTS OF SPEECH CLASSIFICATION PRINCIPLES IN THE WORKS OF MAIN EUROPEAN GRAMMARIANS

ПРИНЦИПИ КЛАСИФІКАЦІЇ ЧАСТИН МОВИ В ПРАЦЯХ ОСНОВНИХ ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКИХ ГРАМАТИСТІВ

Zubenko K.V.,

orcid.org/0000-0003-4874-8408

*Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Language Training
Donbas State Machine-Building Academy*

Lazutkina Yu.A.,

orcid.org/0000-0002-0232-7598

*Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Language Training
Donbas State Machine-Building Academy*

The article represents basic principles of parts of speech classification in the works of main grammarians. Parts of speech are lexical-grammatical word classes characterized by a general abstract grammatical meaning expressed in certain grammatical markers. It means that within certain classes of words certain grammatical features are common to all words of the class.

The problem concerning the essence of parts of speech and the principles of their classification in various languages of the world is one of the most debatable problems of general linguistics. Statements on the matter of what the distribution of words into parts of speech is based on are varied, but also contradictory. The problem of parts of speech classification within theoretical aspect is differently interpreted by linguists. Thus, V. I. Degtyarev identifies two principles of parts of speech classification: morphological and syntactical. In the works of O. P. Sunik general categorical meanings of parts of speech are regarded as lexical, and on this basis he highlights another principle of parts of speech classification – semantic. V. O. Plotnikova (Robinson) also speaks about semantic, morphological and syntactic principles, as well as their combination. According to B. O. Serebrennikov, it is appropriate to allocate semantic (lexical-semantic), morphological, syntactic and lexical-grammatical principles.

From the viewpoint of numerous linguists for the inflected and agglutinative languages morphological principle is a leading one, and for isolating languages (Chinese, for example) – syntactic.

The logical principle occupied a significant place in the works of representatives of the Geneva School, Copenhagen Linguistic Circle. Later the Russian linguist I. I. Meschaninov used logical principle.

In East Slavic grammatical tradition logical principle was added to semantic one in grammars of M. V. Lomonosov, F. I. Buslaev, O. H. Vostokov, G. P. Pavskiy, M. I. Grech, O. P. Pavlovskiy, M. Luchkay, etc., which suggests the logical-semantic principle.

The psychological principle found its realization in the works of I. A. Baudouin de Courtenay, O. O. Potebnya and others.

Within the formal grammatical (morphological) principle language is the subject of detailed analysis of a form. This principle was relied on by P. F. Fortunatov, followed by his students and followers.

Lexical-grammatical principle was developed in the works of L. V. Shcherba, V. V. Vinogradov, etc. The system of parts of speech developed by V. Vinogradov is more streamlined and is considered the most successful.

Samples of cognitive onomasiological analyzing parts of speech and grammatical categories based on semantic invariants are present in the works of M. Dokulil, J. Layonz, J. Lakoff, G. Leneker, O. S. Kubriakova, M. O. Sheliakin, V. P. Danylenko, S. O. Jabotinskaya and others.

Key words: part of speech, morphological principle, syntactic principle, logical principle, psychological principle, lexical and grammatical principle, cognitive principle.

У статті представлено основні принципи класифікації частин мови в працях відомих граматистів. Частини мови – це лексико-граматичні класи слів, що характеризуються загальним абстрактним граматичним значенням, вираженим певними граматичними ознаками. Це означає, що в певних класах слів певні граматичні ознаки є спільними для всіх слів класу.

Проблема сутності частин мови та принципів їх класифікації в різних мовах світу є однією з найбільш дискусійних проблем загального мовознавства. Твердження з приводу того, на чому ґрунтується розподіл слів на частини

мови, різноманітні, але й суперечливі. Проблема класифікації частин мови в теоретичному аспекті по-різному трактується лінгвістами. Так, В. І. Дегтярьов виділяє два принципи класифікації частин мови: морфологічний і синтаксичний. У працях О. П. Суника загальнокатегоріальні значення частин мови розглядаються як лексичні, і на цій основі він виділяє ще один принцип класифікації частин мови – семантичний. Про семантичний, морфологічний і синтаксичний принципи, а також їх поєднання говорить і В. О. Плотнікова (Робінсон). На думку Б. О. Серебреннікова, доцільно виділяти семантичний (лексико-семантичний), морфологічний, синтаксичний та лексико-граматичний принципи.

