

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Національний університет «Одеська політехніка»

Цимбал Н.А.

ТЕОРЕТИЧНА ГРАМАТИКА АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ

Конспект лекцій
для здобувачів першого (бакалаврського) рівня вищої освіти
спеціальності 035 Філологія, освітня програма – Германські мови та
літератури (переклад включно), перша – англійська

Затверджено на засіданні кафедри
англійської філології та перекладу
Українсько-німецького інституту

Протокол № 1 від 29.08.2024

Одеса - 2024

Цимбал Наталія Андріївна.

Теоретична граматики англійської мови. Конспект лекцій з навчальної дисципліни «Теоретична граматики англійської мови» для здобувачів першого (бакалаврського) рівня вищої освіти спеціальності 035 Філологія, освітня програма – Германські мови та літератури (переклад включно), перша – англійська. Одеса: Національний університет «Одеська політехніка», 2024. с.

Конспект лекцій з навчальної дисципліни «Теоретична граматики англійської мови» складено відповідно до навчальної програми. Видання містить 8 тем, які відводяться на лекційне подання матеріалу, теми охоплюють базові поняття граматики, опис морфологічного та синтаксичного рівнів сучасної англійської літературної мови.

Призначається для здобувачів денної та заочної форми навчання.

ЗМІСТ

ВСТУП.....	4
Lecture 1. The scope of theoretical grammar.....	6
Lecture 2. The Noun.....	14
Lecture 3. The Verb.....	24
Lecture 4. The Adjective as a part of speech.....	42
Lecture 5. The Adverb as a part of speech.....	45
Lecture 6. Syntax of the Phrase.....	49
Lecture 7. Sentence as the main object of Syntax.....	54
Lecture 8. Complex and compound sentences.....	58
РЕКОМЕНДОВАНА ЛІТЕРАТУРА.....	66

ВСТУП

Мета вивчення дисципліни «Теоретична граматики англійської мови»: системний виклад основних принципів та особливостей морфологічної та синтаксичної будови сучасної англійської мови у зв'язку з історією розвитку наукової думки.

Практичне значення та використання отриманих знань:

У результаті вивчення навчальної дисципліни здобувач повинен **знати:**

- методи, основні поняття, етапи розвитку та термінологію теоретичної граматики;
- типологічні характеристики граматичної будови сучасної англійської мови;
- теоретичні основи морфологічної та синтаксичної систем англійської мови;
- основні відмінності між напрямками граматичних досліджень у XX-XXI століттях;
- проблемні питання теоретичної граматики та шляхи їх вирішення, що пропонуються в рамках різних лінгвістичних шкіл та напрямів (традиційному, структурному, генеративному, когнітивному).

вміти:

- розумітися на проблемних питаннях теоретичної граматики та висловлювати свою точку зору на те чи інше граматичне явище;

- користуватися різноманітними науковими джерелами з теоретичної граматики англійської мови (підручниками, монографіями та ін.), знайомитися з новими доробками в галузі граматичних досліджень для підвищення свого професійного рівня;
- порівнювати явища граматичного рівня англійської та рідної мов;
- вміти застосовувати знання з курсу теоретичної граматики у практичній викладацькій діяльності.

Спрямованість навчальної дисципліни: навчальну дисципліну «Теоретична граматика англійської мови» рекомендовано для вивчення здобувачами першого (бакалаврського) рівня вищої освіти, які навчаються за освітньою програмою 035 ФІЛОЛОГІЯ. GERMANСЬКІ MOVI TA ЛІТЕРАТУРИ (ПЕРЕКЛАД ВКЛЮЧНО), ПЕРША – АНГЛІЙСЬКА.

Lecture 1.

The scope of theoretical grammar.

Outline

1. Grammar in the systemic conception of language.
2. Language is a system of means of expression.
3. Hierarchy of levels within the system of language
4. Grammatical meaning.
5. The characteristic features of a grammatical category.
6. Means of expressing grammatical meanings.
7. Types of form-building means.
8. Correlation between various means of form-building in English.
9. The parts of speech problem. Word classes.

GRAMMAR IN THE SYSTEMIC CONCEPTION OF LANGUAGE

Language is a means of forming and storing ideas as reflections of reality and exchanging them in the process of human intercourse. Its main function is being communicative. It incorporates three constituent parts:

- phonological system;
- lexical system;
- grammatical system.

Each of the aforesaid is studied by a particular linguistic discipline. Grammar can be regarded from the practical or theoretical point of view. The aim of theoretical grammar is to give a theoretical description of the grammatical system of a given language, or to scientifically analyze and define its grammatical categories and to study the mechanisms of grammatical formation of utterances out of words. Another aim is to consider mood controversial points on which different points of view can be expressed. It is worth noting that English grammatical theory is represented by a number of grammatical schools.

The most influential of them are:

- the classical scientific grammar (Henry Sweet, Jespersen, etc);
- American structural or descriptive linguistics (Bloomfield, Wells, Nida, Hockett, Fries, Trager, Smith, Pike);
- Transformational generative linguistics (Harris, Chomsky).

Systemic character of language is especially stressed in Middle English. Its constituent parts form the Microsystems within the framework of the macrosystem of language. This approach was developed by the Boduen de Kuortane, Ferdinand de Saussure. They outlined the difference between speech proper and language proper.

LANGUAGE IS A SYSTEM OF MEANS OF EXPRESSION.

Speech is the realization of the system of language in the process of humane intercourse. Grammar connects language with speech because it determines the process of utterance formation through grammatical categories.

The two fundamental types of relations between linguistic units are syntagmatic and paradigmatic. Syntagmatic relations are linear relations between units in a segmental sequence. Words are syntagmatically connected within any sentence and morphemes are always syntagmatically connected within words.

Relations opposed to syntagmatic are called paradigmatic. They are intrasystemic relations which find their expression in the fact that each linguistic

unit is included in a set of similar units with common formal and functional properties, e.g. a set of related grammatical forms realises the grammatical category of number of the nouns. These forms make up grammatical paradigms.

HIERARCHY OF LEVELS WITHIN THE SYSTEM OF LANGUAGE

This approach was worked out by the school of descriptive linguistics and the Soviet school. The theory claims that units of any higher level are formed of units of the immediately lower level. Thus phrases are decomposed into words, words into morphemes, morphemes into phonemes. The scheme is as follows:

- supraphrasal unit > text > proposemic level (predicative units) > phrasemic level
- lexemic level (nominative units) > morphemic level (elementary meaningful unit)
- phonemic level (differential unit).

Predication shows the relation of the denoted event to reality. SPU is made up of sentences or, occasionally, a sentence. Text is the main lingual unit.

There are two levels which are of most importance:

- the one of words, because they are units of nomination;
- the one of sentences since they are units of predication.

The main parts of grammar are morphology and syntax. Morphology deals with the morphemic structure: classification and combinability of words. It faces two units: morphemes and words. As to syntax, it deals with the structure, classification and combinability of sentences.

GRAMMATICAL MEANING

Grammatical meanings are more general and abstract than lexical meanings. Words with different lexical meanings can express the same grammatical meaning. e.g. boy – boys

cat – cats

box – boxes grammatical meaning of the category of number

sheep – sheep

ox – oxen

Grammatical meaning is expressed by means of a certain formal sign or signal – the marker of a grammatical form. Grammatical form unites a whole class of words so that each word of the class expresses the corresponding grammatical meaning together with its lexical meaning.

Grammatical meaning is generalized, abstract to some extent meaning that unites large classes of words and is expressed through a certain form of sign or the absence of the sign. Grammatical category is the central concept. A unity of a grammatical form and a grammatical meaning is realised through a grammatical category.

It is a system of expressing a generalised grammatical meaning through means of paradigmatic correlation of grammatical forms:

Notion of paradigm

Notion of word-form

Notion of form-class

A word-form is a combination of the stem of a word with some inflectional sign or symbol.

A form-class is a set of word-forms having different roots and stems but similar formbuilding signal or its allomorphs.

The meaning of these two form-classes are mutually excluding. They are opposed to each other in meaning and in form.

THE CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF A GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY

1. Any grammatical category is based on the opposition of at least two form-classes which are opposed to each other in both form and meaning. In this opposition one of the members of the opposition is usually the marked member

as it has a certain marker. The marked member is the strong member. The opposite member is an unmarked one and it is weak.

2. Form-classes within one and the same grammatical category are mutually excluding. A word-form of one form-class cannot express the meaning of the opposite form-class. No wordform can be the form of both form-classes of the same grammatical category simultaneously.

3. A word-form can be opposed to a number of word-forms within different grammatical categories.

E.g. the word-form WRITES

Write (I write) - person

Write (they write) – number

Wrote – tense

Is writing – aspect

Is written – voice

Has written – time correlation / retrospective coordination.

MEANS OF EXPRESSING GRAMMATICAL MEANINGS

Word-building means serve to express new notions (e.g. WORK – WORKER – WORKABLE) and they are treated in lexicology.

Form-building means are ones of building up grammatical forms of words and they are treated in Grammar (Morphology).

There are traditionally singled out different types of morphemes: root-morphemes and affixal morphemes.

The roots of notional words are lexical morphemes.

Affixal morphemes are prefixes, lexical suffixes, inflexions.

Prefixes and lexical suffixes have word-building functions. It is inflexions (or, grammatical suffixes) that express different grammatical meanings.

The abstract morphemic model of a common word can be represented in the following way:

PREFIX – ROOT – LEXICAL SUFFIX – GRAMMATICAL SUFFIX (INFLEXION).

Morphemes can be free and bound. Free morphemes can build up words by themselves while bound ones cannot.

Morphemes can be overt and covert. Overt is a genuine, explicit morpheme (material). Covert is a zero-morpheme (contrastive absence of a morpheme). Barkhudarov introduced a so-called discontinuous morpheme. It comprises the following elements:

- an auxiliary word
- some form-building signal of a notional word.

In the perfect form there is singled out the discontinuous morpheme **HAVE + -en** where en is a symbolic denotation of the third form of the verb.

Form-building and word-building suffixes can be productive and non-productive, and both of them can be polysemantic.

TYPES OF FORM-BUILDING MEANS

There are two principal types of form-building means: synthetic and analytical.

The synthetic form-building means is the expression of the relation of words in the sentence by means of a change in the word itself. There are three types of the synthetic formbuilding means:

- affixation
- sound interchange (morphological alteration)
- suppletion (suppletive means)

Affixation is the most productive means of expressing a grammatical meaning. The number of grammatical suffixes is small (8). They are: *-s, -ed, -ing, -er, -est, -en, -m (him, them, whom), zero*.

Sound interchange is a change of a sound in the root of the word. There exist two kinds of sound interchange – vowel and consonant ones (spend – spent).

This type of form-building means is non-productive. In suppletive forms there is a complete change of the phonetic shape of the root.

Suppletive forms belonging to the paradigm of a certain word were borrowed from different sources. Suppletive forms are found in the paradigm of such words as TO BE, TO GO, degrees of comparison of the adjectives GOOD, BAD and in case-forms of some pronouns.

Notes that suppletivity can be recognized in the paradigm of some modal verbs too: CAN – BE ABLE, MUST – HAVE TO, MAY – BE ALLOWED. Moreover, that it can be observed in pronouns (ONE – SOME), NOUNS (INFORMATION – PIECES OF INFORMATION, MAN – PEOPLE).

Suppletive forms are few in number, non-productive, but very important, for they are frequently used. Analytical forms were described as a combination of an auxiliary and a notional word.

This definition is not precise enough and due to its ambiguity such word-combinations as TO THE CHILD, MORE INTERESTING were treated as analytical forms. To define a true analytical form the theory of splitting of functions should be taken into account. There must be a splitting of functions between the elements of an analytical form.

The first (auxiliary) element is the bearer of a grammatical meaning only. It is completely devoid of lexical meaning, and it is the second (notional) element that is the bearer of lexical meaning. This process can be complete (perfect form) or incomplete (continuous form). The idiomaticity of an analytical form is a characteristic of a true analytical form.

