THE SYNTACTIC LEVEL OF THE LANGUAGE IN CATEGORICAL DIMENSIONS

СИНТАКСИЧНИЙ РІВЕНЬ МОВИ В КАТЕГОРІЙНИХ ВИМІРАХ

Popova I.S.,
orcid.org/0000-0003-1423-2358
Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,
Professor at the Department of Ukrainian Language,
Dean of the Faculty of Ukrainian and Foreign Philology and Art History
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University

The aim of the article is to show that the specificity of language is determined by its fundamental syntactic categories, at the level of which three basic concepts are derived: a syntactic unit, a syntactic connection and a syntactic model as the most important constructs of the level of language. The main research methods are descriptive, observation, analysis, synthesis, comparison, generalization, modeling, analysis of definitions of vocabulary, transformation and contextual interpretation. The fundamental categories of the Ukrainian syntax at the level of linguistic universals are the syntactic unit, the syntactic connection and the syntactic model, the relationship of which determines the specificity of this level of language. The components of this triad can be stratified as follows: the syntactic units as functionally marked and freely reproducible chains of speech or their fragments include four classes: fundamental, basic, derivative and peripheral (analytic, analytical and searching); the syntactic connections as the semantic and grammatical relations among the components of verbal chain are systemic and non-systemic (non-standard); the syntactic models as the structural or functional analogues of real constructions of language and speech in their symbolic representation are focused on word form, word combination, phrase, sentence, supra-phrase unity and text. The fundamental categories of syntax of the Ukrainian language, which include the syntactic unit, the syntactic connection, the syntactic model and reflect the specificity of this level of language, represent a systemic formation based on the unity, the interconditionality and the interdependence of the three main components.

Key words: syntactic level of language, categorical dimension, fundamental categories, syntactic unit, syntactic connection, syntactic model.

У статті поставлено за мету показати, що фундаментальні синтаксичні категорії, на рівень яких виведено три основні поняття: синтаксична одиниця, синтаксичний зв'язок та синтаксична модель як найбільш значущі конструкти цього рівня мови, – і визначають його специфіку. Основними методами дослідження є описовий, спостереження, аналіз, синтез, порівняння, узагальнення, моделювання, аналіз словникових дефініцій, трансформація та контекстуальна інтерпретація. Фундаментальними категоріями українського синтаксису на рівні лінгвістичних універсалій є синтаксична одиниця, синтаксичний зв'язок та синтаксична модель, взаємозв'язок яких і визначає специфіку цього рівня мови. Стратифікувати компоненти зазначеної тріади можна так: синтаксичні одиниці як функційно марковані й вільно відтворювані мовленнєві ланцюги або їхні фрагменти охоплюють чотири класи: базові, основні, похідні та периферійні (аналітичні й аналітико-пошукові); синтаксичні зв'язки як семантико-граматичні відношення між компонентами мовленнєвого ланцюга є системними та позасистемними (нестандартними); синтаксичні моделі як структурні чи функційні аналоги реальних мовних і мовленнєвих побудов у їхньому символічному поданні зорієнтовані на словоформу, словосполучення, словоз'єднання, речення, надфразну єдність та текст. Фундаментальні категорії синтаксису української мови, до яких належить синтаксична одиниця, синтаксичний зв'язок і синтаксична модель і які відбивають специфіку цього рівня мови, є системним утворенням, що ґрунтується на єдності, взаємозумовленості та взаємозалежності цих трьох основних складників.

Ключові слова: синтаксичний рівень мови, категорійний вимір, фундаментальні категорії, синтаксична одиниця, синтаксичний зв'язок, синтаксична модель.