На думку багатьох лінгвістів, для флективних і аглютинативних мов провідним є морфологічний принцип, а для ізолюючих мов (наприклад, китайської) – синтаксичний.

Значне місце займав у працях представників женецької школи, Копенгагенського лінгвістичного гуртка логічний принцип.

У східнослов'янській граматичній традиції логічний принцип доповнився семантичним у граматиках М. В. Ломоносова, Ф. І. Буслаєва, О. Г. Востокова, Г. П. Павського, М. І. Греча, О. П. Павловського, М. Лучкая та ін., що свідчить про застосування логіко-семантичного принципу.

Психологічний принцип знайшов свою реалізацію у працях І. А. Бодуена де Куртене, О. О. Потебні та ін.

У рамках формально-граматичного (морфологічного) принципу мова є предметом детального аналізу форми. На цей принцип спирався П. Ф. Фортунатов, а потім його учні та послідовники.

Лексико-граматичний принцип отримав розвиток у працях Л. В. Щерби, В. В. Виноградова та ін. Система частин мови, розроблена В. Виноградовим, є більш конкретною і вважається найбільш вдалою.

Зразки когнітивного ономаціологічного аналізу частин мови та граматичних категорій на основі семантичних інваріантів наявні в працях М. Докуліла, Дж. Лайонза, Дж. Лакоффа, Г. Ленекера, О. С. Кубрякової, М. О. Шелякіна, В. П. Даниленка, С. О. Жаботинської та ін.

Ключові слова: частина мови, морфологічний принцип, синтаксичний принцип, логічний принцип, психологічний принцип, лексико-граматичний принцип, когнітивний принцип.

The problem of parts of speech classification is one of the most relevant and controversial in linguistics. Since modern linguistics is based on the experience of linguistic research, turning to the scientific heritage of grammarians of the past is extremely relevant.

The analysis of scientific literature shows the existence of a small number of special works devoted to the problem of parts of speech in European linguistics and the principles of their selection in the linguistic-historiographical aspect. Studies systematizing the views of linguists on the problem of parts of speech classification in the 19th–20th centuries, are mostly general in nature, they lack a detailed analysis of specific material. So, in modern linguistics there are no comprehensive linguistic-historiographical works devoted to the problem of parts of speech and the principles of their selection.

The topic of the article is to consider the principles of parts of speech classification as a scientific problem in modern linguistics.

It should be noted that the topic of the parts of speech classification principles in the theoretical aspect is disclosed by linguists in different ways.

Internal differences are also observed within classification by one criterion (homogeneous classification) and classification by several different criteria (heterogeneous classification). For example, supporters of homogeneous classification recognize either the lexical, morphological, or syntactic criterion as the only criterion for the distribution of words by parts of speech. S. Bally acted as a consistent representative of the lexical classification of parts of speech. The need to introduce only a morphological criterion is now advocated, in particular, by A. Mukhin.

For example, V. I. Degtiarev singles out two principles for parts of speech classification: morphological and syntactic [2, p. 180–185]. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that the main (generally categorical) meanings of parts of speech (subjectivity, attributiveness, procedurality, abstract quantification, attributive and predicative familiarity, indicativeness) are interpreted by V. I. Degtiarev followed O. O. Potebna, O. M. Peshkovskiy, M. M. Panov and other grammarians as grammatical ones, noting that O. O. Shakhmatov considered them semasiological, and V. V. Vynogradov – «grammaticalized» [2]. We would like to emphasize that in a number of works, the general category values of parts of speech are considered as lexical, and on this basis, another principle of classification of parts of speech is distinguished – semantic (while, of course, we are talking about lexical semantics).

This is the way O. P. Sunik considers parts of speech. In his book, three principles for parts of speech classifying are identified: morphological, syntactic and semantic [3]. According to Sunik, the general grammatical meanings of speech parts are the only feature according to which words are combined into these classes. The heterogeneous classification in various modifications was reflected in the works of L. Shcherba, V. Vinogradov, V. Zhirmunskiy, V. Admoni, V. Kodukhov, I. Kucherenko, etc. With a heterogeneous parts of speech classification, both quantitative and qualitative varieties of it are observed.