An analytical form functions as a grammatical form of a word. Analytical forms have a specific feature, a specific morpheme which is called a discontinuous morpheme which comprises an auxiliary word and a formbuilding signal of a notional word. The root of a notional word is not included in the discontinuous morpheme (HAVE + -en ; BE + -ing).

CORRELATION BETWEEN VARIOUS MEANS OF FORM-BUILDING IN ENGLISH

Analytical forms are much more typical of ME. Synthetic form-building means are few in number but widely used. Some grammatical suffixes are very productive.

Analytical forms comprise synthetic forms. Although sound interchange is non-productive it is extensively used through the paradigm of the irregular verbs. Though suppletive forms are found through the paradigm of very few words they are very frequently used words. Middle English is not a purely analytical language, it is mainly analytical.

Espersen mentioned that "English is an ideal language. Analytical languages reflect a more developed mentality.

THE PARTS OF SPEECH PROBLEM. WORD CLASSES.

The term PART OF SPEECH was introduced long ago and is considered conventional. There are three principles of the classification: semantic, formal, functional. In many grammar schools the semantic principle is employed. This principle is based on universal forms of human thought which are reflected in three main categorial meanings of words:

Substance (предметність)

Process (процесуальність)

Property (якість, ознака)

But it doesn't always work, for it is hard to define the category of meaning of such words as WHITENESS, ACTION etc. Another point of view is that only the form should serve as a criterion of the classification of the part of speech.

This principle is called "the formal criterion". It was widely used by H. Sweet and others. They singled out the classes of declinable and indeclinable words. To the class of indeclinable words belong: THE, FOR, AS, ENOUGH, MUST. But this

criterion is unreliable because they include MUST in the group. For MUST functions as many other verbs: SHALL > MUST (MUST WE GO?; SHALL WE GO?).

Some linguists representing this approach define parts of speech as morphological classes. They are words of similar paradigm of word-forms. This definition cannot be applied to the languages like Chinese where morphological system is non-existent or poorly-developed puts it that parts of speech are grammatical word-classes. In singling out parts of speech they take into consideration their morphological and syntactical property. This particular approach is the boarder-line case between the second and the third approaches. Only the function of a word should be taken into consideration as a criterion for the part-of-speech classification. It is called "the functional criterion."

The champions of this approach are Bloomfield. Charles Fries puts it: "The words that occupy the same sets of in English sentences must belong to the same class of words."

It is based on the combinability of words and the method used by Charles Fries is called SUBSTITUTION TESTING. It resulted four main positions of notional words. Accordingly all notional words are grouped into 4 classes:

- of nouns
- of verbs
- of adjectives
- of adverbs

Pronouns were included into the corresponding classes as their substitutes. The number of functional words is 154 and they fall into 15 groups or into 3 sets.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT

1. What are the three fundamental constituent parts of language?
2. What is the aim of theoretical grammar as a linguistic discipline?

3. What does the “prescriptive” approach to the grammatical phenomena consist in?
4. What are the two planes of language units?
5. What are the two fundamental types of relations of language units?
6. What is the hierarchy of language levels?
7. What is the elementary meaningful part of the word?
8. What are the three main types of distribution according to the “allo-emic” theory?

Lecture 2.

The Noun.

Outline

1. The category of number of the nouns.
2. The category of case of the nouns.
3. The theory of positional cases.
4. The theory of prepositional cases.
5. The limited case theory.
6. The theory of the possessive postposition.
7. The Article.

THE CATEGORY OF NUMBER OF THE NOUNS

The noun as a part of speech has the categorial meaning of SUBSTANCE (THINGNESS).

The class of nouns falls into four subclasses:

- proper and common nouns
- animate and inanimate nouns
- human and non-human nouns
- countable and uncountable nouns

- concrete and abstract

As to the category of number, it is expressed by the opposition of the plural form of the noun to its singular form. The strong member of this binary opposition is the plural, its productive formal mark being the suffix -(e)s. The productive formal mark correlates with the absence of the number suffix in the singular form of the noun. The semantic content of the unmarked form means the presence of the zero-suffix of the singular in English.

The other, non-productive ways of expressing the number opposition are vowel interchange in several relict forms (man – men, woman – women, tooth – teeth), the archaic suffix -(e)n supported by phonemic interchange in a couple of other relict forms (ox – oxen, child – children, cow – kine, brother – brethren), the correlation of individual singular and plural suffixes in a limited number of borrowed nouns (formula – formulae, phenomenon – phenomena, alumnus – alumni etc). In some cases the plural form is homonymous with the singular form (sheep, deer, fish).

The most general quantitative characteristics of individual words constitute the lexicogrammatical base for dividing the nounal vocabulary as a whole into countable nouns and uncountable nouns. The constant categorial feature quantitative structure is directly connected with the variable feature number since uncountable nouns are treated grammatically as either singular or plural.

Namely, the singular uncountable nouns are modified by the quantifiers much / little and they take the finite verb in the singular, while the plural uncountable nouns take the finite verb in the plural. The two subclasses of uncountable nouns are usually referred to, respectively, as *singularia tantum* / *pluralia tantum*. Since the grammatical form of the uncountable nouns of the *SINGULARIA TANTUM* subclass is not excluded from the category of number, it stands to reason to speak of it as the absolute singular, as different from the correlative (common) singular of the countable nouns.

The absolute singular excludes the use of the modifying numeral ONE as well as the indefinite article. The absolute singular is characteristic of the names of:

- abstract notions (peace, love, joy ...)
- branches of professional activity (chemistry, architecture, linguistics...)
- mass materials (water, snow, steel...)
- collective inanimate objects (foliage, fruit, furniture...)

Some of these words can be used in the form of the common singular with the common plural counterpart, but in this case they come to mean either different sorts of materials, or separate concrete manifestations of the qualities denoted by abstract nouns, or concrete objects exhibiting the respective qualities.

Joy is absolutely necessary for human life. – It was a joy to see her among us.

On the other hand, the absolute singular can be used with countable nouns.

In such cases the nouns are taken to express either the corresponding abstract ideas, or else the meaning of some mass-material correlated with its countable referent.

Waltz is a lovely dance.

The refugees needed shelter. Under this heading comes also the generic use of the singular.

Man's immortality lies in his deeds.

In the sphere of the plural there should be recognized the common plural form as the regular feature of countability and the absolute plural form peculiar to the uncountable subclass of pluralia tantum nouns.

The absolute plural cannot directly combine with numerals, and only occasionally does it combine with the quantifiers many, few. The absolute plural is characteristic of the uncountable nouns:

- which denote objects consisting of two halves (trousers, scissors, spectacles...)
- expressing some sort of collective meaning, i.e. rendering the idea of indefinite plurality, both concrete and abstract (supplies, outskirts, clothes; tidings, earnings, contents, politics; police, cattle, poultry ...)
- denoting some diseases as well as some abnormal states of the body and mind (measles, rickets, creeps, hysterics...)

The absolute plural, by way of oppositional reduction, can be represented in countable nouns having the form of the singular, in uncountable nouns having the form of the plural, and also in countable nouns having the form of the singular.

The first type of the reduction, consisting in the use of the absolute plural with countable nouns in the singular form, concerns collective nouns, which are thereby changed into nouns of multitude.

The family were gathered round the table. The government are unanimous in disapproving the move of the opposition.

This form of the absolute plural may be called multitude plural. The second type of the described oppositional reduction, consisting in the use of the absolute plural with uncountable nouns in the plural form, concerns cases of stylistical marking of nouns.

The sands of the desert; the snows of the Arctic; the waters of the ocean; the fruits of the toil.

This variety of the absolute plural may be called descriptive uncountable plural.

The third type of oppositional reduction concerns common countable nouns used in repetition groups. The acquired implication is indefinitely large quantity intensely presented.

The nouns in repetition groups may themselves be used either in the plural or in the singular.

There were trees and trees around us. I lit cigarette after cigarette.

This variety of the absolute plural may be called repetition plural.

THE CATEGORY OF CASE OF THE NOUNS

Case is the immanent morphological category of the noun manifested in the forms of noun declension and showing the relations of the nominal referent to other objects and phenomena.

This category is expressed by the opposition of the form in –'s [-z, -s, -iz], usually called the possessive (genitive) case, to the unfeatured form of the noun, usually called the common case.

In fact, in the course of linguistic investigation the category of case in English has become one of the vexed problems.

Four special views advanced at various times by different scholars should be considered as successive stages in the analysis of this problem.

THE THEORY OF POSITIONAL CASES

This theory is directly connected with the old grammatical tradition, and its traces can be seen in many contemporary text-books for school in the English-speaking countries (J.C. Nesfield, M. Deutschbein, M. Bryant and others).

In accord with this theory, the unchangeable forms of the noun are differentiated as different cases by virtue of the functional positions occupied by the noun in the sentence. Thus, the English noun would distinguish, besides the inflexional genitive case, also the uninflexional, purely positional cases: nominative, vocative, dative, accusative.

The nominative case (subject to a verb):

Rain falls. The vocative case (address): Are you coming, my friend? The dative case (indirect object to a verb): I gave John a penny.

The accusative case (direct object, and also an object to a preposition):

The man killed a rat. The earth is moistened by rain.

The cardinal blunder of this view is that it substitutes the functional characteristics of the part of the sentence for the morphological features of the word class. In reality, the case forms as such serve as means of expressing the functions of the noun in the sentence, and not vice versa.

THE THEORY OF PREPOSITIONAL CASES

In accord with the prepositional theory, combinations of nouns with prepositions in certain object and attributive collocations should be understood as morphological case-forms. To these belong first of all the dative case (to + NOUN, for + NOUN) and the genitive case (of + NOUN).

These prepositions, according to G. Curme, are inflexional prepositions, i.e. grammatical elements equivalent to case-forms. The prepositional theory, though somewhat better grounded than the positional theory, nevertheless can hardly pass a serious linguistic trial. As is well known from noun-declensional languages, all their prepositions, and not only some of them, do require definite cases of nouns.

This fact, together with a mere semantic observation of the role of prepositions in the phrase, shows that any preposition stands in essentially the same grammatical relations to nouns. It should follow from this that not only of-, to-, for- phrases, but also all the other prepositional phrases in English must be regarded as analytical cases.

As a result of such an approach illogical redundancy in terminology would arise: each prepositional phrase would bear then another, additional name of prepositional case, the total number of the said cases running into dozens upon dozens without any gain to theory.

THE LIMITED CASE THEORY

This view of the English noun case recognizes a limited inflexional system of two cases in English, one of them featured, the other – unfeatured (H. Sweet, O.

Jespersen). The limited case theory in its modern presentation is based on the explicit oppositional approach to the recognition of grammatical categories.

In the system of the English case the functional mark is defined which differentiates the two case-forms:

- the possessive (genitive) as the strong member of the categorial opposition;
- the common (non-genitive) as the weak member of the opposition.

THE THEORY OF THE POSSESSIVE POSTPOSITION

This view approaches the English noun as having completely lost the category of case in its historical development. All the nounal cases, including the much spoken of genitive, are considered as extinct, and the lingual unit that is named the GENITIVE CASE by force of tradition, would be in reality a combination of a noun with a postposition (i.e. a relational postpositional word with preposition-like functions).

Of the various reasons substantiating the postpositional theory the following two should be considered as the main ones.

1.The postpositional element –'s is but loosely connected with the noun, which finds the clearest expression in its use not only with single nouns, but also with whole word-groups of various status: somebody else's daughter, another stage-struck girl's stage finish...

2.There is an indisputable parallelism of functions between the possessive postpositional constructions and the prepositional constructions, resulting in the optional use of the former.

This can be shown by transformational reshuffles of the above examples: the daughter of somebody else, the stage finish of another stage-struck girl.

One cannot but acknowledge the rational character of the cited reasoning. However, the theory of the possessive postposition fails to take into due account

the consistent insight into the nature of the noun form in -'s achieved by the limited case theory.

The latter has demonstrated that the noun form in -'s is systemically contrasted against the unfeatured form of the noun, which does make the whole correlation of the nounal forms into a grammatical category of case-like order.