Problem setting. Modern, up-to-date linguistics accumulates a variety of approaches to the study of phenomena of language and speech, among which it is possible to distinguish anthropocentric, cognitive, culturological, communicative and pragmatic, functional ones and some others. It provides an opportunity to comprehensively describe and emphasize the specificity of any level of language. At the same time, the most important point in the theory of language is the description of universal concepts and categories, so the language theory includes the research of linguistic universals, the language theory should study the linguistic universals as an interaction of linguistic signs with forms of thinking. The basis of the theory of linguistics is the theory of universals: the universals represent any of the levels or tiers of language, which are the components, the autonomous mechanisms of the language system as a whole, have their own linguistic and lingual space, functional load and most importantly – their own type of units. Having it in mind, at least the phonological, lexical and grammatical (morphological and syntactic) levels can be considered, qualifying the relevant linguistic phenomena and values in the role of such units as phoneme, lexeme (word), morpheme, construction (in particular, phrase and sentence), as well as all their derivatives. Here we clearly trace the linguistic hierarchy, because the units of each subsequent

level are usually built from the units of the previous ones with the acquisition of a new quality. It is quite understandable that syntax is on the top place in this hierarchy, because, on the one hand, it is at this level that the interaction of the units of the previous language tiers is completed, and, on the other, it is the end product of the interaction – the building material (substantively or procedurally presented) for the formation of communicatively oriented constructions designed to perform all functions of language. Only in syntax do all means of language (or the unit, combination of language units of all previous levels) acquire their functional specialization, becoming a fact of speech.

Considering it, first of all, there is an urgent need to systematically describe the syntactic structures of the Ukrainian language. The system description should be effective, comprehensive and consistent, which will undoubtedly contribute to obtaining objective and, therefore, reproducible results of parsing of speech chains and their fragments. This is on the one hand. On the other hand, the built-in description system should be quite simple, the most clear and convenient in practical use for all those involved in the study and the teaching of the Ukrainian language.

The decisive factor in the construction of the outlined system may be the representation of the syntactic level of language in its categorical dimensions. In our opinion, the fundamental categories of the metalanguage of Ukrainian syntax are **the syntactic unit, the syntactic connection and the syntactic model** [1, p. 207]. The disclosure of essence of these three categories will allow comprehending the highest level of language in the most effective and consistent way, solving a number of important metalanguage problems of modern linguistics in general and the Ukrainian linguistics in particular.

In our research the named categories are defined, as a whole, as follows: the syntactic unit means the functionally marked and freely reproducible chain of speech or its fragment; the syntactic connection represents the syntactic and grammatical relations between the components of the chain of speech; the syntactic model is the structural or functional analogue of the real constructions of language and speech in their symbolic representation.

In the article we *aim* to show that the syntactic unit, the syntactic connection and the syntactic model are the most functionally and communicatively significant constructs of the syntactic level of language and comprehensively reflect its essence. This goal provides for the following *tasks*: to offer our own stratification of the components of this triad; to clarify the definitions, the status and the relationship of the fundamental syntactic constructs; to adjust some theoretical positions of metalanguage of modern Ukrainian syntax on the general principles of formation of the system of syntactic units, construction of their models, as well as on the nomenclature of syntactic relations.

Achieving a separate goal requires an integrated approach to the interpretation of the syntactic level of the language in categorical dimensions. Considering this, in scientific intelligence, first of all, the universal method of linguistic research is used – descriptive one, as well as such general scientific and general philosophical methods as observation, analysis, synthesis, comparison, generalization. A modeling method has been introduced, in particular, to represent the author's interpretation of certain syntactic phenomena. The analysis of dictionary definitions, contextual interpretation and transformation are also used.

Analysis of recent research and publications. There is no objection to the point of view that everything at the pre-syntactic level is essentially only a certain building material for speech chains and their grammatically significant fragments. Exactly the syntax that combinations of units of previous linguistic tiers, and even each of them separately, being functionally determined, become a fact of speech. In the general structure of scientific knowledge about the syntactic order of a language, a special place is occupied by the linguistic interpretation of the category concept, since the syntax is constantly filled with structurally and functionally significant categories of all language levels. In modern linguistics, a general category is qualified as a generic concept meaning a category of objects, phenomena, etc., or their important common feature. Since certain properties of grammatical units, their differential features also determine the actual categorical parameters of any linguistic phenomenon, then the **grammatical**, and accordingly the syntactic category, in our opinion, can be given as a general, fundamental concept, correlated with such properties of linguistic phenomena that receive a certain grammatical expression in a particular language. Given this, the concept of fundamental syntactic categories has the right to exist in Ukrainian linguistics, so three basic concepts can be derived on their level: a **syntactic unit**, a **syntactic link**, a **syntactic model**, which are the most functionally and communicatively significant constructs of this tier of the language. The stratification of the components of this definite triad suggests new ideas and approaches, which will make it possible to interpret their essence and specificity

more specifically, projecting it onto the syntactic level as a whole.