It is also important to note that, from the point of view of numerous linguists, for languages with an inflectional and agglutinative structure, the morphological principle is the leading one, and for isolating

languages (for example, for Chinese) it is the syntactic one [4]. As O. O. Reformatyskyi noted, the approach to determining the parts of speech in Chinese differs from the corresponding approach in Ukrainian, since words in Chinese, as a rule, do not have external morphological features, which is typical for the words of the Ukrainian language. To determine which part of speech a certain word in Chinese belongs to, it is necessary to be limited by two features: 1) which part of the sentence the given word acts as; 2) with what categories of words this word can or cannot be combined [4].

V. A. Plotnikova (Robinson) also talks about semantic, morphological and syntactic principles, as well as their combination. From the researcher's point of view, the semantic principle was put forward by A. A. Potebnya, the morphological one – by P. F. Fortunatov. V. A. Plotnikov connects the principles combination with A. M. Peshkovskyi. V. A. Plotnikov considers A. A. Shakhmatov the representative of the syntactic principle [5].

V. Vinogradov believed that the division of words into parts of speech is due to five factors:

1) differences in those syntactic functions that different categories of words perform in connected speech, in the structure of a sentence;

2) differences in the morphological structure of words and word forms;

3) differences in the real (lexical) meanings of words;

4) differences in the way of reflecting reality;

5) differences in the nature of those correlative and subordinate grammatical categories that are connected with one or another part of the language.

Citing such features of speech parts, V. Vinogradov emphasized that differences in the grammatical structure of speech parts are caused by differences in their syntactic functions.

V. Zhirmunskyi, sharing mainly the views of the V. Vinogradov's school, considers parts of speech as lexical and grammatical categories of words, in the definition of which it is necessary to take into account both the meaning of the word, its lexical and semantic meaning, and its grammatical form – morphological and syntactic.

However, the scientist makes a significant remark that the complex relationship between the lexico-semantic and grammatical aspects of a particular category in different cases is not the same and any of its features may dominate. I. Kucherenko considers the real meaning of the word to be the initial and leading one in defining the concept of "part of speech" and the grammatical classification of words, emphasizing that the specifics of the real meaning of the word ultimately determines its grammatical attributes. Not all

supporters of the heterogeneous parts of speech classification are inclined to give preference to one of the criteria. Thus, V. Admoni rightly points out that the simultaneous application of several criteria follows from the very essence of linguistic phenomena, but considers it unlawful to proceed from the dominant position of one of the criteria.

According to B. A. Serebrennikov, it is advisable to single out semantic (lexical-semantic), morphological, syntactic and lexical-grammatical principles [1].

Semantic, morphological and syntactic principles for classifying parts of speech are also postulated by V. M. Alpatov [6]. He argues that when considering modern points of view, one cannot proceed only from the definitions of parts of speech contained in certain works [6]. As N. D. Arutiunova noted, "one of the characteristic limits of traditional grammar is the lack of correlation between the applied principles of classification and the definitions of the resulting classes or categories" [1, p. 59].

Traditional grammar, faithfully reflecting the linguistic intuition of native speakers, often gave it a one-sided (semantic) interpretation. But it does not follow from this that the very principles of the material systematization were also one-sided semantic. In many cases, the principles of speech parts defining (not always realized by the researcher) are visible primarily from a specific classification.

It is possible to outline, according to V. M. Alpatov, several basic approaches to the allocation of speech parts, which usually are not contained in a "pure" form in the works of linguists.

The semantic approach, according to V. M. Alpatov, manifests itself most of all in the definitions of speech parts than in the actual division of vocabulary (at least in relation to Indo-European languages) [6].

However, this point of view has repeatedly been subjected to justified criticism. The discrepancy between the parts of speech familiar to us and the semantic classes of vocabulary is especially obvious in relation to nouns, which, in terms of lexical meaning, may not differ from the words of other speech parts.

The semantic definition of an adverb is also difficult, according to V. M. Alpatov [6]. Characteristically, in V. V. Vinogradov's book, the adverb is the only part of speech whose definition refers to semantics.

Finally, the difference between states and qualities is not always obvious, which shows a comparison of different languages.

J. Laions' statement is true: «The difference between «quality» and «state» (if it is not illusory at all) is less striking than the difference between «action» and «state»».

For many languages of the world, primarily inflectional-synthetic, the morphological approach has clear advantages, notes V. M. Alpatov. Morphological features of certain words classes in these languages are usually quite obvious. In fact, the traditional classification of the speech parts (especially in its early, Alexandrian version) is basically (regardless of definitions) a morphological classification. All full-valued parts of speech, identified by ancient scientists, have certain morphological features in the ancient Greek and Latin languages [6].