The solution of the problem is to be sought on the ground of a critical synthesis of the positive statements of the two theories: the limited case theory and the possessive postposition theory.

A two case declension of nouns should be recognized in English, with its common case as a direct case, and its genitive case as the only oblique case. But, unlike the case system in ordinary noun-declensional languages based on inflexional word change, the case system in English is founded on a particle expression.

The particle nature of -'s is evident from the fact that it is added in post position both to individual nouns and to nounal word-groups of various status, so two subtypes are to be recognized: the word genitive and the phrase genitive.

The described particle expression of case may to a certain extent be likened to the particle expression of the Subjunctive mood in Russian. As is known, the Ukrainian subjunctive particle *БЫ* not only can be distanced from the verb it refers to, but it can also relate to a lexical unit of non-verb-like nature without losing its basic subjunctive-functional quality:

Якби не він. Мені б таку можливість.

THE ARTICLE

Article is a determining unit of specific nature accompanying the noun in communicative collocation. A mere semantic observation of the articles in English, i.e. the definite article *THE* and the indefinite article *A/AN*, at once discloses not two, but three meaningful characterizations of the nounal referent achieved by their correlative functioning:

- one rendered by the definite article;
- one rendered by the indefinite article
- one rendered by the absence (or non-use) of article.

The definite article expresses the identification or individualization of the referent of the noun: the use of this article shows that the object denoted is taken in its concrete, individual quality.

The indefinite article is commonly interpreted as referring the object denoted by the noun to a certain class of similar objects; in other words, the indefinite article expresses a classifying generalization of the nounal referent, or takes it in a relatively general sense. As for the various uses of nouns without an article, from the semantic point of view they all should be divided into two types.

In the first place, there are uses where the articles are deliberately omitted out of stylistical considerations.

Telegram received room reserved for week-end (the text of a telegram).

Conference adjourned until further notice (the text of an announcement).

Big red bus rushed food to strikers (the title of a newspaper article).

The purposeful elliptical omission of the article in cases like that is quite obvious, and the omitted articles may easily be restored. Alongside of free elliptical constructions, there are cases of the semantically unspecified non-use of the article in various combinations of fixed type, such as prepositional phrases (on fire, at hand, in debt ...), fixed verbal collocations (take place, make use, cast anchor...), descriptive coordinative groups and repetition groups (man and wife, day by day...), and the like.

These cases of traditionally fixed absence of the article are quite similar to the cases of traditionally fixed uses of both indefinite and definite articles (in a hurry, at a loss, have a look, give a start; in the main, out of the question, on the look-out...).

Outside the elliptical and fixed constructions there exists a really semantic absence of the article with the noun. It is this semantic absence of the article that stands in immediate meaningful correlation with the definite and indefinite articles as such. The meaningful non-uses of the article admit of a very explicit classification founded on the countability of the noun.

The essential points of this classification are three in number. The meaningful absence of the article before the countable noun in the singular signifies that the noun is taken in an abstract sense expressing the most general idea of the object denoted (the meaning of absolute generalization).

Law begins with the beginning of human society. Steam-engine introduced for locomotion a couple of centuries ago has now become obsolete.

The absence of the article before the uncountable noun corresponds to the two kinds of generalization: both relative and absolute John laughed with great bitterness.

The subject of health. Coffee or tea, please? Coffee stimulates the function of the heart.

The absence of the article before the countable noun in the plural, likewise, corresponds to both kinds of generalization, and the exposition of the meaning in each case can be achieved by the same semantic tests.

Cf.: Stars, planets and comets (these kinds of objects: relative generalization) are different celestial bodies (not terrestrial bodies: relative generalization). Wars (in general: absolute generalization) should be eliminated as means of deciding international disputes.

To distinguish the demonstrated semantic functions of the non-uses of the article by definition, we may say that the absence of the article with uncountable nouns, as well as with countable nouns in the plural, renders the meaning of “ uncharacterized generalization”, as different from the meaning of “ absolute

generalization”, achieved by the absence of the article with countable nouns in the singular.

So much for the semantic evaluation of the articles as the first stage of our study. Passing to the situational estimation of the article, there should be pointed out that the basic principle of their differentiation here is not a direct consideration of their meanings, but disclosing the informational characteristics that the article conveys to its noun in concrete contextual conditions.

In the situational study of syntax the starting point of the communication is called its theme, while the central informative part is called its rheme. In accord with the aforesaid situational functions, the typical syntactic position of the noun modified by the definite article is the thematic subject, while the typical syntactic position of the noun modified by the indefinite article or by the meaningful absence of the article is the rhematic predicative.

The day was drawing to a close, the busy noises of the city were dying down. How to handle the situation was a big question. The sky was pure gold above the setting sun. It should be noted that in many other cases of syntactic use the articles reflect the same situational functions. Another essential contextual-situational characteristic of the articles is their immediate connection with the two types of attributes to the noun.

The first type is a limiting attribute, which requires the definite articles before the noun;

the second type is a descriptive attribute which requires the indefinite article or the meaningful absence of the article before the noun. The events chronicled in this narrative took place some four years ago (limiting). She was a person of strong will and iron self-control (descriptive).

The third stage of the analysis is concerned with the consideration of the articles in the light of the oppositional theory.

Bearing in mind the facts established at the two previous stages of observation, it is easy to see that oppositionally, the article determination of the noun should be divided into two binary correlations connected with each other hierarchically.

The opposition of the higher level operates in the whole system of articles. It contrasts the definite article with the noun against the two other forms of article determination of the noun. In this opposition the definite article should be interpreted as the strong member of the opposition by virtue of its identifying and individualizing function, while the other forms of article determination should be interpreted as the weak member.

The opposition of the lower level operates within the article subsystem that forms the weak member of the upper opposition. This opposition contrasts the two types of generalization, i.e. the relative generalization distinguishing its strong member (the indefinite article plus the meaningful absence of the article as its analogue with uncountable nouns and nouns in the plural) and the absolute, or abstract generalization distinguishing the weak member of the opposition (the meaningful absence of the article).

The data obtained through the analyses show that the English noun, besides the variable categories of number and case, distinguishes the category of determination expressed by the article paradigm of three grammatical forms: the definite, the indefinite, the zero.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT

1. What are the three main qualitative types of the grammatical oppositions?
2. What are the three criteria of discrimination of parts of speech?
3. What is substitution testing in the syntactico-distributional classification of words?

4. What are the four main subclasses of nouns according to their formal features?
5. Why is the category of gender of nouns rather controversial?
6. What is grammatical personifying transposition?
7. What are the productive and non-productive ways of expression of number opposition?
8. What are the main theories of case?

Lecture 3.

The Verb.

Outline

1. General characteristics.
2. The category of tense.
3. The problem of the future and future-in-the-past.
4. The category of voice.
5. Types of passive constructions.
6. Reasons for the frequent occurrence of the passive in English.
7. The reflexive voice.
8. The reciprocal voice.
9. The middle voice.
10. The category of mood.
11. The category of aspect.
12. The general characteristics of non-finite forms (Verbids).
13. The Infinitive.
14. The Gerund.
15. The Present Participle.
16. The Past Participle.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

The verb is the most complex part of speech. It possesses an intricate system of grammatical categories. All these complexities are due to the central role that the verb plays in the expression of predication. Predication reflects the connection between the situation denoted in the sentence and reality. The verb falls into two different sets of forms: the finite and the non-finite.

The general categorial meaning of the verb is process presented dynamically, developing in time. This general processual meaning is embedded in the semantics of all the verbs, including those that denote states, forms of existence, types of attitude, evaluations rather than actions. And this holds true not only about the finite verb, but also about the non-finite one. The processual categorial meaning of the notional verb determines its characteristic combination with a noun expressing both the doer of the action (its subject) and, in cases of the objective verb, the recipient of the action (its object). It also determines its combination with an adverb as the modifier of the action.

In the sentence the finite verb invariably performs the function of the verb-predicate. The non-finite verb performs different functions according to its intermediary nature. In other words, the non-finite forms perform a potentially predicative function, constituting secondary predicative centres in the sentence. In each case of such use they refer to some subject of their own which is expressed either explicitly or implicitly.

Roddy cared enough about his mother to want to make amends to Arabella
> *Roddy wanted to make amends...* > *Roddy will make amends*

Changing gear, the taxi turned the sharp corner > *The taxi changed gear and turned the corner.*

Acting as mate is often more difficult than acting as captain. > *One acts as mate; one acts as captain.*

THE CATEGORY OF TENSE

The immediate expression of grammatical time, or tense, is one of the typical functions of the finite verb. It is necessary to strictly distinguish between the general notion of time, the lexical denotation of time, and the grammatical time proper.

The general notion of time is that the latter, as well as space, are the basic forms of the existence of matter, they both are inalienable properties of reality and as such are absolutely independent of human perception. All the lexical expressions of time are divided into present-oriented (absolute) and nonpresent-oriented (non-absolute) expressions of time.

The absolute time denotation distributes the intellectual perception of time among three spheres: the sphere of present, with the present moment included within its framework; the sphere of the past, which precedes the sphere of the present by way of retrospect; the sphere of the future, which follows the sphere of the present by way of prospect. Thus, words and phrases like now, last week, in our century, in the past etc are absolute names of time.

The non-absolute time denotation does not characterize an event in terms of orientation towards the present. This kind of denotation may be either relative or factual. The relative expression of time correlates two or more events showing some of them either as preceding the others (priority), or following the others (posteriority), or happening at one and the same time with them. Here belong such words and phrases as after that, before that, some time later etc.

The factual expression of time either directly states the astronomical time of an event or else conveys this meaning in terms of historical landmarks. Under this heading should be listed such words and phrases as in (the year of) 1066, during the First World War, at the early period of civilization etc.

The grammatical expression of verbal time (tense) is effected in two correlated stages. At the first stage, the process receives an absolute time characteristic by means of opposing the past tense to the present tense. The

marked member of this opposition is the past form. At the second stage, the process receives a non-absolute relative time characteristic by means of opposing the forms of the future tense to the forms of no future marking.

THE PROBLEM OF THE FUTURE AND FUTURE-IN-THE-PAST

The combinations of the verbs SHALL / WILL with the infinitive have of late become subject of heated discussions. Many linguists do not include the Future Tense in the system of tenses. In "PHYLOSOPHY OF GRAMMAR" Espersen points out that the Future Tense does not exist in English for there is no grammatical form of the Future standing on the same grammatical footing with the forms of the Present and the Past. He analysed the phrase SHALL / WILL + INFINITIVE and said that it couldn't be treated as the analytical form of the Future according to the theory of the splitting of functions. SHALL / WILL is not deprived of the lexical meaning because they retain their modal meaning;

SHALL – obligation; WILL – volition.

His objection consists in the demonstration of the double marking of this WOULD-BE tense form by one and the same category: the combinations in question can express at once both the future time and the past time (the form FUTURE-IN-THE-PAST), which hardly makes any sense in terms of a grammatical category. Indeed, the principle of identification of any grammatical category demands that the forms of the category in normal use should be mutually exclusive.

The category is constituted by the opposition of its forms, not by their co-position. Blokh agrees with the both but he develops their ideas. He believes that SHALL / WILL + INFINITIVE belongs to a new specific temporal category – the category of prospective time. This category is built on the opposition of forms with SHALL / WILL-marker and forms without this marker. As to the difference in meaning the forms with SHALL / WILL-marker express an AFTER-ACTION whereas the forms without this marker express NON-AFTER-ACTION. The prospective time

is relative – the future action is relative to the present or the past time. If they are relative to the present time we speak of the form of the FUTURE. If they are relative to the past time we speak of the FUTURE-IN-THE-PAST.

The category of the prospective time is not the one singled out by Blokh. The other one, pointed out by this scholar is the category of the primary time. It provides for the absolute expression of the time of the process, or, it refers the action to the moment of speech. It is built on the opposition of two forms: PRESENT versus PAST.

THE CATEGORY OF VOICE

Ilyish points out two approaches to the definition of voice that used to exist:

1. The category of voice expresses the relation between the subject and the action.
2. The category of voice expresses the relation between the subject and the object of the action.