Syntactic unit. In the system of such categorical concepts as syntactic units, first of all, the issues of defining this construct, their classification, as well as grading according to the significance of the hierarchical relations between them, are being relevant.

A syntactic unit must be defined, taking into account such concepts as a speech chain (any sequence of words, including a word, if it is somehow highlighted, isolated or functionally loaded), grammatical ordering (the presence between its components of certain grammatical or semantic-grammatical grammatical coherence), functional marking (functional significance). Considering this, a syntactic unit is a functionally marked and grammatically ordered speech chain, which is an arbitrary meaningfully significant sequence of word forms, even a separate word form.

Conceptually, in special sections about the syntactic structure of language, this or that system of syntactic units is being formed, motivated and interpreted. It should be emphasized that traditionally philologists represent a variety of concepts (often far from each other), mainly in the range from one component to four or more, and also with different content of the corresponding system. In this regard, the question arises both about the essence of the phenomenon and about the terminology used. In addition, only the **main syntactic units** were considered to be a system of syntactic units. The most characteristic systems of basic syntactic units in Slavic linguistics are: one-component (sentence); two-component (word, sentence) [2], (phrase, sentence) [3]; three-component (word / minimal syntactic unit / word form, phrase and sentence) [4]; (phrase, sentence and complex sentence); four-component (word, phrase, sentence, complex sentence), (word, construction, sentence, text) [5]; five-component (word, word form, phrase, simple sentence and complex sentence) [6], (word, phrase, sentence, complex sentence, text) [7]. It is still problematic to belong to the main syntactic units such syntactic constructs such as **syntagma, syntaxeme, communications, configuration**. Not all linguists agree with the assignment to the main syntactic units of the **text**, arguing that the syntactic system of the language ends at the level of complex polynomial sentences, and the rest of the constructions and constructions refer to the speech system.

Setting objectives. It is possible to motivate any preferences of this or that construct in relation to the main syntactic units only if at least two problems of a metalinguistic nature are solved. Firstly, to define the concept of a syntactic unit clearly and unambiguously, as proposed in the article, and secondly, to outline the criterion according to which a construction can be qualified in this way. Such a criterion is the unity of the five parameters of any syntactic construction: adequacy to the grammatical structure of the Ukrainian language; functional determination; the maximum possible generalization within the limits of the functions performed; completeness and self-sufficiency; connection with other units of the entire system [1, p. 207]. Given the proposed parameters and in accordance with the qualification aspect of the subject of syntax, the system of basic syntactic units can be filled as follows: **word form**, **phrase**, **phrase**, **sentence**, **text** and **superphrasal unity** [8]. In the hierarchy of syntactic units, the main ones constitute a separate subset, which is based directly on the **basic** syntactic units, which include a **word** (an elementary, minimal lexical component of a speech chain), a **construction** (a sequence of words that is one or another speech chain). Basic syntactic units are not specified either functionally or structurally (if it is a construct). They are a kind of universals that point to the subject of syntax and become the substantive basis of other syntactic units, including the main ones.

Presenting the main material. The components of the system of basic syntactic units require separate comments. In our opinion, the minimum syntactic unit should be qualified not as a word, but as a word form. Compare: in lexicology a word is a lexeme, in morphology it is predominantly a certain sequence of morphemes with the corresponding meaning and morphological characteristics (part of speech, gender, number, etc.). In syntax, the word manifests itself functionally, that is, as a syntactic unit (a component of one or another syntactic construction or as an independent formation outside its boundaries), and not as a lexeme and not as some sequence of morphemes. This becomes possible if the lexeme has grammatical parameters, in accordance with which its semantic-grammatical relations with other lexemes are marked, also as word forms in the speech chain.

