

5. Жовтобрюх М. А. Історична граматики української мови. Київ, 1980. С. 201–234.
6. Крижанівська О. І. Історія української мови: Курс лекцій. Кіровоград. 2003. 34–47.
7. Леута О. І. Старослов'янська мова: Підручник. Київ: Вища шк., 2001. 255 с.
8. Майборода А. В. Старослов'янська мова. Київ: Вища шк., 1975. 294 с.
9. Русанівський В. М. Структура українського дієслова. Київ: Наукова думка. 1971. С. 78–125

Anatolii Zahnitko
(*Vinnytsia*),
Maria Tereschuk
(*Kyiv – Vinnytsia*),

FUNCTIONAL-OBJECTIVE BASICS OF THE PARTS OF SPEECH' CLASSIFICATION¹

1. In the history of linguistic studies, the well-known statement is that the ancient Indian etymologist Yaska (according to V. Alpatov [1]), was the first to prove the parts of speech' classification of the language – Indian linguistic tradition. In the ancient world, in the authoritative grammars by Dionysius Thrax (II century BC) and Apollonius Dysculus (II century AC), the grammatical structure of the Greek language with a distinction between morphology and syntax is described. Classical grammars have been cleverly interpreted by the ancient Roman scholars, the most authoritative among whom Donat (III - IV centuries AC) and Priscian (second half of the VI-th century) can be considered – European linguistic tradition. Significant is also the parts of speech' differentiation with orientation on purely applied tasks – the lexicographic processing of the material (the Chinese linguistic tradition from Xu Shen (1-st century BC) and to this day. From the XIV-th century dictionaries of “empty words”, that are, the particles and other grammatical elements, are being created. It is interesting that within this tradition, a dictionary containing 47035 characters with the expression of their 19995 variants was created in the 10-th years of XVIII-th century, and the linguistic tradition was used in the Arabic linguistic tradition that was formed at the latest – the second half of the

1 The research was conducted within the confines of the fundamental research program “Objective and subjective linguistic grammar: communicative-cognitive and pragmatical-linguistic computer measurements” (0118U0033137) – Vasyli' Stus Donetsk National University of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine.

millennium. The Basra scholars (Basra and Kufa in Mesopotamia), one of the most famous of which was Sibawayh, as well as Spanish Arabists (Ibn Jinni (end of X - the beginning of the XI century)) formed a grammatical concept, the main task of which was to master Arabic. Another linguistic tradition – Japanese, the latest in the time of appearance (in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries), with a relatively conservative-closed character, was oriented towards the study of national values and the national language. The school of cocogas (the other names of koogaku (studying culture), vagaku (Japanese studies), koagaku (the doctrine of the emperor or the science of antiquity)) became the leading in a relatively isolated state, scientists managed to create the morphology of the Japanese language. With support on the underlying foundations of Motoori Norinaga (1730-1801), the theoretician of the Kogugaksuyu school, Toji Gimon (1786-1843) created Japanese grammar with a clear set of parts of speech' classification, with coverage of the conjugation.

In all the linguistic traditions – Indian, European, Chinese, Arabic, Japanese – the researcher was differently included in the analyzed language element (Bungo (Old Japanese) and spoken Japanese, classical Arabic and Arab dialects, Latin and Middle Ages Roman languages, Latin and Ancient Greek, ancient Chinese (wenjian), and spoken Chinese, Sanskrit, and the linguistic situation in India, as well as the sacred language of the Pale in India, as compared to Sanskrit, etc.), where the main opposition was based on the “prestigious / unscrupulous” language, and non-diachronic cut. Each researcher tried to get used to the text and context, which led to the non-separation of the native speaker from the language researcher. Subsequently, this direction of studies by A. Wejbitskaya was called anthropocentric [2].

2. In all linguistic traditions, the main interest was its own language, and the other languages were viewed as mostly unnatural sounds that do not require attention. Sometimes considerable attention was paid to the dialects of their own language and the features of the established variant were established on this basis. For convenience of the description (in the Old Indian linguistic tradition – the actual commentary and / or comments on comments, etc.) used a part-language classification, which in European linguistics has ancient linguistic tradition for its origins. For example, in the European linguistic tradition in ancient times, the morphological character of the parts of speech' differentiation became the defining criterion (for example, in Varon: names are words that are declined by cases sentences, but not by tenses, verbs – by tenses, but not by cases; the adjectives are also varied and adverbially, and temporarily, adverbs are not altered by any of the established criteria [1, p. 12-14]). It is essential that adverbs, exclamations, articles, and connections are delimited semantically and syntactically. The last signs did not become decisive, so the antique the parts of speech' classification has not become exhaustive.

