
© **OLGERD I. USMINSKIY**

usminskaya@mail.ru

УДК 801.56

THE TYPOLOGY OF SUBORDINATING WORD COMBINATIONS

SUMMARY. This article is devoted to the problem of subordinating word combinations distribution in the contemporary Russian language. The typology is based on the intersections of the paradigm, including types of syntactic link and the paradigm of grammar (syntactic) meanings.

KEY WORDS. Government, agreement, juxtaposition, subordination.

The practice of teaching the contemporary Russian language, including the syntax section «Word-combinations» shows the following quite clearly.

Firstly, the commonly used concepts, such as agreement, government, adjunction, do not «cover» all the variety of word-combinations typologically, that requires active use of other terms-concepts.

Secondly, it still remains actual to fundamentally differentiate between the type of word combinations (link type) and the grammatical meaning of a particular word combination. For example, the interpretation of appositional agreement as a syntactic meaning is not valid even by virtue of semantic emptiness of a number of such meanings as «objective», «attributive», «subjective-attributive.»

Thirdly, one should pay attention to syntactic diffusion, which manifests itself in a combination of syntactic qualities and typological relatedness within a single word combination.

Fourthly, one should determine the paradigm of grammatical meanings, which become actual in combinations. Looking a little ahead, we note that the concept of “relative meaning» entered into the scientific tradition actually reduces the clear distinction of meanings into such types as place, purpose, degree, cause.

We have allowed ourselves to arrange the article material in the way that, firstly, the typological solutions are laid out in two tables, so that the second acts as a natural extension of the first. This material delivery is primarily due to the conditions of the article format, natural limitations of publishing nature. After each table there are comments on the most problematic syntactic identifications from our point of view.

Some problematic identifications are marked as “asterisks”: * or ***.

General taxonomic solution is based on the principle of overlapping of the specific manifestations of the paradigm, «Combination type» and the specific manifestations of the paradigm «Meaning» (syntactic meaning of a word-combination). This taxonomic overlapping has resulted in the complex identifications the formulae of which reflect the following: 1. Type of a combination (syntactic link type). 2. Syntactic meaning of a combination. 3. Morphological «content» of a combination.

The role of the given formulae is the reflection of such an important quality of any typology as «non-overlapping of types and classes» that indicates the validity and the correctness of the typology. Note also the reduced «regime» of the given formulae, because we regard their format as a sufficient one in terms of the reflection of the essence of a word-combination.

Table 1

Meaning Word-combination type	Subjective-Attributive A	Objective B	Objective-Attributive C	Instrumental D
1. Government	<i>Атака противника; (Opponent's attack); Ход чемпиона (Champion's move)</i>	<i>Писать письмо (To write a letter)</i>	<i>Гимн труду; (Hymn to labour); Памятник Пушкину (Monument to Pushkin)</i>	<i>Строгать рубанком</i>
2. Full agreement				
3. Partial agreement				
4. Oppositional agreement				
5. Associative agreement (Associative juxtaposition)				
6. Conditional agreement (Conditional juxtaposition)				
7. Juxtaposition (full)		<i>Любить рисо-вать (To like drawing)</i>		
8. Adjunction				
9. Combination of government and agreement				
10. Combination of nominal adjunction and government				
FORMULA	1A (Sub+Sub)	1B (Verb+Sub) 7B (Inf+Inf)	1C (Sub+Sub)	1D (Verb.+Sub)

In modern Russian syntax such link type as «juxtaposition» is not lucky. Most often it is attributed to the peculiarities of the relation between the subject and the predicate [1; 291], for example: *Мы вместе* (*We are together*); *Мы про-*

тив войны (*We are against war*). Sometimes the juxtaposition between the subject and predicate is defined as «uncoordinated form» [2; 623], for example: *Жаловаться бесполезно* (*Useless to complain*). In the last example the pausation proves the binomiality of the predicative unit very simply: *Жаловаться — бесполезно* (*Useless to complain*). Not disputing this scientific version, we emphasize that «juxtaposition» still should be also spread on a number of subordinating word-combinations. The main point in this respect is that the headword is linked with the dependent one by means of meaning and is invariable. This distinguishes «juxtaposition» from «adjunction», within which the subordinate word form is invariable. In a strict sense, the example *Любить рисовать* (*To like drawing*) serves as a symbiosis of «juxtaposition» and «adjunction».