Separately, the question arises about the interpretation of syntactic units in the system of basic ones at the pre-communicative level. For a long time, traditionally constructions at the pre-communicative level were qualified as one syntactic unit – a phrase. However, it is impossible to cover all constructions with this term, because the components of the phrase are interconnected by a contractual relationship. Therefore, for a construction with any other semantic-grammatical relations (compositional

connection, arrangement, semantic fit, etc.), the term **word combination** can be updated – a combination of word forms and phrases based on any other semantic-grammatical relations than contractual ones, and with wider functions than the nominative one. In this case, any construction as a structural syntactic formation can be qualified either as a phrase or as a word compound. For example, the fragment *Tired, he stopped to rest. Evening stars slowly appeared in the sky and gleamed in the waters of a small but noticeable lake*; word combinations will be the predicative foundations of both structures (he stopped, the stars appeared), as well as the constructions *he was tired, appeared and gleamed.*

At the communicative level, any word type or construction (word-group and word combination) becomes a sentence if it is functionally marked as a unit of communication. The categorical parameters of the Ukrainian sentence, therefore, are predicativity, communicativeness and functionality [9].

The word type, as well as the sentence itself or their certain combination can be a **text**, if they are functionally marked, is a normative and formally complete speech formation with pragmatically oriented information (for example, inscriptions like *Pharmacy* or *Enjoy success!* on a billboard). Similarly, a word-group or word combination may, under certain conditions, acquire the categorical parameters of the text by moving from the nomination level to the message level, i. e. becoming a sentence. For example: *Beauty and strength; Believe in people!* (inscriptions on a billboard).

Among the syntactic formations there are units that are structurally opposed to both a text and a sentence. These include **superphrasal unity** – a sequence of sentences that is not finalized as a complete speech formation or that is not such an formation objectively. The minimum superphrasal unity can consist of two individual sentences (one sentence or even one word or letter may form a text). For example, in the superphrasal unity *Winter is outdoors. It started imperceptibly, buried, covered in snow everything around*, we have a chain connection of two sentences (*winter – it*) and the parallelism of the forms of predicates of these sentences (*started, buried, covered*). It is clear that there are no sufficient grounds to qualify such a construction as a text [10].

To summarize, the basic syntactic units can be defined as follows:

Word form is a structurally minimal syntactic unit that functions either as a communicatively significant component of a certain speech chain, or as an independent syntactic formation.

Word combination is a combination of two or more content words (word types) based on a dependent relation.

Word group is a combination of two or more content words based on a coordinative or other semantic-grammatical relations that is not actually a subordination.

Sentence is a certain predicative syntactic formation that consists of a word (or its analogue) or a syntactically connected group of words (or their analogues) and performs a communicative function.

Text is a certain communicatively significant, formally and conceptually complete speech formation, construed with a certain pragmatic instruction.

Superphrasal unity is a combination of two or more sentences connected by formal linguistic means of lexical or grammatical nature and united by a common theme, instruction to the intuitive completeness of a separate communication act.

Basic syntactic units are a holistic structural and systemic formation, within which any syntactic phenomenon can be interpreted. However, from each of the basic units as a separate grammatical category due to their derivational details, different subclasses are formed that constitute a system of **derived** syntactic units [11]. These units are related to the procedure of speech chains parsing. It should be emphasized that derivatives of any of the basic syntactic units may vary in one way or another in both substantive and procedural terms, and therefore be combined into different systems, each of which will have its own aspect of studying and describing of a language syntax and application. In Ukrainian linguistics there are various systems and complexes of derived syntactic units, their nomenclature and study scope [12]. The authors of the proposed study also addressed this issue, presenting their configuration of the derived syntactic units [1]. With this in mind, we illustrate a possible system of derivatives from only one basic unit, such as text. In our opinion, it is expedient to connect these derivatives only with its character as a certain syntactic construction, i. e. with the actual syntactic level of the language structure. Therefore, the following options of text derivatives classification are possible:

1. Text correlated with the word type (*Minimarket*) (shop sign).

2. Text correlated with the construction: word combination (*Repair of watches*) (workshop sign), word group (*Dream and Hope*) (inscription on the billboard), sentence (*Peace and stability for the state*) (inscription on the billboard).