Now those definitions of voice are more widely accepted that indicate that the form of the verb shows the direction of an action in respect of the subject. If the subject of a sentence is the agent of the action, or, the action comes from it, we speak of the Active Voice. If the subject of a sentence is the recipient of the action, or, the action is directed upon it, we speak of the Passive Voice.

From the point of view of the oppositional theory the category of voice is built up on the opposition of the Active and Passive voice. The passive voice is the marked element of the opposition, the marker is the discontinuous morpheme BE + -EN. The form of the passive voice is a true analytical form.

TYPES OF PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

According to the number of elements in a passive construction, the latter can be divided into:

1. a two-member passive construction
2. a three-member passive construction

A two-member passive construction includes the subject of the construction which is the recipient of the action, and the second member is the action itself. The child will be looked after.

A three-member passive construction consists of the subject of the construction which is the recipient of the action, the action itself and the agent of the action. This kind of the passive construction is considered emphatic and is usually used to emphasize the doer of the action. There are several reasons why passive constructions are more extensively used in English than in Ukrainian.

The fact is that only one type of Passive exists in Ukrainian in which a direct object of the active construction becomes the subject of the passive construction. And indirect object cannot be used as the subject of the passive construction. Unlike in Ukrainian, many English verbs that take two objects can feature them both in the position of the subject of the passive construction. Thus the following types of passive constructions exist:

- the direct passive
- the indirect passive
- the prepositional passive
- the adverbial passive

REASONS FOR THE FREQUENT OCCURENCE OF THE PASSIVE IN ENGLISH

It is common knowledge that the Passive is extensively used in English. This seems to be due to a number of reasons.

In English there are no means of avoiding the indication of the doer of the action in active constructions. In other languages we find special active constructions which make it possible to avoid any mention of the agent.

For instance, in Ukrainian there several grammatical means to serve the purpose:

- the so-called indefinite-personal sentences in which there is no subject and the predicate is in the third person plural:

Греків утримували як полонених, але при цьому поводитися з ними з пошаною і надавали їм усі можливі зручності.

sentences with reflexive verbs:

Ця картина цінувалася вище, ніж усі інші. Він знав, що залишалося ще одне важливе питання. Його неочікувана поява пояснювалася дуже просто.

- impersonal sentences:

Не чулося ніякого шуму. Зірвало греблю. Усе небо затягло хмарами.

It is true that in English the indefinite pronoun ONE and occasionally the personal pronouns WE, YOU, THEY and the noun PEOPLE may be used in the same way. But for some reason or other, the use of this kind of sentences is restricted, and English, instead, resorts to passive constructions.

- In English, owing to the loss of distinction between the accusative and the dative cases, the number of verbs taking a direct object is quite considerable. It accounts for the extensive use of the Direct Passive.
- There is a great variety of passive constructions in English. Although some of them are restricted in their application, they still contribute to the frequent occurrence of the Passive.

Most grammarians agree that there are two voices in ME. However, three other voices have been singled out:

- the Reflexive voice
- the Reciprocal voice
- the Middle voice

THE REFLEXIVE VOICE:

I will shave and wash.

Actually the direction of the action in this example is different from that of the Active Voice. The action is performed by the subject upon itself, or, as characterizes it, "The action comes from the subject and back to it". This kind of direction is called "reflexive".

It can be rendered explicitly (that is with the help of reflexive pronouns) or it can be rendered implicitly (without reflexive pronouns). But the trouble is that this meaning is not expressed formally, by the form of the verb itself. Ilyish notices: "In order to acknowledge the existence of the Reflexive Voice it is necessary to prove that reflexive pronouns used in here are voice auxiliaries".

E.g. He is helping himself and his friends.

However, there is an example of a different kind:

He found himself alone. / Help yourself.

They cannot be joined by any conjunction and a noun. So in that case the SELFPRONOUNS can be treated as voice-auxiliaries. However, Ilyish is very cautious and says that there is no sufficient ground for recognizing the REFLEXIVE VOICE and he leaves the question open.

THE RECIPROCAL VOICE.

Nelly and Christopher divorced two years ago. The friends will be meeting tomorrow. These sentences can be used with reciprocal pronouns (EACH OTHER; ONE ANOTHER). The direction of the action in these examples is specific, it differs from that of the ACTIVE VOICE. In fact the action is performed by the subjects on one another. Or, the action goes on between the elements of the subject. And this kind of verbal meaning is called reciprocal. It can be rendered explicitly or implicitly. The grammarians who support the existence of the RECIPROCAL VOICE treat reciprocal pronouns as voice-auxiliaries. However, most grammarians do not recognize reciprocal voice-forms as grammatical. Блох says: "They are phrasal derivatives and can be interpreted syntactical-lexical. There are four main directions of an action:

- from the subject
- to the subject
- from the subject and back to it
- between the elements of the subject.

The first two directions are indicated by the form of the verb and therefore they are included in the opposition of the category of voice. The other two directions are indicated lexically either by a verb or by reflexive or reciprocal pronouns.

THE MIDDLE VOICE

The door opened.

The book is selling well.

The transitive verbs in these examples are used specifically. The action is confined to the subject, it appears to go on of its own accord. The action goes on within the subject without affecting any object.

It differs from the ACTIVE VOICE in meaning and syntactical construction. However, it is not recognized because it is lacking in regularity and the outer form of expression. Blokh points out: "they are cases of neutralization of voice opposition but peculiar ones. Because the weak member does not coincide with the strong one but is located between the two members.

THE CATEGORY OF MOOD.

It is the most controversial category. The category of mood in the present English verb has given rise to so many discussions, and has been treated in so many different ways, that it seems hardly possible to arrive at any more or less convincing and universally acceptable conclusion concerning it.

The only and true cause of the multiplicity of opinion in question lies in the complexity of the category as such, made especially peculiar by the contrast of its meaningful intricacy against the scarcity of the English word inflexion. The category of mood expresses the character of connection between the process

denoted by the verb and the actual reality, either presenting the process as a fact that really happened, happens or will happen, or treating it as an imaginary phenomenon, i.e. the subject of hypothesis, speculation, desire. It follows from this that the functional opposition underlying the category as a whole is constituted by the forms of oblique mood meaning, i.e. those of unreality, contrasted against the forms of direct mood meaning, i.e. those of reality, the former making up the strong member, the latter – the weak member of the opposition.

In traditional grammar three moods are singled out;

- The Indicative
- The Imperative
- The Subjunctive

The three moods correspond to three principal modal meanings;

- the meaning of fact
- the meaning of urge
- the meaning of potentiality

THE INDICATIVE MOOD is used to show that the speaker represents an action as an actual fact.

The Imperative form of the verb is traditionally referred to as the Indicative Mood. It is used to express the modal meaning of urge. In form it coincides with the infinitive stem, so it is a synthetic form. But the emphatic and negative forms of the Imperative are analytical.

The Imperative has one person (second). However, Ilyish claims that there is no category of person in the Imperative since the second person does not oppose any other person.

The Imperative has no number, tense or aspect distinctions. Generally it is used in onemember sentences. Though the Imperative has no category of Tense it has a temporal meaning of future, more or less immediate. As to theoretical

grammar not all grammarians recognize the Imperative Mood as a separate one. They deny it the status on the grounds that it has no specific morphological characteristics. Ilyish points out that in form it coincides with the infinitive, Blokh puts it that in form it coincides with the Spective Mood which belongs to the Subjunctive Mood.

The aforesaid mood is represented by the following examples: Be what may. God forgive us. It is important that he arrive here as soon as possible. My orders are that the guards draw up. As to the participation of the Imperative Mood in the above-mentioned, Blokh proves it by the transformation of imperative constructions.

Be off! > I demand that you be off etc

Semantical observation of the constructions with the analyzed verbal form shows that within the general meaning of desired or hypothetical action, it signifies different attitudes towards the process denoted by the verb (desire, supposition, speculation, suggestion etc). Thus, the analyzed forms present the mood of attitudes, which is traditionally called Subjunctive One. Blokh suggests that this mood should be called SPECTIVE, employing the Latin base for the notion of "attitudes".

The counted above form-types can be used with modal verbs such as MAY / MIGHT, SHOULD, LET:

May it be as you wish. Orders were given that the searching group should start out at once. Let me try it. Etc.

Being the functional equivalents of the pure Spective Mood, these form-types are characterized by a high frequency occurrence, they are more universal stylistically than the pure spective form, and Blokh names them as MODAL SPECTIVE. Considering the forms of the subjunctive referring to the past order of the verb we should identify the specific form of the conjugated BE as the only native manifestation of the categorial expression of unreal process. If I were

in your place, I'd only be happy. It is only the first and third persons singular that have suppletive marking feature WERE, the rest of the forms coincide with the past indicative.

Usually this form-type occurs in complex with the principal clause with WOULD / SHOULD marker. Thus, the most characteristic construction in which the two form-types occur in such a way that one constitutes the environment of the other is the complex sentence with a clause of unreal condition. The subjunctive form-type used in the conditional clause is the pastunposterior; the subjunctive form-type used in the principal clause is the past-posterior. The subjunctive past unposterior is called by some grammarians SUBJUNCTIVE TWO. Blokh suggests that the term SUBJUNCTIVE be reserved for denoting the mood of unreality as a whole.

The term SPECTIVE cannot be used here for the simple reason that the analysed moodform does not express attitudes.

- Even though it were raining, we'll go boating on the lake. [We don't know whether it will be raining or not, but even in case it is raining we will go boating] – concession.

- She was talking to Bennie as if he were a grown person. [She was talking to Bennie as she would be talking to him if he were a grown person] – comparison

As we see, the subjunctive form under analysis in its various uses does express the unreality of action which constitutes a condition for the corresponding consequence. So, as Blokh proposes, the appropriate term for this form of the subjunctive would be STIPULATIVE. Or, the subjunctive form-type which is referred to on the structural basis as the past unposterior, on the functional basis will be referred as stipulative.

As to the form-type of the subjunctive presenting past-posterior its most characteristic use is connected with the principal clause of the complex sentence

expressing a situation of unreal condition: the principal clause conveys the idea of its imaginary consequence, thereby also relating to unreal state of events.

Apart from complex sentences, the past posterior form of the subjunctive can be used in independent sentences, though, these sentences are based on the presupposition of some condition, the consequence of which they express. He would be here by now:

he may have missed his train. > He may have missed his train, otherwise (i.e. if he hadn't missed it) he would be here by now.

As it can be beheld, the subjunctive form-type in question essentially expresses an unreal consequential action dependent on an unreal stipulating action, so, relying on Latin etymology, Блох considers the term CONSECUTIVE the most appropriate. So, the subjunctive, the integral mood of unreality, presents the two sets of forms according to the structural division of verbal tenses into the present and the past. These form-sets constitute the two corresponding functional subsystems of the subjunctive, namely, the spective (the mood of attitudes) and the conditional (the mood of appraising causal-conditional relations of processes). Each of these, in its turn, falls into two systemic sub-sets, so that on the immediately working level of presentation we have the four subjunctive form-types identified on the basis of the strict correlation between their structure and their functions: THE PURE SPECTIVE, THE MODAL SPECTIVE, THE STIPULATIVE CONDITIONAL, THE CONSECUTIVE CONDITIONAL.

THE CATEGORY OF ASPECT

The aspective meaning of the verb, as different from its temporal meaning, reflects the inherent mode of the realization of the process.

The continuous verbal forms analysed on the principles of oppositional approach admit of only one interpretation, and that is aspective

The continuous forms are aspective because, reflecting the inherent character of the process performed by the verb, they do not, and cannot denote

the timing of the process. The opposition constituting the. The continuous verbal forms analysed on the principles of oppositional approach admit of corresponding category is effected between the continuous and non-continuous (indefinite) forms. The categorial meaning discloses the nature of development of the verbal action, on which ground the suggested name for the category as a whole will be development. As is the case with the other categories, its expression is combined with other categorial expressions in one and the same word-form, involving also the category that features the perfect. Thus, it should be identified, within the framework of the manifestations of the category of development, not only the perfect continuous forms, but also the perfect indefinite forms (i.e. non-continuous).