The morphological criterion for the so-called isolative languages, where morphological classes are absent or weakly differentiated, encounters great difficulties. The consistent use of this approach to the Chinese language led the Chinese scientist Gao Mingnai to the idea of the speech parts absence in this language.

An extreme case of the syntactic approach is the identification of speech parts and sentence members. In European science, according to V. M. Alpatov, such a point of view was sometimes encountered in theory, but was not fully realized in practice: with the traditional distinction between subject and object, no one introduced an appropriate division for parts of speech.

It is noteworthy, however, that this is how the authors of early Europeanized grammars in China, Ma Jianzhong, and in Japan, Tanaka Yoshikado, treated parts of speech in their languages. Direct identification of a speech part and a sentence member takes place where morphology helps least of all: quite often adverbs and complements are identified.

However, more often, with a syntactic approach, classes are distinguished the way in order not to conflict with what A. I. Smirnitskyi called “word identity,” says V. M. Alpatov. From this point of view, a word can act as different members of a sentence, but some of the different syntactic functions are recognized as essential and defining: those words for which the function of the predicate is essential are called verbs, the function of the subject and object – nouns, the function of the definition – adjectives.

From our point of view, a significant drawback of the classifications discussed above is that within their limits, parts of speech are interpreted exclusively within the linguocentric paradigm. At the same time, it should be noted that over the past decades, an anthropocentric paradigm has reigned in linguistics. In particular, the positions of cognitive linguistics are strong. In the studios of grammarians-cognitologists,

parts of speech are interpreted from the point of view of the cognitive principle. This is taken into account in the detailed parts of speech classification proposed by A. A. Selivanova.

O. O. Selivanova postulates seven principles of parts of speech classification: 1) logical, 2) logical-semantic (semantic), 3) psychological, 4) formal-grammatical, 5) lexical-grammatical, 6) functional (functional-syntactic, syntactic), 6) cognitive [6, p. 788–793].

Samples of cognitive-onomasiological analysis of speech parts and grammatical categories based on semantic invariants are found in the works of M. Dokuleel, J. Laions, J. Lakoff, R. Lenecker, A. S. Kubriakova, M. A. Sheliakin, V. P. Danilenko, S. O. Zhabotinskaya and others [6].

The cognitive principle in grammar is not new, because it either corresponds to the postulates of logical universalism, or follows the ethnocentric psychological approach developed by W. Humboldt [6].

Proponents of the cognitive principle note that parts of speech in the most general form express the speaker's internalized picture of the world, where important vectors are people and objects as subjective things, their signs and relationships, actions, states, quantitative indicators, spatial and temporal characteristics, etc., [6, p. 439–440].

This classification seems to us the most complete. Of the doublet terms logical-semantic / semantic and functional / functional-syntactic / syntactic, in our opinion, the terms semantic and syntactic are more accurate and do not cause ambiguous interpretation. As for the term “formal-grammatical”, then, bearing in mind the above thesis of O. P. Sunik, we note that the formal-grammatical approach is possible within the morphological principle, it is a consequence of excessive formalization of the morphological features of words. It is more expedient to single out the morphological principle, speaking of the possibility within the formal-grammatical (narrow-formal) approach.

So, the variety of principles for distinguishing parts of speech in the studies of scientists of the 19th–20th centuries causes the need for a comprehensive, in-depth analysis of their works, a comparison of the conclusions made by linguists. This will make it possible to clarify the features of scientific approaches to the problem of speech parts and determine the degree of their study during the 19th–20th centuries.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Вихованець І. Р., Городенська К. Г. Теоретична морфологія української мови. Київ, 2004. 398 с.
2. Ковалик І. І. Самійленко С. П. Загальне мовознавство. Історія лінгвістичної думки : навч. посіб. для студ. філол. ф-тів спец. «Укр. мов. і л-ра». Київ, 1985. 215 с.

3. Кучеренко І. К. Теоретичні питання граматики української мови: Морфологія. 2-ге вид. Вінниця, 2003. с.
4. Левицький А. Е., Сингаївська А. В., Славова Л. Л. Вступ до мовознавства: Навчальний посібник. Київ, 2006. 104 с.
5. Огієнко І. Історичний словник граматичної термінології. Київ, 1908. 129 с.
6. Селіванова О. О. Лінгвістична енциклопедія. Полтава, 2010. 844 с.