3. A text correlated with a sequence of sentences, particularly two sentences: (*Mountains are calling. They are charming*) (inscription on a billboard).

It is obvious that the system of derived syntactic units cannot complete the syntactic analysis of speech chains. Any derivative syntactic unit can, in turn, have derivatives of a more specific nature. In this way, it seems possible to distinguish two more subsets in the system of syntactic units: **analytical** units and **analytical and retrieval** units.

Analytical units arise as a result of concretization of basic and derived syntactic units within the categories of traditional formal-grammatical syntax [13]. They combine, for example, sentence members, types of subordinate clauses, types of word combinations and word groups according to the syntactic and morphological characteristics of their components [14].

Analytical and retrieval units are related to original, new, retrieval, experimental, not yet well-established concepts in syntax compared to traditional approaches (theme and rhema, constructive centers and their expanders, a set of structural schemes of simple and complex sentences, etc.).

Thus, the metalanguage of modern syntax and real factual material, analyzed in terms of this metalanguage, allow the formation of five independent syntactic units with their own specific classes: basic, principle, derivative, analytical and analytical and retrieval.

Syntactic link. The most required, obligatory component of any speech chain as a syntactic unit is a **syntactic link**. This is a fundamental category of linguistics, which can be defined as a semantic-grammatical relation between the components of a speech chain, which allows its linguistic understanding as a message or a fragment and qualify this chain as a syntactic unit [1, p. 207].

Traditionally, the system of syntactic communication covers the main types: subordinated, coordinative and predicative with their varieties such as control of concordance, contiguity, coordination, correlation. It can be assumed that this link is a closed group, and it can be called systemic according to five parameters: determination of the nature of syntactic dependence; binary of the corresponding constructive formation; identity of its components as syntactic units; implementation within one sentence; functional marking of related components. All five parameters must be implemented and can be denoted by units in the systemic link vector (11111) [1].

If zero appears in the link vector together with the units, the link loses its systemic nature and becomes **non-systemic** or **accidental**. Relevant non-systemic link vectors: (01111), (10111), (11011), (11101), (11110). In this case, the differential feature marked

with the number of this item is not implemented, and therefore, it marks accidental relations.

The most typical and common manifestation of accidental link is that which occurs due to the non-determination of the nature of syntactic dependence: bilateral, unilateral, lack of dependence. Here it is impossible to establish neither predicative, nor coordinative, nor subordinated relations. Note that if the subordinated relations are available, then within this construction it is not possible to determine the subordination of components. This group includes such accidental links as **correlation, joining, explanation, reorientation, deformation, juxtapositional link and asyndeton**. In particular, in the case of joining, there is no opposition on the basis of subordination/coordination, for example: *The work is completed and on time*. The vector (01111) corresponds to this link. By the way, if we formalize this construction as two predicative units, we will not have another vector of systematicity – going beyond one communicative unit, for example: *The work is completed. And on time*. In this case, another vector corresponds to the joining (01101).

In the Ukrainian language, a situation when a certain component of the speech chain implements its syntactic parameters in different syntagmas, i. e. it goes beyond binary relations, is quite common. This is characteristic of **restructuring, variability, laddering, cutting, segmentation, division, extrapolation**. For example, in the construction *Single light clouds in the sky* there is an omission of one of the syntagma components (*appeared, are seen*, etc.) with the preservation of dependent on it words. This is how the accidental link – the gap – with the vector (10111) occurs.

Accidental link is also a link, where syntactic units of different nature within one syntagma enter into syntactic relations. These include the **separation** and **generalization** to which the vector (11011) corresponds. In sentences with homogeneous members and a generalizing word both syntactic unit (word type) and a generalizing word enter into syntactic relations with homogeneous members (word group), i. e. another syntactic unit. Thus, the third parameter of the systemic syntactic link is missing – the identity of the components of the structure as syntactic units.