The perfect, as different from the continuous, does reflect a kind of timing, though in a purely relative way. It coordinates two times, locating one of them in retrospect towards the other. Should the grammatical meaning of the perfect have been exhausted by this function, it ought to have been placed into one and the same categorial system with the future, forming the integral category of time coordination (correspondingly, prospective and retrospective). But it cannot be done, because the perfect expresses not only time in relative retrospect, but also the very connection of a prior process with a time limit reflected in a subsequent way. Thus, the perfect forms of the verb display a mixed, intermediary character, which places them apart both from the relative posterior tense and the aspective development. Bloch suggested that the name for this category be RETROSPECTIVE COORDINATION (RETROSPECT). The categorial member opposed to the perfect is named IMPERFECT (NON-PERFECT).

The aspective category of development is constituted by the opposition of the continuous forms of the verb to the non-continuous. The marked element of the opposition is the continuous. It is represented by the discontinuous morpheme BE + ...ING. The category of retrospective coordination (retrospect) is

constituted by the opposition of the perfect forms of the verb to the non-perfect (imperfect). It is shown with the help of the discontinuous morpheme HAVE + ...EN.

THE GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF NON-FINITE FORMS (VERBIDS)

Verbids are the forms of the verb intermediary in many of their lexico-grammatical features between the verb and the non-processual parts of speech. The mixed features of these forms are revealed in the principal spheres of the part-of-speech characterization, i.e. in their meaning, structural marking, combinability, and syntactic functions.

Every verb-stem (except for a few defective verbs), by means of morphemic change, takes both finite and non-finite forms, the functions of the two sets being strictly differentiated. While the finite forms serve in the sentence only one syntactic function (that of the finite predicate), the non-finite forms serve various syntactic functions other than that of the finite predicate.

The strict division of functions clearly shows that the opposition between the finite and non-finite forms of the verb creates a special grammatical category. The differential feature of the opposition is constituted by the expression of the verbal time and mood: while the time-mood grammatical signification characterizes the finite verb in a way that it underlies its finite predicative function, the verbid has no immediate means of expressing time-mood categorial semantics and therefore presents the weak member of the opposition. The category expressed by this opposition is called the category of FINITUDE (Strang, Barkhudarov). In other words, we may say that the opposition of the finite verbs and the verbids is based on the expression of the functions of full-predication and semi-predication.

The English verbids include four forms distinctly differing from one another within the general verbid system:

- the Infinitive

- the Gerund
- the Present Participle
- the Past Participle

In compliance with this difference, the verbal semi-predicative complexes are distinguished by the corresponding differential properties both in form and in syntactic contextual function.

THE INFINITIVE

The infinitive is the non-finite form of the verb which combines the properties of the verb with those of the noun, serving as the verbal name of a process.

The infinitive is used in three fundamentally different types of functions:

- as a notional, self-positional syntactic part of the sentence
 - as the notional constituent of a complex verbal predicate built up around a predicator verb
 - as the notional constituent of a finite conjugation of the verb
- The first use is grammatically “free”, the second is grammatically “half-free”, the third is grammatically “bound”.

The dual verbal-nominal meaning of the infinitive is expressed in full in its free, independent use. Do you really mean to go away and leave me here alone? ~ What do you really mean? The combinability of the infinitive also reflects its dual semantic nature, in accord with which there can be distinguished its verb-type and noun-type connections.

The verb type combinability of the infinitive is displayed in its combining:

- with nouns expressing the object of the action
- with nouns expressing the subject of the action
- with modifying adverbs
- with predicator verbs of semi-functional nature forming a verbal predicate

- with auxiliary finite verbs (word-morphemes) in the analytical forms of the verb

The self-positional infinitive, in due syntactic arrangements, can perform the following functions:

- the subject
- the predicative
- the object
- the attribute
- the adverbial modifier

The infinitive is a categorially changeable form. It distinguishes three grammatical categories sharing them with a finite verb:

- the category of aspect (continuous in opposition)
- the category of retrospective coordination (perfect in opposition)
- the category of voice (passive in opposition)

Consequently, the categorial paradigm of the infinitive of the objective verb includes eight forms:

- the indefinite active (to take)
- the continuous active (to be taking)
- the perfect active (to have taken)
- the perfect continuous active (to have been taking)
- the indefinite passive (to be taken)
- the continuous passive (to be being taken)
- the perfect passive (to have been taken)
- the perfect continuous passive (to have been being taken)

The infinitive paradigm of the non-objective verb, correspondingly, includes four forms:

- the indefinite active (to go)
- the continuous active (to be going)
- the perfect active (to have gone)

- the perfect continuous active (to have been going).

THE GERUND

The gerund is the non-finite form of the verb which, like the infinitive, combines the properties of the verb with those of the noun. Similar to the infinitive, the gerund serves as the verbal name of the process, but its substantive quality is more strongly pronounced than that of the infinitive.

Namely, as different from the infinitive, and similar to the noun, the gerund can be modified by a noun in the possessive case or its pronominal equivalents (expressing the subject of the verbal process), and it can be used with prepositions. The general combinability of the gerund, like that of the infinitive, is dual, sharing some features with the verb, and some features with the noun.

The verb type combinability of the gerund is displayed in its combining:

- with nouns expressing the object of the action
- with modifying adverbs
- with certain semi-functional predicator verbs, but other than modal of the

noun type is the combinability of the gerund:

- with finite notional verbs as the object of the action
- with finite notional verbs as the prepositional adjunct of various functions
- with finite notional verbs as the subject of the action
- with nouns as the prepositional adjunct of various functions.

The gerund, in the corresponding positional patterns, performs the functions of all the types of notional sentence-parts:

- the subject
- the predicative
- the object
- the attribute
- the adverbial modifier

Like the infinitive, the gerund is categorially changeable. It distinguishes the two grammatical categories, sharing them with the finite verb and the present participle:

- the category of retrospective coordination (perfect in opposition)
- the category of voice (passive in opposition)

Consequently, the categorial paradigm of the gerund of the objective verb includes four forms:

- the simple active (taking)
- the perfect active (having taken)
- the simple passive (being taken)
- the perfect passive (having been taken)

The gerundial paradigm of the non-objective verbs, correspondingly, includes two forms:

- the simple active (going)
- the perfect active (having gone)

THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE

The present participle is the non-finite form of the verb which combines the properties of the verb with those of the adjective and adverb, serving as the qualifying-processual name. In its outer form the present participle distinguishes the same grammatical categories with gerund as retrospective coordination and voice.

The verb-type combinability of the present participle is revealed:

- in its being combined with nouns expressing the object of the action
- with nouns expressing the subject of the action
- with modifying adverbs
- with auxiliary finite verbs (word-morphemes) in the analytical form of the

verb.

The adjective-type combinability of the present participle is revealed in its association with the modified nouns as well as with some modifying adverbs such as adverbs of degree. The adverb-type combinability of the present participle is revealed in its association with the modified verbs

The self-positional present participle, in the proper syntactic arrangements, performs the functions:

- the predicative (occasional use, and not with the pure link BE)
- the attribute
- the adverbial modifier of various types.

THE PAST PARTICIPLE

The past participle is the non-finite form of the verb which combines the properties of the verb with those of the adjective, serving as the qualifying-processual name. The past participle is a single form having no paradigm of its own. By way of the paradigmatic correlation with the present participle, it conveys implicitly the categorial meaning of the perfect and the passive. As different from the present participle, it has no distinct combinability features or syntactic function features specially characteristic of the adverb. Thus, the main self-positional functions of the past participle in the sentence are those of the attribute and the predicative.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT

1. What are the main subclasses of verbs?
2. How many tense forms are there in Modern English?
3. What is the main difference between the active and the passive voices?
4. How is the category of aspect of verbs expressed?
5. How is the category of mood of verbs expressed?
6. What are the main grammatical features of the infinitive?
7. What are the main grammatical features of the gerund?

8. What are the main grammatical features of the participle?

Lecture 4.

The Adjective as a part of speech.

Outline

1. General characteristics.
2. The category of adjectival comparison.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS The adjective expresses the categorial semantics of property of a substance. It means that each adjective used in the text presupposes relation to some noun the property of whose referent it denotes, such as its material, colour, position, state and other characteristics both temporary and permanent. Adjectives, unlike nouns don't possess a full nominal value. Adjectives are distinguished by a specific combinability with nouns, which they modify, if not accompanied by adjuncts (обставинне слово), usually in pre-position, and occasionally in post-position by a combinability with link-verbs (дієслово-зв'язка), both functional and notional; by a combinability with modifying adverbs. In the sentence the adjective performs the functions of an attribute and a predicative (іменна частина складного присудка).

The more specific function of the adjective is the attribute, since the function of a predicative can be performed by a noun as well. The predicative adjective expresses some attributive property of its noun-referent, whereas the predicative noun expresses various substantival characteristics of its referent, such as its identification (classification) of different types.

E.g.: It will be silent as a grave. – I'll be like a silent grave. To the derivational features of adjectives belong a number of suffixes and prefixes of which the most

important are: -ful (hopeful), -less (flawless), -ish (bluish), -ous (famous); un- (unpleasant), in- (inaccurate).

All the adjectives are traditionally divided into 2 large subclasses: qualitative and relative..

1. Relative adjectives express such properties of a substance as are determined by the direct relation of the substance to some other substance.

E.g.: wood – wooden hut; history – a historical event; surgery – surgical treatment.

2. Qualitative adjectives denote various qualities of substances which admit (ДОЗВОЛЯТИ) of a quantitative estimation (ОЦІНКА). The measure of a quality can be estimated as high or low, adequate or inadequate, optimal or excessive, sufficient or insufficient.

E.g.: an awkward situation – a very awkward situation, a difficult task – a too difficult task, etc. In this connection, the ability of an adjective to form degrees of comparison is usually taken as a formal sign of its qualitative character, in opposition to a relative adjective and is understood as incapable of forming degrees of comparison by definition.

E.g.: a pretty girl – a prettier girl; a hearty welcome – the heartiest welcome, etc.

But there are 2 typical classes of contradiction should be pointed out here.

- Some qualitative adjectives are incapable to form degrees of comparison. Here refer adjectives like extinct, deaf, immobile, final, fixed, etc.
- Many adjectives considered under the heading of relative can form degrees of comparison.

E.g.: a mediaeval approach – rather a ..., a grammatical topic – a purely ..., the most

THE CATEGORY OF ADJECTIVAL COMPARISON expresses the quantitative characteristic of the quality of a nounal referent, thus, it gives a relative evaluation

of the quantity or quality. The purely relative nature of the categorial semantics of comparison is reflected in its name.

This category is constituted by the opposition of the three forms under the heading of degrees of comparison:

1. the basic form – positive degree, having no features of comparison;
2. the comparative degree form, having the feature of restricted superiority;
3. the superlative degree form, having the feature of unrestricted superiority.

Some linguists exclude the positive degree from the category as one having no features of comparison, and recognize comparative and superlative degrees. But sometimes the basic form can express comparative degree, but as the unmarked member, not distinguished by any comparative suffixes, while the superiority forms are the marked members, distinguished by the comparison suffixes or comp. auxiliaries.

E.g.: The remark was as bitter as could be. That was the bitterest remark I've ever heard from the man. Thus, at the upper level of presentation the superiority degrees as the marked member of the opposition are contrasted against the positive degree as its unmarked member.

The synthetical forms of comparison in “-er” and “-(e)st” coexist with the analytical forms of comparison effected by the auxiliaries “more, most”, which perform a double function: they are used with the evaluative adjectives, that consist of more 2-syllable composition and cannot normally take the synthetic forms of comparison; the analytical forms of comparison are used to express emphasis.