Table 2

Meaning Word-combination type	Indirect Object E	Attributive F	Deponent G	Relative (of place, purpose, cause) H
1. Government	<i>Играть на скрипке; (To play the violin) Быть закатам* (Let sunsets be)</i>	<i>Три крейсера** (Three cruisers)</i>	<i>Один из нас (One of us)</i>	<i>Иду к мосту (I go to the bridge)</i>
2. Agreement		<i>Чистый стол (Clean table)</i>		
3. Partial agreement		<i>Вижу его готовым (I see him ready)</i>		
4. Appositional agreement		<i>Котенок- шалун (Pickle kitten)</i>		
5. Associative agreement (Associative juxtaposition)		<i>Крепкий кофе; (Strong coffee) Быстрое такси*** (Quick taxi)</i>		
6. Conditional agreement (Conditional juxtaposition)		<i>Сладкое какао**** (Sweet cocoa)</i>		
7. Juxtaposition				<i>Очень хорошо (Very good)</i>

The end of table 2

8. Adjunction		<i>Их работа</i> (Their work)		<i>Долго учу</i> (I) have been learning for a long time
9. Combination of government and agreement			<i>Одна из доя-рок****</i> (One of the milkmaids)	
10. Combination of nominal adjunction and government				На крейсере «Аврора»; (On cruiser "Avroga") К гостинице «Москва»***** (To the hotel "Moskva")
FORMULA	1E (Verb+Verb)	1F (Num+Sub) 2F (Atr+Sub) 3F (Pro+Atr) 4F (Sub+Sub) 5F (Atr+Sub) 6F (Pro+Sub)	1G (Num+Pro) 9G (Num+Pro)	7D (Adv+Adv) 8D (Adv+Verb) 10D (Sub+Sub)

* We anticipate possible objections concerning the objective meaning of the word-combination *Быть закатам* (*Let sunsets be*). However, its possible transformation into the combination *Будут закаты* (*Sunsets will be*) seems correct in terms of lexical semantic relations, but not correct in terms of syntax, since the alteration of the impersonal construction (and still — the word-combination!) into a two-member sentence is in fact a «verification» based on the optional transfer of a unit from one level of language (the level of word-combinations) into the predicative level (the level of utterances).

** Of course, long scientific tradition has firmly established the concept of «completive meaning» or «completive word-combination» However, the justification of the term by the fact that numerative is semantically insufficient and requires semantic fulfillment does not look convincing: it can just as well be stated that the adjective «цветной» («colourful») is also semantically weak and requires semantic extension — *цветная капуста* (*cauliflower*), *цветной телевизор* (*colour TV*) and *цветная печать* (*colour printing*). There are so many cases of «lack of information contained in the headword» [3; 21] that, if to be consistent, the characteristic of «completivity» should be spread on a very large mass of word-combinations. Secondly, (and this is perhaps more important) the attention of syntacticians has not been «held» on the reduced attributive meaning of such combinations, this meaning can even be defined as latent, but simple transformations make it possible to determine: *Три крейсера* → *крейсерская тройка*; (*Three cruisers* → *Cruisers triad*) *Десять команд* → *командная десятка*

(*Ten teams* → *Team score*). Conversion of a noun (dependent word) into an adjective determines the attributiveness of semantics of a word-combination. Of course, not in all cases, these transformations are perfect from the stylistic point of view, for example: *Четыре дома* → *домовая четверка* (*Four houses* → *houses quartet*). However, in most transformations stylistic faults are absent. Sometimes the semantics of combinations of this type is defined as the semantics of degree or measure (eg. V.A. Beloshapkova), but the principal objection to this interpretation can be the reminder of the semantic role of a dependent word in combinations.