According to the fourth parameter – the syntactic links outside one communicative unit (simple or complex sentences) – there are distinguished the **connections** and **insertions**, which corresponds to the vector (11101). Insertion, in particular, occurs when one communicative unit enters another as an inserted sentence, for example: *The rain ended*

abruptly – who would have known that in advance – and it was possible to move on without hindrance. The link of the inserted sentence with the main sentence is accidental, as the existing semantic-grammatical relations are fixed between the components of different sentences.

Another group of the accidental syntactic link is related to the functional marking of components, with their functional uniqueness as members of a sentence. In such cases, the syntactic link, which determines the functional load of the components of the speech chain, is determined first and not vice versa, as is the case with normative and standard communicative situation, which clearly outlines the functions of each component of expression, and hence the nature and syntactic links with other components. According to this parameter, accidental links are **arrangement, transposition, contact, quasi-dominance, coupling**. For example, in the case of arrangement, the function of the components of the expression is determined by the sequence of their location. Cf .: *My friend is a doctor* and *The doctor is my friend*. The vector (11110) corresponds to this group of accidental syntactic links.

The above configuration of accidental syntactic links, of course, does not exhaust their diversity, as non-standard speech situations, and hence syntactic links between components of the speech chain cannot be predicted and adequately described.

Syntactic model. As already noted, the specificity of syntax is that this syntactic tier of the language structure actualizes the connecting properties of language units, which allows to generate a huge and uncontrolled number of both specific communicative constructions and constructions of the communicative level. In such a situation, the problem of adequate description of the syntactic structure of the language, including Ukrainian, is acute. This, in turn, becomes possible if we correlate a separate syntactic construction with one or another of its models, which represents all constructions of a given type. Only through a system of models filled with specific speech material, we can, in our opinion, adequately and most fully describe the real syntax, for example, of the Ukrainian language.

In the practice of linguistic modeling, the concept of **model** should be interpreted, firstly, as a structural or functional **analogue** of a phenomenon, secondly, as a kind of **metalanguage** (system of some rules), and thirdly, as a **linguistic unit** [1]. Both syntactic links and syntactic units are modeled in syntax, although with significant differences. In particular, it has not yet been possible to build a general model of syntactic link, as it is impossible to substantially convey the semantic-grammatical relations between the components of the speech chain. Regarding syntactic units, the picture is different. For example, it is impossible to list all even elementary (two-component) word combinations of the Ukrainian language, but their models are both comprehensive and easy to interpret. In particular, graphically, any word combination can be represented as follows: $\underline{\downarrow} \ \underline{\quad}\rfloor$, where ══ – head component of a word combination, ── – dependent component, $\sqrt{\quad}\rceil$ – dependency direction.

It is the linguistic model as a metalanguage value of syntax that is a very effective tool for scientific research, as well as a way to present its results. There are usually a distinction between graphic models (different graphs) and analytical (letter symbols, unique images, formulas based on the mapping of set of words to a set of the classes to which these words belong).

At the pre-communicative level, based on the system of basic syntactic units, word type, word combinations and word groups are modeled; on the communicative – sentence, superphrasal unity and text. Being unable to refer in the proposed paper to the examples of construction of models of all syntactic units, we offer only models of word combination and text.

Studying, for example, simple nominal word combinations with a defining adjective and reflecting their certain features, they can be substantially presented, firstly, as specific speech constructions such as *summer day, autumn rain* (there are a lot of such constructions in a language), and secondly, as special terms – nominees of *noun-adjective word combination* or *combination of noun with adjective* or, finally, in the verbal form of *adjective + noun* or symbolic *Adj N*, where *Adj* – adjective, N – noun. Analytical model of *Adj N* is a linguistic unit, where one can display an information that is updated using indexes and other suprasegmental means such as: *Adj N. h.* (*h* – head word); *Adj N̲* (head word underlining); *N Adj* (preposition of the head word); *Adj 1 N1* (case forms of word types); *Adj → N* (arrow indicates the direction of the subordinated relation).