E.g.: The audience became more and more noisy. Some scholars consider more/most and less/least-combinations to be free syntactic constructions and semantically analogous to each other. The inherent superlative semantics is

emphasized by the definite article normally. There exist suppletive forms of degrees of comparisons: good – better – the best, bad – worse – the worst, etc.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT

1. What are the subclasses of adjectives?
2. What are the degrees of comparison of adjectives?
3. What is the subcategorization of adverbs?
4. What are the syntactic functions of adverbs?
5. What are the subclasses of pronouns?
6. What is the main function of pronouns?
7. What are the grammatical features of numerals?
8. What are the functions of small groups of words (articles, prepositions, conjunctions, particles, modal words, interjections)?

Lecture 5.

The Adverb as a part of speech.

Outline

1. General characteristics.
2. Structural types of adverbs.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

The adverb as a word denoting non-substantive property. Its formal and functional characteristics. The productive model of adverbial derivation (the suffix -ly): the problem of its lexical and grammatical status. Other structural types of adverbs. The problem of adverbs derivationally connected with words of other classes by conversion. Grammatically relevant semantic subdivision of adverbs: qualitative, quantitative and circumstantial adverbs. Their subdivision into notional and functional (pronominal) adverbs. The degrees of comparison of adverbs in their correlation with the degrees of comparison of adjectives.

The adverb is a notional part of speech denoting, like the adjective, property; the adjective, as has been outlined in the previous unit, denotes properties of a substance, and the adverb denotes non-substantive properties: in most cases the properties of actions (to walk quickly), or the properties of other properties (very quick), or the properties of the situations in which the processes occur (to walk again). In other words, the adverb can be defined as a qualifying word of the secondary qualifying order, while the adjective is a primary qualifying word.

The adverb is the least numerous and the least independent of all the notional parts of speech; it has a great number of semantically weakened words intermediary between notional and functional words; this is why its notional part of speech status was doubted for a long time: the first grammarians listed adverbs among the particles.

Adverbs are characterized by their combinability with verbs, adjectives and other adverbs, which they modify. They perform the functions of various adverbial modifiers: of time (yesterday), place (there), of manner (secretly), etc. The adverbs which refer to whole situations are defined as situation-“determinants”, e.g.: They quarreled again.

There are certain contexts in which adverbs combine with nouns and perform a peculiar function of mixed adverbial-attributive character, e.g.: the trip abroad, his return home, the then President of the US, etc. This is the result of the nominalization of syntactic constructions in which the correspondent adverb functions as a regular adverbial modifier, cf.: his return home; he returned home; the then President of the US; the person who was the president of the US then.

In accordance with their form, adverbs are divided into simple and derived. There are few simple adverbs, most of them are of a functional or semi-functional character, e.g.: more, very, there, then, here, etc. The characteristic adverbial word-building affixes are the following: simply, clockwise, backward, ahead, etc.

The most productive derivational model of adverbs is the one with the suffix ‘-ly’. It is so highly productive that practically every adjective has its adverbial counterpart, e.g.: simple - simply, soft – softly, etc.; some linguists, for example, A. I. Smirnitsky, consider them to be not adverbs but specific forms of adjectives.

The other structural types are compound adverbs, e.g.: sometimes, downstairs, etc., and stable adverbial phrases or composite phrasal adverbs, e.g.: upside down, at least, a great deal of, from time to time, etc.

STRUCTURAL TYPES OF ADVERBS

There are certain controversies among linguists about the status of phrases like from above, before now, until then, etc. They are sometimes treated as stable adverbial phrases (phrasal adverbs), but this approach can be challenged, because the members of such word combinations are not semantically blended into an indivisible idiomatic unity. More plausible is the following approach: some adverbs are freely combined with prepositions and, since combinability with prepositions is characteristic of nouns, they make a peculiar set of partially substantivized adverbs (“adverbids”), i.e. their lexico-grammatical status is intermediary between adverbs and nouns.

There is a large group of adverbs homonymous with words of other parts of speech, both notional and functional. Some adverbs are adjective-stem conversives (zero-derived adverbs), cf.: a hard work – to work hard, a flat roof – to fall flat into the water, etc. Among the adjective-stem converted adverbs there are a few words with the non-specific -ly originally inbuilt in the adjective, cf.: a kindly man – to talk kindly. Since there are no other differential features except for their positions, these words can be defined as “fluctuant conversives”.

Some of the zero-derived adverbs coexist with the ‘-ly’-derived adverbs; the two adverbs are in most cases different in meaning, cf.: to work hard – to work hardly at all. If their meanings are similar, the two adverbs differ from the point of view of functional stylistics: adverbs without ‘-ly’ are characteristic for the

American variant of the English language; additionally, there is some research showing that adverbs without ‘-ly’ are more often used by men than by women, cf.: He talks real quick - He talks really quickly.

Some adverbs of weakened pronominal semantics are connected by fluctuant (positional) conversion with functional words; for example, some adverbs are positionally interchangeable with prepositions and conjunctions, e.g.: before, since, after, besides, instead, etc. Cf.: We haven’t met since 1996. – We haven’t met since we passed our final exams. - We met in 1996, and haven’t seen each other ever since.

Adverbs should not be confused with adverb-like elements, which are interchangeable with prepositions (and sometimes prefixes) and when placed after the verb form a semantic blend with it, e.g.: to give – to give up, to give in, to give away, etc.; to go down the hill - to download, to downplay - to sit down, to bring down, to bend down, etc. These functional words make a special set of particles; they are intermediary between the word and the morpheme and can be called “postpositives”.

Traditionally, adverbs are divided on the basis of their general semantics into qualitative, quantitative, and circumstantial. The qualitative adverbs denote the inherent qualities of actions and other qualities; most of them are derived from qualitative adjectives, e.g.: bitterly, hard, beautifully, well, etc. The quantitative adverbs show quantity measure; genuine quantitative adverbs are usually derived from numerals, e.g.: twice, three times, tenfold, manifold, etc. The circumstantial adverbs denote mainly the circumstances of time and place (they can also be defined as “orientative”), e.g.: today, here, when, far, ashore, abroad, often, etc.

Taking into consideration various hybrid types of adverbs of weakened nominative force, it is important to subdivide adverbs on the basis of their semantic value into the following groups: “genuine”, or notional (nominal) adverbs

of full semantic value and semi-functional (pronominal) adverbs of partial semantic value. Quantitative adverbs belong to the group of semi-functional adverbs by their own pronominal (numerical) semantics. Qualitative adverbs include, on the one hand, genuine qualitative adverbs, e.g.: bitterly, hard, beautifully, well, etc. and on the other hand, a group of semi-functional words of degree, quality evaluators of intermediary qualitative-quantitative semantics. The latter include adverbs of high degree (intensifiers), e.g.: very, greatly, absolutely, pretty, etc.; adverbs of excessive degree, e.g.: too, awfully, tremendously, etc.; adverbs of unexpected degree, e.g.: surprisingly, astonishingly, etc.; adverbs of moderate degree, e.g.: fairly, relatively, rather, etc.; and some other groups. Circumstantial adverbs are also divided into notional and functional. Notional (genuine) circumstantial adverbs are self-dependent words denoting time and space orientation, e.g.: tomorrow, never, recently, late; homeward, ashore, outside, far, etc. The functional circumstantial adverbs, besides the quantitative (numerical) adverbs mentioned above, include pronominal adverbs of time, place, manner, cause, consequence, e.g.: here, when, where, so, thus, nevertheless, otherwise, etc. They substitute notional adverbs or other words used in the function of adverbial modifiers in a sentence, cf.: He stayed at school. – He stayed there; many of them are used as syntactic connectives and question-forming functionals, e.g.: Where is he? I do not know where he is now.

Thus, the whole class of adverbs can be divided, first, into nominal and pronominal, then the nominal adverbs can be subdivided into qualitative and orientative, the former including genuine qualitative adverbs and degree adverbs, the latter divided into temporal and local adverbs, with further possible subdivisions of each group.

Like adjectives, adverbs are also subdivided functionally into evaluative and specificative. When used in their evaluative function, adverbs (qualitative adverbs, predominantly) distinguish the category of comparison and have five

morphological forms: one positive, two comparative (direct and reverse) and two superlative (direct and reverse), e.g.: bitterly – more bitterly, less bitterly – most bitterly, least bitterly. Their superlative degree form can also be used either in the absolute sense (to denote absolute superiority) or in the elative sense, denoting a high degree of the property, e.g.: The youngest kid cried most bitterly of all. – The kid cried most bitterly. When used in the specificative function, adverbs are unchangeable, e.g.: We meet today; We came ashore.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT

1. What are the subclasses of adjectives?
2. What are the degrees of comparison of adjectives?
3. What is the subcategorization of adverbs?
4. What are the syntactic functions of adverbs?
5. What are the subclasses of pronouns?
6. What is the main function of pronouns?
7. What are the grammatical features of numerals?
8. What are the functions of small groups of words (articles, prepositions, conjunctions, particles, modal words, interjections)?

Lecture 6.

Syntax of the Phrase

Outline

1. The phrase as a polynominative lingual unit.
2. Syntagmatic connections of word.

THE PHRASE AS A POLYNOMINATIVE LINGUAL UNIT

The main object of study in syntax is the communicative unit of the language, the sentence. The phrase is the syntactic unit used as a notional part of a sentence. As a level-forming unit, it is characterized by some common and some differential features with the unit of the lower level, the word, and the unit of the upper level, the sentence. Like the word, the phrase is a nominative unit, but it provides a complex nomination of the referent, a polynomination consisting of several (at least two) nominative components, presenting the referent as a complicated phenomenon, cf.: a girl – a beautiful girl; a decision – his unexpected decision; etc. Moreover, the regular free phrase does not enter speech as a ready-made unit like the word; it is freely formed in speech, like the sentence according to a certain grammatical pattern. As for the fixed word-combinations, idioms, they are closer to the word in the type of nomination: they are ready-made units fixed in dictionaries and studied mainly by lexicology.

The basic difference between the phrase and the sentence is as follows: the phrase cannot express full predication, even if it denotes a situation; this becomes obvious in their mutual transformations, for example, in the so-called phrasalization, or nominalization of the sentence, cf.: They considered the problem. – their consideration of the problem; for them to consider the problem; their considering of the problem. Thus, the phrase enters speech only as a constituent of a sentence, as “a denoteme” (see Unit 1), to be more exact, as “a polydenoteme” as contrasted with the word, which enters a sentence as “a monodenoteme”. The grammatical description of the phrase is seen as a separate part of syntax, the syntax of the phrase; it is sometimes called “minor syntax”, in distinction to “major syntax”, studying the sentence and its textual connections.

The definition of the phrase is rather a controversial issue. In linguistics, the narrow approach, traditionally prevails: only a combination of two notional words, one of which dominates the other, is considered a word-combination. A much broader approach was proposed by Leonard Bloomfield and it is shared by many

modern linguists. One of the leading specialists in this field, defines a word-combination as any syntactically organized group of syntagmatically connected words; this includes combinations of functional and notional words, and predicative and coordinative combinations of words. Critical revision of these two approaches is possible on the basis of the above given description of the phrase (the phraseme) as a separate lingual unit.

Defining the phrase as a polynominative lingual unit helps reveal the status of notional phrases, semantically independent ("autosemantic") combinations of notional words, as the basic type of phrasemes. Besides notional phrases (phrases proper), two other structural types of syntagmatic groupings of words can be distinguished, which can be defined as phrases or word-combinations only in form: formative phrases and functional phrases. The formative phrase is a combination of a notional word with a functional word, which is contextually dependent ("synsemantic") and functionally similar to separate notional words used in various grammatical forms, e.g.: of Peter (= Peter's); in a moment, without doubt, etc. Functional phrases are combinations of functional words similar to regular functional words, e.g.: apart from, as soon as, with reference to, must be able, etc.

Notional phrases are subdivided into different types, which reveal various grammatical and semantic properties of the phrase constituents and the phrase in general.