In contrast to the European linguistic tradition, only three parts of the language were differentiated in Arabic: name, verb, and particle. This approach correlated with the ancient Indian language classification based on Yaska. The researcher differentiated the name and verb from their consistent opposition to the service class, distinguishing the preposition and the particle in its structure. The qualification of the particles as units with their own values and functions emerged as a feature, while the prepositions were defined as units, the main function of which is the marking of the values of the name and verb. If in the Arabic linguistic tradition only hints of the functional delineation can be noticed (non-service, fullness (independence) ↔ service incompleteness (independence)), then in the ancient linguistic tradition there is a step functional semantization, where the name and verb are differentiated on the first stage, on the basis of the intra-sentence positional status, on the second – separated autonomy and non-autonomy, the third degree covers the internal differentiation of the service elements.

The division of independent and non-independent words did not go away the Japanese linguistic tradition. Within the first component, the opposition of the name and the verb was subsequently differentiated, where within the latter the own-verb and predicate verbs were allocated (according to the European linguistic tradition, as “predicative adjectives” with a special reciprocity and specific semantics, e.g. The books is big (Книги великі); This woman is alone (Ця жінка одна); あおい (синій-blue), あたたかい (теплый-warm)).

In the Japanese linguistic tradition, the parts of speech’ classification is multilevel, where the classes of words contrasted on the first level are opposed on the basis of independence and / or dependence, on the second – within the limits of separate words, the names and verbs are delimited, on the third – internalized verbal differentiation is realized. The European tradition has introduced detailization for independent words, from which adverbs, pronouns, partly also numerals, etc. were also highlighted.

The Chinese linguistic tradition distinguished the words only from “full” and “devastated”, which is motivated by the lack of phrasing and acting in the Chinese language.

3. The eight-component parts of speech’ classification originates from the Alexandrian Antique School. The declared classification has become classical, which was later supplemented. Confirmation of the latter may appear the approach by Vinogradov [3, p. 287-301], which distinguished between the four main groups: 1) the word-names together with the pronouns that create the substantive-semantic, logical and grammatical foundations of speech and appear as parts of the language; 2) particles of the language, that is, connected, official words, deprived of a nominative function, which are maximally related to the technique of language, and their lexical values are identical with grammatical values; 3) modal words and particles, deprived, like communicative, their nominative function, but more “lexical”: they are used in the sentence and indicate the relation of speech to reality

from the point of view of the subject of speech. Attached to the sentence, modal words appear outside the boundaries and parts of the language, and particles of speech (V. Horpynych distinguishes between modal and stagnant as separate parts of speech [5]), although the form is similar to both the first and the last; 4) exclamations in the broad sense of the word, which have no cognitive value, are syntactically unorganized, are not combined with other words with an affective color characteristic of them, close to facial expressions and gestures.

Equally relevant is the classification by G. Sveet [14], the author of the first grammar of the English language, with the consistent application of morphological and syntactic criteria. By the first criterion, all the words of the English language are differentiated into declinable (nouns, adjectives, verbs) and non-declinable (adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, exclamations) [14, p. 101-145]. The last criterion differentiated noun-words with noun-pronouns, noun-numbers, infinitive, and gerund. The claimed qualification is based on the similarity of functions. Adjectives include proper adjectives, adjective-pronouns, adjective-numerals, participles (functional basis). The verbal group covers personal forms and nonverbal forms (verbals).

The syntactic criterion in the inter-sentence positional version was substantiated by Ch. Frice [11], who believed that the part of the language could be set according to the position that the word occupies in the sentence, but in the form that is opposed to other positions and forms. The theoretical substantiation enabled the allocation of 4 main positional classes. The first class formed words that are capable of occupying the position of the subject (the term of traditional grammar is used). The second class includes lexemes that occupy the position of a verb-predicate in a personal form. The third class is the position of the adjective word, that is, the position of the prepositional definition and the nominal part of the compilation of the predicate. Up to the fourth class, are lexemes with a modifying spell-word potential (adverbs in traditional grammar). Four basic positional classes are complemented by 15 groups of formal words. Morphological and positional principles have been combined in the classification of G. Glison [12, p. 41-91], substantiating the division of all the words into two large classes, where the first – with signs of change, and the second – without signs of change. The class of inflection covers nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs. A non-inflection class contains words with the same position. The words that may appear in both positions form “constituent” classes.

Interpretative classification or parts of speech’ model was used by O. Eperspersen [13, p. 49-72], I. Vychovanets’ [4, p. 7-15]. I. Vychovanets’ allocated the core (noun and verb) from the parts of speech, semi-periphery (adjective, adverb), as well as parts of speech’ periphery. The researcher reasoned the necessity of using the morphological, syntactic, semantic and word-building criteria of the parts of speech classification. Considering the laws of inter-language transformations with the differentiation of functional, semantic and formal, the

author consistently uses the intra-sentence position to diagnose the degrees of transitivity between the parts of speech [4, p. 92-95].

4. An incomplete, rather selective review of various parts of speech' classifications convinces that the basis of the European linguistic tradition is the concept of Aristotle, in particular the principles of formal logic defined by him, among which as functionally burdened appear: a) the principle of identity (the equality of things for itself, the stability of its features); b) the principle of forbidden contradiction (two contradictory statements can't be simultaneously true); c) the principle of the excluded third (one element or one concept fall under one or another concept). For all the differences between different language classes in different periods of the development of linguistic doctrine remained the continuity of the use of the stated principles of formal logic by Aristotle.