УДК 811.163.2'366.584:2-282

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2022.26.1.14>

МАЙБУТНІЙ ЧАС В НОВОБОЛГАРСЬКИХ ПОВЧАННЯХ ПРОТИ ЯЗИЧНИЦТВА ОДЕСЬКОЇ РУКОПИСНОЇ ЗБІРКИ В. І. ГРИГОРОВИЧА

THE FUTURE TENSE IN THE SERMONS OF THE XVIII CENTURY AGAINST PAGANISM FROM ODESA MANUSCRIPT COLLECTION OF V. I. HRYHOROVYCH

Стоянова Д.Ф.,

orcid.org/0000-0001-9741-2519

кандидат філологічних наук,

*доцент кафедри загального та слов'янського мовознавства
Одеського національного університету імені І.І. Мечникова*

Статтю присвячено дослідженню граматичних засобів вираження майбутнього часу в новоболгарській пам'ятці 2-ої половини XVIII ст. та визначенню стадії формування футуральних форм в означений період. Об'єктом дослідження обрано комплекс проповідей антиязичницького спрямування, який входить до складу збірника № 1/154 рукописної колекції В. І. Григоровича, що зберігається в Одеській національній науковій бібліотеці. Встановлено, що комунікативна мета комплексу повчальних проповідей сатирично-викривального звучання – виявлення, засудження і викорінення зі свідомості тогочасного суспільства марнославних дохристиянських уявлень.

Отримані результати показують, що у досліджуваних повчаннях представлена багата система граматичних засобів вираження майбутнього часу. Граматичне оформлення досліджуваної темпоральної категорії розгортається в межах визначальної для новоболгарських пам'яток тенденції – синтезу в одне функціональне ціле книжних і народних лексико-граматичних елементів як співвідносних варіантів. Проаналізований мовний матеріал ілюструє різні стадії становлення граматичних форм майбутнього часу: сполучення особової форми допоміжного дієслова *хотѣти* з інфінітивом, сполучення особової форми цього ж допоміжного дієслова з *да*-конструкцією, утворення граматичної частки і її поєднання з *да*-конструкцією. Фіксація у пам'ятці діалектних різновидів граматичної частки доводить її остаточну сформованість у живому мовленні. Факт нечастого вживання у тексті форм, складовим компонентом яких була граматична частка, свідчить про свідоме обмеження книжниками їх використання у писемній мові, оскільки вони сприймалися ними як простонародні і не відповідали мовно-стилістичним параметрам жанру проповіді. Здатність форм простого майбутнього вживатися у підрядних речення не змінилася впродовж століть; стабільною вона є і в досліджуваних повчаннях.

Ключові слова: майбутній час, граматична форма, рукописна збірка В. І. Григоровича, збірник № 1/154, повчання проти язичництва.

The analysis proposed in this article focuses on the “Odeskyi zbirnyk” – the manuscript No. 1/154 kept in the Odesa National Scientific Library, V. I. Hryhorovych manuscript collection and presents the already extended verb system of the 18th – century Bulgarian Language. The object of the study is complex of anti-pagan sermons which are the part of manuscript No 1/154/. The main communicative purpose of the sermons is to identify, condemn and eradicate from the people's minds the pre-Christian ideas. The special attention is paid to the temporal system, the future tense, more precisely to the diachronic changes, that result the development tendencies and namely from the general tendency towards analyticism. The sermons present a rich system of future tense forms of the different chronological stages which is due to the main New Bulgarian Language feature – the combination of the bookish and vernacular lexical-grammatical elements as correlated variants. In the analyzed linguistic material the most frequent are such future tense forms as: conjugated auxiliary verb *хотѣти* + infinitive, conjugated auxiliary verb *хотѣти* + *da*-construction, particle + *da*-construction. Fixation in the manuscript of dialect varieties of the particle proves its final formation in spoken language. The fact of their infrequent use indicates a conscious limitation of their use in the written language by scribes. They seem to perceive such forms as inappropriate to the linguistic and stylistic parameters of the sermon genre. The forms of the simple future tense (present verbs of perfective and imperfective aspect) are stably used in adverbial clauses of conditions and time and some other types of clauses. This function of simple future tense forms remains unchanged throughout the historical development of the Bulgarian Language, from the Old Bulgarian to the New Bulgarian period.

Key words: future tense, grammatical form, manuscript collection of V. I. Hryhorovych, manuscript No. 1/154, sermons against paganism.