On the basis of constituent rank, the groupings of notional words are subdivided into dominational (hypotactic) and equipotent (paratactic). The constituents of equipotent phrases are of equal syntactic rank; none of them modifies another, e.g.: poor but honest; mad, bad and dangerous; his, not Mary's; etc. As these examples show, the syntactic connections in equipotent phrases can be realized with the help of a coordinative conjunction or without any connecting element involved; the former are called "syndetic" connections, the latter

“asyndetic” connections. In the above examples, the phrase constituents form logically consecutive connections, which are defined as “coordinative”. Entering the structure of the sentence, constituents of coordinative phrases function as homogeneous notional parts of the sentence, e.g.: He is mad, bad and dangerous (mad, bad and dangerous are homogeneous predicates). Besides coordinative phrases, there are phrases in which the sequential element, although connected with the foregoing element by a coordinative conjunction, is unequal to it in the character of nomination, e.g.: came, but late; agreed, or nearly so; etc. Such formally equipotent phrases of a non-consecutive type are defined as “cumulative”. Cumulative connection in writing is usually signaled by some intermediary punctuation mark, such as a comma or a hyphen. The term “cumulation” is commonly used to denote connections between separate sentences; so, cumulative connections between words can be defined as “inner cumulation” in distinction to the “outer cumulation” of sentences.

In dominational phrases, one word modifies another. The principal constituent, which dominates the other constituent syntactically, is called the kernel, the key-word, or the head word; the subordinate (dominated) constituent, which modifies the kernel, is called the adjunct, the adjunct-word, or the expansion. For example, in the word-combination a beautiful girl the word ‘a girl’ is the kernel, and ‘beautiful’ is the adjunct. Dominational connection, like equipotent connection, can be both consecutive and cumulative, cf.: definitely off the point (consecutive domination) – off the point, definitely (cumulative domination). Logically consecutive dominational connections are defined as “subordinative”.

SYNTAGMATIC CONNECTIONS OF WORDS

Dominational connection is achieved by different forms of the word (categorical agreement, government), connective words (prepositions, i.e. prepositional government), or word order (adjoining, enclosure). Agreement takes

place when the subordinate word assumes a form similar to the form of the kernel, e.g.: this boy, these boys; the child plays, the children play; in English, words agree only in number in some grammatical contexts. Government takes place when a certain form of adjunct is required by its head-word, but it does not coincide with the form of the head word, e.g.: to see him; to talk to him. Adjoining involves no special formal mark of dependence between constituents; words are combined by sheer contact, e.g.: to go home. Enclosure takes place in phrases in which the subordinate word is placed between two parts of an analytical head-word form, e.g.: to thoroughly think over, the then government, an interesting question, etc. Domination achieved by the form of the word, through agreement or government, is important for inflectional languages; in English, it is the remnant of the old inflectional system as in the cases shown above. Phrases in which the connections are expressed by prepositions only or word-order are predominant in English.

The two basic types of dominational connections are bilateral (reciprocal, two-way) domination and monolateral (one-way) domination. The connections in most of the examples above are monolateral dominational; the kernel dominates the adjunct: this boy, to talk to him, a beautiful girl, etc. Bilateral domination is realized in predicative connections of words, which may be either fully predicative, or semi-predicative, e.g.: the pupil understands, the pupil's understanding, the pupil understanding, for the pupil to understand. In predicative groupings of words the subject dominates the predicate, determining the person of predication; formally, domination is manifested by the reflection of the person and number properties of the subject in the form of the verb performing the function of a predicate. The predicate dominates the subject, determining the event of predication, some action, state, or quality; in the transformation of nominalization the transform of the predicate occupies the

position of the head-word, while the subject becomes its adjunct, cf.: he decided - his decision.

Some linguists challenge the idea of “a predicative word-combination”, arguing that predication can be expressed only by the sentence. Still, there is no arguing with the fact, that the groupings of words which constitute the predicative line in the sentence, predicative sintagmas, are to be distinguished as a specific type, because bilateral domination is a specific type of syntagmatic connections of words; to avoid disagreements, L. Hjelmslev suggests the term “interdependence” to denote the connections between the constituents of bilateral dominational phrases.

Thus, there are four basic types of syntagmatic connections of words distinguished in their syntactic groupings: coordination (consecutive equipotent connection), subordination (consecutive dominational connection), predication, or interdependence (bilateral dominational connection) and cumulation (inner cumulation).

Besides the classification of word groupings on the basis of the major syntagmatic connections outlined above, there are further subdivisions and generalizations, and other approaches possible in the description of the phrase. The traditional classification of phrases is based on the part-of-speech characteristics of their constituents (on the part of speech of the kernel in dominational phrases); there are noun phrases (NP), e.g.: a beautiful girl; men, women and children; verbal phrases (VP), e.g.: went home; came and went; adjective phrases (AP), e.g.: quite unexpected; nice and quiet; adverbial phrases (DP), e.g.: quite unexpectedly. On the base of kernel-adjunct relations, subordinative phrases can be divided into those with objective connections (direct objective and indirect objective) and qualifying connections (attributive and adverbial), e.g.: to see a child (direct objective); put on the table (indirect objective); a beautiful girl (attributive); came soon (adverbial). On the base of the

position of the adjunct in relation to the kernel, subordinative phrases are characterized as regressive or progressive: in regressive phrases, the adjunct precedes the kernel, e.g.: a beautiful girl; in progressive phrases, the adjunct follows the kernel, e.g.: came home.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT

1. What are the main distinctive features of the word-group?
2. What are the main distinctive features of the sentence?
3. Is the sentence a unit of language or a unit of speech?
4. What are the peculiarities of the sentence as distinct from the word?
5. What are the subgroups of sentences according to the aim of the utterance?
6. What is a rhetorical question?
7. What is the theme and what is the rheme according to the actual division of the sentence?
8. What are the main semantic roles of the sentence constituents?

Lecture 7.

Sentence as the main object of Syntax.

Outline

1. Some grammatical properties of the sentence.
2. Communicative types of sentences.

SOME GRAMMATICAL PROPERTIES OF THE SENTENCE

Sentence is the immediate integral unit of speech built up of words according to a definite syntactic pattern and distinguished by a contextually relevant communicative purpose. Therefore the sentence is the main object of syntax as part of the grammatical theory.

The sentence, being composed of words, may in certain cases include only one word of various lexico-grammatical standings.

E.g.: Night. Congratulations. Away! Why?!

The actual existence of one-word sentences, however doesn't contradict the general idea of the sentence as a special syntactic combination of words. While the word is a component element of the word-stock and as such is a nominative unit of language, the sentence is a predicative utterance unit, linguistically.

It means the sentence not only names some referents with the help of its word-constituents, but also, presents these referents as making up a certain situation, a situational event; and reflects the connection between the nominal denotation of the event and objective reality, showing the time of the event, its being real or unreal, necessary or unnecessary, etc.

E.g.: I'm satisfied, the experiment has succeeded. – I would have been satisfied if the experiment had succeeded. – The experiment seems to have succeeded – why then I'm not satisfied?

The sentence is characterized by its specific category of predication, which establishes the relation of the named phenomena to actual life. Predication is the connection between the subject and predicate.

The centre of predication in a sentence of verbal type (which is the predominant type of sentence structure in English) is a finite verb, that expresses essential predicative meaning by its categorial forms (tense, mood). Besides the purely verbal categories, in the predicative semantics are included such syntactic sentence meanings as purposes of communication (declaration – interrogation – inducement), modal probability, affirmation and negation and others.

The sentence is intonationally delimited. Intonation separates one sentence from another. The role of intonation is especially important for sentences, which have more than one predicative centres.

E.g.: The class was over. The noisy children filled the corridors. The general semantic category of modality is also defined by linguists as exposing the connection between the named objects and surrounding reality. But modality is not specifically confined (замкнутый, заключенный) to the sentence; this is a broader category. Thus, every word expressing a definite correlation between the named substance and objective reality should be recognized as modal with the meanings of “probability”, “desirability”, “necessity”. Here belong semi-notional words and phrases of probability and evaluation, such as perhaps, maybe, by all means, etc.; particles – just, even, would-be, etc.

Predication reflects only syntactic modality. Different sentences may express questions or statements. If it is a question the speaker expects to hear an answer. However, if it is a statement, the aim of the speaker is just to express some thoughts. The sentence has a question pattern if it is a question. The question is addressed to a listener. Generally, long sentences have some kind of punctuation. According to the purpose of communication we speak about the following types of sentence; all of them show marked peculiarities in their structure.

1. Declarative sentences expressing a statement;
2. Imperative sentences expressing inducement;
3. Interrogative sentences expressing a question.
4. Some linguists include one more type – exclamatory sentences expressing people’s emotions.

COMMUNICATIVE TYPES OF SENTENCES.

Sentence is the immediate integral unit of speech built up of words according to a definite syntactic pattern and distinguished by a contextually relevant communicative purpose. Therefore the sentence is the main object of syntax as part of the grammatical theory. The sentence is a communicative unit, therefore the primary classification of sentences must be based on the

communicative principle. The principle is formulated in traditional grammar as the “purpose of communication”.

Different sentences may express questions or statements. If it is a question the speaker expects to hear an answer. However, if it is a statement, the aim of the speaker is just to express some thoughts. The sentence has a question pattern if it is a question. The question is addressed to a listener. Generally, long sentences have some kind of punctuation. In accord with the purpose of communication three cardinal sentence-types have long been recognized in linguistic tradition: the declarative sentence; the imperative (inductive) sentence; the interrogative sentence.

These communicative sentence-types stand in strict opposition to one another. The declarative sentence expresses a statement, either affirmative or negative.

E.g.: “We live very quietly here, indeed we do; my niece here will tell you the same.” – “Oh, come, I’m not such a fool as that,” answered the squire (D. du Maurier) The imperative sentence expresses inducement, either affirmative or negative. That is, it urges the listener, in the form of request or command, to perform or not perform a certain action. The imperative sentence is situationally connected with the corresponding “action response”.

E.g.: Let’s go and sit down there! “Send him back!” – “Nonsense, old chap.”

The interrogative sentence expresses a question, i.e. a request for information wanted by the speaker from the listener. It is naturally connected with an answer, forming together with it a question-answer dialogue unity.

E.g.: “What do you suggest I should do, then?” said Mary helplessly. “If I were you I should be waiting to the last moment.

Alongside the three cardinal communicative sentence-types, another type of sentences is recognized in the theory of syntax, namely, the so-called exclamatory sentence. It doesn’t possess any complete set of qualities that could

place them on one and the same level with the three cardinal communicative types of sentences.

In other words, each of the cardinal communicative types of sentences can be represented in the two variants, exclamatory and nonexclamatory.

E.g.: What a very small cabin it was! – It was a very small cabin. Why, if it isn't my lady! – It is my lady.

Here we can easily identify exclamatory sentences-statements with their nonexclamatory declarative prototypes. Similarly, exclamatory questions are related in the syntactic system to the corresponding interrogative sentences.

E.g.: Whatever do you mean, Mr. Smith? – What do you mean?

Imperative sentences, naturally, are characterized by a higher degree of emotive intensity than the other two cardinal sentence-types.

E.g.: Peter, will you please try to speak loudly! – Try to speak loudly.

All the three pairs of variant communicative types of sentences (non-exclamatory – exclamatory for each cardinal division) make up distinct semantico-syntactic oppositions effected by regular grammatical means of language, such as intonation, word order and special constructions with functional-auxiliary lexemic elements. Point of view sentences are divided into:

1. Declarative including emotional words;
2. Interrogative including emotional words;
3. Imperative including emotional words;
4. Purely exclamatory sentences. ("Great Heavens!", "Good Lord!", etc.)

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT

1. What are the subgroups of sentences according to their grammatical structure?
2. What are the principal parts of the sentence?
3. What are the secondary parts of the sentence?

4. What are the independent elements of the sentence?
5. What is the division of composite sentences?
6. What is the main peculiarity of compound sentences?
7. What is the structure of complex sentences?
8. What are the main means of connecting clauses of composite sentences?

Lecture 8.

Complex and compound sentences.

Outline

1. The principles of subordination.
2. Subject, predicative, object clauses.
3. "Descriptive" attributive and "restrictive" attributive clauses.
4. Four groups of adverbial clauses.
5. The characteristics of compound sentences.
6. "Leading" and "sequential" clauses of compound sentences.