5. It is promising to study the language-related classifications in various linguistic traditions – European, Ancient Indian, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese – with the definition of common and distinct planes of the parts of speech' language classifications, as well as generalization of the conceptual and terminological basis for the activation of contrastive and comparative-typological studies.

References

1. Alpatov, Vladimir. "Istoriya Lingvisticheskikh Ucheniy. 4-e izd., ispr. i dop. (History of Linguistic Studies. 4th ed.)". Moskow: Yazyiki slavyanskoy kultury, 2005. 368. Print.
2. Vezhbitskaya, Anna. "Yazyk. Kultura. Poznanie / perevod s angl. (Language. Culture. Cognition)". Moskow: Russkie slovari, 1996. 412. Print.
3. Vinogradov, Viktor. "Russkiy Yazyk. Grammaticheskoe Uchenie o Slove. 2-e izd. (Russian Language. Grammar Studies of the Word)". Moskow: Vysshaya shkola, 1972. 601. Print.
4. Vykhoanets, Ivan. "Chastyny Movy v Semantiko-Hramatychnomu Aspekti (Parts of Speech in the Semantic-Grammatical Aspect)". Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1988. 255. Print.
5. Horpynych, Volodymyr. "Morfolohiia Ukrainskoi Movy (Morphology of Ukrainian Language)". Kyiv: Akademiia, 2004. 335. Print.
6. Zahnitko, Anatolii. "Teoretychna Hramatyka Ukrainskoi movy. Morfolohiia. Syntaksys (Theoretical grammar of Ukrainian language. Morphology. Syntax)". Donetsk: LLC "VTK "BAO", 2011. 992. Print.
7. Zahnitko, Anatolii. "Movnyi Prostrir Hramatyky (Linguistic Space of Grammar)". Vinnytsia: Tvory, 2018. 448. Print.
8. Krasnobaieva-Chorna, Zhanna. "Linhvofrazemna Aksiolohiia : Paradyhmalno-Katehoriinnyi Vymir. 2-e vyd., vypr. i dop. (Linguophrasemic Axiology: Paradigm-Categorical Dimension)". Vinnytsia: DonNU, 2016. 416. Print.

9. Lukin, Oleg. “Chasti Rechi v Antichnoy Nauke (Logika, Ritorika, Grammatika (Parts of Speech in Ancient Science (Logic, Rhetoric, Grammar). Voprosy Yazykoznaniiya (Questions of Linguistics) 1 (1999): 131–141. Print.

10. Sytar, Hanna. “Syntaksychni Frazeolohizmy v Rozrizi Konstruktsiinoi Hramatyky (Syntactic Phraseologisms in the Context of Structural Grammar)”. Vinnytsia: TOV «Nilan-LTD», 2017. 458. Print.

11. Fries, Charles. American English grammar. N.Y. – L., 1940. 457. Print.

12. Gleason, Henry. Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics. New York: Hot, Rinehart and Winston, 1955. 501. Print.

13. Jespersen, Otto. Essentials of English Grammar. London, 1948. 357 pp.

14. Sweet, Henry. A New English Grammar: Logical and Grammar. London, 1892. 587. Print.

Жанна Краснобаєва-Чорна

(м. Вінниця)

МОВНА КОНЦЕПТУАЛІЗАЦІЯ ТА КАТЕГОРИЗАЦІЯ ЗНАТЬ: КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНА І ЦІННІСНА КАРТИНИ СВІТУ

Формування знання ґрунтоване на процесах концептуалізації та категоризації – процесах конфігурування знань, що у межах діяльності суб'єкта емпіричного пізнання спирається на можливості сприйняття й охоплює цілісне уявлення про конкретний об'єкт.

Концептуальна картина світу (ККС) і ціннісна картина світу (ЦКС) постають складниками мовної картини світу. Закономірність їхнього співвідношення визначується кореляцією процесів концептуалізації та категоризації, яким належить визначальна роль в описі пізнавальної діяльності та когнітивних здібностей людини.

Концептуалізацію в лінгвістиці (див. праці О. Кубрякової, В. Маслової, Ю. Степанова та ін.) позиціоновано як процес пізнавальної діяльності людини, що полягає в осмисленні інформації, яка надходить до неї, і призводить до утворення концептів і концептуальних систем; як процес породження нових смислів із пошуком відповідей на комплекс питань (як формуються нові концепти, як створення нового концепту обмежується наявними концептами, як можна витлумачити здатність людини постійно поповнювати та видозмінювати концептуальну систему тощо). Отже, увагу акцентовано на процесі структурування знань, їхньої репрезентації мінімальними концептуальними одиницями.

Істотними в сучасному баченні процесу категоризації постають класична теорія категоризації та її варіації (теорія гештальтів, теорія визначальної ознаки, теорія порівняння ознак, прототипова теорія, теорія динамічного конструала тощо). Категоризація у вузькому розумінні є