*** In word-combinations *Крепкий кофе* (*Strong coffee*) and *Быстрое такси* (*Quick taxi*) the grammatical «adjustment» of the dependent word forms is carried out by the association: *Крепкий кофе* (*Strong coffee*) is a drink, *Быстрое такси* (*Quick taxi*) is a vehicle. On the one hand, this is an associative agreement, on the other hand, this is an associative juxtaposition, within which it is the headword that appears to be grammatically invariable (unlike adjunction).

**** In the word-combination *Сладкое какао* (*Sweet cocoa*) the adaptation of the secondary element is conditional, since the assignment of the neuter gender to the word «какао» («cocoa») is determined by the final part of the word that reminds the finals of such Russian words as *окно* (*window*), *зеркало* (*mirror*), *стекло* (*glass*). The conditional agreement can also be interpreted as conditional juxtaposition, as in contrast to adjunction, it is the main element that appears to be invariable.

***** In the word-combination *Одна из доярок* (*One of the milkmaids*) the agreement is realized in grammatical meanings and forms of the feminine gender. The government appears in the definition of the meaning and the form of the dependent word by the headword.

***** The question of distinction between the nominal adjunction and such kind of government as the government of the substantive in the nominative case still remains controversial. But most likely, such word-combinations again show the combinatorial principle of subordinating relations. In such combinations as (*Я восхищен*) *кинотеатром «Спутник»* ((*I admire*) the «Sputnik» cinema) or (*Благодаря*) *таблеткам «Плантиокс»* ((*Due to*) the tablets «Plantioks») the government is realised in relation to the substantive not in the form of an ergative case, but in the form of the nominative case, which is unusual enough in terms of the traditional approach to word-form «falling» under the government. But most likely, the prejudice against such an approach is based on a standard psychological stereotype. On the other hand, the acquisition of the characteristic of a frozen form by a proper name (especially «the quoted one») and its dependence on the headword in the semantic, but not in the formal sense brings to the nature of the relations of elements to the adjunction.

The experience of the typological solution of the problem of subordinating word-combinations gives grounds to say that the main difficulty in making a consistent classification is due to both the diffusion of types of syntactic relations and the diffusion of syntactic meanings. The last problem has not been considered in this article because of its complexity and the need for very substantial amount of text. Semantic diffusion leads to a more complex, more problematic identification of grammatical meanings. For example, a very frequent definition of the syntactic

meaning in the combination *Хозяйка гостиницы* (*The owner of the hotel*) as an «objective one» and not «attributive» can be explained by the powerful influence of lexical semantics and foregrounded lexical-semantic field of the predictive character: *Если хозяйка, значит она владеет гостиницей* (*If she is the owner, then she owns the hotel*). Such shifts from the syntactic semantics to the lexical one are typical and can considerably be attributed to lack of experience in verification transformations: *Хозяйка гостиницы* → *Гостиничная хозяйка* (*The owner of the hotel* → *the hotel owner*).

According to our observations, the most complex and ambiguous in terms of identifying link types are such word-combinations as «government» and «juxtaposition.»

As for the definition of syntactic semantics, the link type of «government» assumes, perhaps, the greatest number of combinatorial or diffuse syntactic meanings [4; 3]. But not taking into account such complex cases means emasculating the real picture of these syntactic phenomena and reducing the correctness of syntactic classifications.

REFERENCES

1. Contemporary Russian Literary Language / Edited by P.A. Lekant. Moscow: Vasshaya Shkola, 1996. 462 p.
2. Contemporary Russian Language / Edited by L.A. Novikov. S.Petersburg: Lan, 2001. 864 p.
3. Gikburd, S.M. The Russian Language: the Theory and methods of teaching // Collection of Scientific Works. Surgut Pedagogical Institute. Surgut, 2000. P. 3-8.
4. Pipchenko, N.M. Contemporary Russian Language. Minsk, 2008. 196 p.