THE PRINCIPLES OF SUBORDINATION.

The complex sentence is a polypredicative construction built up on the principle of subordination. It is derived from two or more base sentences one of which performs the role of a matrix in relation to the others, the insert sentences. The complex sentence of minimal composition includes two clauses - a principal one and a subordinate one.

The subordinate clause is joined to the principal clause either by a subordinating connector (subordinate), or, with some types of clauses, asyndetically.

Moyra left the room. > (I do remember quite well) that Moyra left the room.
> (He went on with his story) after Moyra left the room. > (Fred remained in his place) though Moyra left the room. > (The party was spoilt) because Moyra left the room. > (It was a surprise to us all) that Moyra left the room...

The minimal, two-clause complex sentence is the main volume type of complex sentences. It is the most important type, first, in terms of frequency; second, in terms of its paradigmatic status.

SUBJECT, PREDICATIVE, OBJECT CLAUSES.

Clauses of primary nominal positions

- subject, predicative, object
- are interchangeable with one another in easy reshufflings of sentence constituents.

Cf.: What you saw at the exhibition is just what I want to know. > What I want to know is just what you saw at the exhibition. > I just want to know what you saw at the exhibition.

The subject clause, in accordance with its functional position, regularly expresses the theme at the upper level of the actual division of the complex sentence.

The thematic property of the clause is well exposed in its characteristic uses with passive constructions, as well as constructions in which the voice opposition is neutralized.

E.g.: Why he rejected the offer has never been accounted for. What small reputation the town does possess derives from two things.

The predicative clause, in conformity with the predicative position as such, performs the function of the nominal part of the predicate, i.e. the part adjoining the link-verb. The linkverb is mostly expressed by the pure link be, not infrequently we find here also the specifying links seem and look; the use of other specifying links is occasional.

E.g.: The trouble is that I don't know Fanny personally. The question is why the decision on the suggested innovation is still delayed. The difficulty seems how we shall get in touch with the chief before the conference. After all those years of

travelling abroad, John has become what you would call a man of will and experience.

The predicative clause introduced by the conjunctions *as* //, *as though* has an adverbial force, which is easily shown by contrast: She looks as though she has never met him. > She behaves as though she has never met him. The predicative clause in a minimal complex sentence regularly expresses its rheme. Therefore there is an essential informative difference between the two functional uses of a categorially similar nominal clause: that of the predicative and that of the subject.

Cf.: The impression is that he is quite competent. That he is quite competent is the impression.

The second sentence (of an occasional status, with a sentences-stress on the link-verb), as different from the first, suggests an implication of a situational antithesis: the impression may be called in question, or it may be contrasted against another trait of the person not so agreeable as the one mentioned, etc.

The third type of clauses considered under the heading of clauses of primary nominal positions are object clauses. The object clause denotes an object-situation of the process expressed by the verbal constituent of the principal clause.

The object position is a strong substantive position in the sentence. In terms of clausal relations it means that the substantivizing force of the genuine object-clause derivation is a strongly pronounced nominal clause-type derivation. This is revealed, in particular, by the fact that object clauses can be introduced not only non-preposition-ally, but also, if not so freely, prepositionally.

Cf.: They will accept with grace whatever he may offer. She stared at what seemed a faded photo of Uncle Jo taken half a century before. I am simply puzzled by what you are telling me about the Carfairs.

The semantic content of the object clause discriminates three types of backgrounds: first, an immediately substantive background; second, an adverbial

background; third, an uncharacterized background of general event. This differentiation depends on the functional status of the clause-connector, that is on the sentence-part role it performs in the clause.

Cf.: We couldn't decide whom we should address. The friends couldn't decide where they should spend their vacation.

The object clause in (he first of the cited sentences is of a substantive background (We should address - whom), whereas the object clause in the second sentence is of adverbial-local background (They should spend their vacation - where).

The first object clause in the above two sentences is of substantive background, while the second one is of an adverbial-causal background. Object clauses of general event background are introduced by conjunctions: Now he could prove that the many years he had spent away from home had not been in vain..

The considered background features of subordinate clauses, certainly, refer to their inner status and therefore concern all the nominal clauses, not only object ones. But with object clauses they are of especial contrastive prominence, which is due to immediate dependence of the object clause on the valency of the introducing (subordinating) verb.

An extremely important set of clause-types usually included into the vast system of object clauses is formed by clauses presenting chunks of speech and mental-activity processes. These clauses are introduced by the verbs of speech and mental activity (Lat. "verba sentiendi et dedarandi"), whose contextual content they actually expose.

Cf.: Who says the yacht hasn't been properly prepared for the voyage! She wondered why on earth she was worrying so much, when obviously the time had come to end the incident and put it out of mind.

“DESCRIPTIVE” ATTRIBUTIVE AND “RESTRICTIVE” ATTRIBUTIVE CLAUSES

Subordinate clauses of secondary nominal positions include attributive clauses of various syntactic functions. They fall into two major classes: "descriptive" attributive clauses and "restrictive" ("limiting") attributive clauses. The descriptive attributive clause exposes some characteristic of the antecedent (i.e., its substantive referent) as such, while the restrictive attributive clause performs a purely identifying role, singling out the referent of the antecedent in the given situation.

Descriptive clauses, in their turn, distinguish two major subtypes: first, "ordinary" descriptive clauses; second, "continuative" descriptive clauses. The ordinary descriptive attributive clause expresses various situational qualifications of noun antecedents. The qualifications may present a constant situational feature or a temporary situational feature of different contextual relations and implications.

Cf.: It gave me a strange sensation to see a lit up window in a big house that was not lived in. He wore a blue shirt the collar of which .was open at the throat They were playing such a game as could only puzzle us.

The continuative attributive clause presents a situation on an «equal domination basis with its principal clause, and so is attributive only in form, but not in meaning. It expresses a new predicative event (connected with the antecedent) which somehow continues the chain of situations reflected by the sentence as a whole.

Cf.: In turn, the girls came singly before Brett, who frowned, blinked, bit his pencil, and scratched his head with it, getting no help from me audience, who applauded each girl impartially and hooted at every swim suit, as if they could not see hundreds any day round the swimming pool (M. Dickens).

FOUR GROUPS OF ADVERBIAL CLAUSES.

The whole system of adverbial clauses is to be divided into four groups.

The first group includes clauses of time and clauses of place. Their common semantic basis is to be defined as "localization" - respectively, temporal and spatial. Both types of clauses are subject to two major subdivisions, one concerning the local identification, the other concerning the range of functions.

The second group of adverbial clauses includes clauses of manner and comparison. The common semantic basis of their functions can be defined as "qualification", since they give a qualification to the action or event rendered by the principal clause. The identification of these clauses can be achieved by applying the traditional question-transformation test of the how-type, with the corresponding variations of specifying character.

Cf.: He spent the Saturday night as was his wont. > How did he spend the Saturday night? You talk to people as if they were a group. > How do you talk to people? I planned to give my mother a length of silk for a dress, as thick and heavy as it was possible to buy. > How thick and heavy the length of silk was intended to be?

All the adverbial qualification clauses are to be divided into "factual" and "speculative", depending on the real or unreal prepositional event described by them.

The third and most numerous group of adverbial clauses includes "classical" clauses of different circumstantial semantics, i.e. semantics connected with the meaning of the principal clause by various circumstantial associations; here belong clauses of attendant event, condition, cause, reason, result (consequence), concession, purpose.

Thus, the common semantic basis of all these clauses can be defined as "circumstance". The whole group should be divided into two subgroups, the first being composed by clauses of "attendant circumstance"; the second, by clauses of "Immediate circumstance".

The fourth group of adverbial clauses is formed by parenthetical or insertive constructions. Parenthetical clauses, as has been stated elsewhere, are joined to the principal clause on a looser basis than the other adverbial clauses; still, they do form with the principal clause a syntactic sentential unity, which is easily proved by the procedure of diagnostic elimination.

Cf.: Jack has called here twice this morning, if I am not mistaken. > Jack has called here twice this morning.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPOUND SENTENCES. The compound sentence is a composite sentence built on the principle of coordination. Coordination, the same as subordination, can be expressed either syndetically or asyndetically. The main semantic relations between the clauses connected coordinatively are copulative, adversative, disjunctive, causal, consequential, resultative.

Similar semantic types of relations are to be found between independent, separate sentences forming a continual text. Some subordinate clauses of a complex sentence can also be separated in the text, thus being changed into specific independent sentences.

Cf.: Suddenly Laura paused as if she was arrested by something invisible from here. > Suddenly Laura paused. As if she was arrested by something invisible from here.

“LEADING” AND “SEQUENTIAL” CLAUSES OF COMPOUND SENTENCES

The compound sentence is derived from two or more base sentences which, are connected on the principle of coordination either synthetically or asyndetically. The base sentences joined into one compound sentence lose their independent status and become coordinate clauses - parts of a composite unity.

The first clause is "leading" (the "leader" clause), the successive clauses are "sequential". The coordinating connectors, or coordinators, are divided into conjunctions proper and semi-functional clausal connectors of adverbial character.

The main coordinating conjunctions, both simple and discontinuous, are: and, but, or, nor, neither, for, either ... or, neither ... nor, etc.

The main adverbial coordinators are: then, yet, so, thus, consequently, nevertheless, however, etc. The adverbial coordinators, unlike pure conjunctions, as a rule can shift their position in the sentence (the exceptions are the connectors yet and so).

Cf.: Mrs. Dyre stepped into the room, however the host took no notice of it.
> Mrs. Dyre stepped into the room, the host, however, took no notice of it.

QUESTIONS FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT

1. What are the subgroups of sentences according to their grammatical structure?
2. What are the principal parts of the sentence?
3. What are the secondary parts of the sentence?
4. What are the independent elements of the sentence?
5. What is the division of composite sentences?
6. What is the main peculiarity of compound sentences?
7. What is the structure of complex sentences?
8. What are the main means of connecting clauses of composite sentences?

РЕКОМЕНДОВАНА ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Алексєєва І. О. Курс теоретичної граматики сучасної англійської мови / І. О. Алексєєва. – Вінниця: Нова книга, 2007

2. Варга Наталія Іванівна. Теоретична граматика англійської мови (для студентів 4 курсу галузі знань 03 Гуманітарні науки спеціальності 035 Філологія предметної спеціальності 035.071 Філологія. Угро-фінські мови та літератури (переклад включно), перша – угорська освітньо-професійної програми «Угорська мова та література. Англійська мова. Переклад»). Методична розробка / Уклад. Н. Варга. – Ужгород. ДВНЗ «УжНУ», 2024

3. Воронцова Н. Г. Теоретична граматика англійської мови: навчальний посібник / Н. Г. Воронцова. – Кременець: ВЦ КОГПІ імені Тараса Шевченка, 2014.

4. Ковальчук Л. В. Практикум з теоретичної граматики англійської мови: навчально-методична розробка. – Луцьк: Вежа-Друк, 2020

6. Ніконова В.Г. Курс теоретичної граматики сучасної англійської мови: навчальний посібник / В.Г. Ніконова. – Вінниця: Нова книга, 2018

7. ТЕОРЕТИЧНА ГРАМАТИКА АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ: АНАЛІЗ ПРОСТОГО РЕЧЕННЯ: навч. посібник для здобувачів вищої освіти першого (бакалаврського) рівня за освітньою програмою 035 Філологія, спеціалізація 035.041 Германські мови та літератури (переклад включно), перша англійська / укладач д.філол.наук, проф. Т. І. Домброван/. Одеса, 2021

8. Ткач М. В. Методичні рекомендації з теоретичного курсу іноземної мови (граматика) для студентів філологічного факультету / М. В. Ткач, В. Ю. Котлярова. – Мелітополь, 2019

9. Cavallaro Joanne Everyday Linguistics: An Introduction to the Study of Language. – Routledge, 2023
file:///C:/Users/Админ/Downloads/Telegram%20Desktop/Everyday_Linguistics_An_Introduction_to_the_Study_of_La