The graphic model of a word combination is significantly simpler than the analytical one, where the head word is usually marked, syntactic links between components (strong and weak) are differentiated, and phraseological units and idioms are fixed, if required. The graphic model of the above noun-adjective word combinations will look like $\underline{\quad}\ \underline{\downarrow}$, where ══ – head component of word combination, ── – word combination component, ──→ – subordinated relation (from the dependent component to the main one).

A text model is a symbolic image of a set of basic syntactic units, which is given with an indication of an element of this set, i. e. a symbol of the unit or a symbol of the units from which the text is constructed. Such units are:

– word type (W) – *Exit* (inscription on the door of a building);

– word combination (C) – *Grand style* (inscription on a billboard);

– word group (C) – *Style and beauty* (inscription on a billboard);

– sentence (S) – *Mountains are called* (inscription on a billboard);

– superphrasal unity (L) – *Mountains are calling. Mountains are charming. They are accessible and at the same time mysterious*.

If the model of the Ukrainian text is represented by only one of the named components, it is basic: T = (W); T = (S); T = (L). In the case of addition,

expansion of the base model such models as SS; SSL, etc. can be derived. The text model (as well as other large syntactic compound) is the maximum possible generalization in the system of basic syntactic units.

Conclusions. Thus, three basic concepts: syntactic unit, syntactic connection and syntactic model – as fundamental syntactic categories are systemic formation; the unity, mutual validity and interdependence of its components reflect the specifics of the syntactic level of language, providing its interpretation in categorical dimensions. Within the proposed system of syntactic units (basic, main, derivative, analytical, analytical and exploratory), it is possible to qualify any speech chain; the set of syntactical links (systemic and off-system) gives an opportunity to do it. In general, the real syntax of the Ukrainian language can be adequately and fully described only through the system of models (graphic and analytical).

REFERENCES:

1. Попова І.С. Фундаментальні категорії метамови українського синтаксису (одиниця, зв'язок, модель) : монографія. Дніпропетповськ : Вид-во ДНУ, 2009. 453 с.

2. Сучасна українська літературна мова. Синтаксис / за ред. І.К. Білодіда. Київ : Наукова думка, 1972. 516 с.

3. Ганич Д.І., Олійник І.С. Словник лінгвістичних термінів. Київ : Вища школа, 1985. 360 с.

4. Шульжук К.Ф. Синтаксис української мови: підручник. Київ : Академія, 2004. 408 с.

5. Меньшиков І.І., Попова І.С. Речення як предикативна, комунікативна та функціональна одиниця мовлення. Дніпропетровськ : ДНУ, 2002. 48 с.

6. Загнітко А.П. Теоретична граматика сучасної української мови. Морфологія. Синтаксис. Донецьк : ТОВ «ВКФ "БАО"», 2011. 992 с.

7. Вихованець І.Р. Граматика української мови. Синтаксис. Київ : Либідь, 1993. 368 с.

8. Великий тлумачний словник української мови (з дод. і допов.) / уклад. і головн. ред. В.Т. Бусел. Київ, Ірпінь : ВТФ «Перун», 2005. 1728 с.

9. Гуйванюк Н.В. Слово – речення – текст: Вибр. праці. Чернівці : Чернівецький національний університет, 2009. 664 с.

10. Загнітко А.П. Теоретична граматика української мови. Синтаксис. Донецьк : ДонДУ, 2001. 662 с.

11. Кротевич Є.В., Родзевич Н.С. Словник лінгвістичних термінів. Київ : Вид-во АН УРСР, 1957. 236 с.

12. Українська мова. Енциклопедія / за ред. В.М. Русанівського, О.О. Тараненка. Київ : Українська енциклопедія, 2000. 752 с.

13. Селіванова О. Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енциклопедія. Полтава : Довкілля-К, 2006. 716 с.

14. Слинько І.І., Гуйванюк Н.В., Кобилянська М.В. Синтаксис сучасної української мови. Проблемні питання. Київ : Вища школа, 1994. 670 с.