ДОНСКОЙ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННЫЙ ТЕХНИЧЕСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ

УПРАВЛЕНИЕ ДИСТАНЦИОННОГО ОБУЧЕНИЯ И ПОВЫШЕНИЯ КВАЛИФИКАЦИИ

Кафедра «Лингвистики и иностранные языки»

КУРС ЛЕКЦИЙ

по предмету

«Основы теории: теоретическая грамматика английского языка»

(согласно теории проф. М.Я.Блоха)

Авторы
Косоножкина Л.В.,
Кашурина И.А.

Ростов-на-Дону, 2015

Аннотация

В работе изложены основные положения теоретической грамматики, разработанные проф. М.Я.Блохом и необходимые для теоретической подготовки будущих лингвистов-переводчиков. В курсе лекций по теоретической грамматике английского языка содержатся важнейшие сведения о морфологии и синтаксисе.

Работа представляет собой курс лекций с теоретическим материалом, иллюстрированный примерами с комментариями. Она состоит из 16 лекций и библиографического списка.

Цель курса лекций – ознакомить студентов с основными проблемами теоретической грамматики английского языка, помочь им сориентироваться в теоретических сведениях по данному предмету, а также самостоятельно подготовиться к семинарским занятиям по предмету.

Курс лекций снабжен списком литературы, рекомендуемой для успешного освоения данного курса.

Курс лекций предназначен для студентов специальности 031100 «Лингвистика», а также для широкого круга лиц, интересующихся проблемами теоретической грамматики английского языка.

Авторы

К.ф.н., доцент Косоножкина Людмила Валентиновна
К.с.н., доцент Кашурина Ирина Александровна

Оглавление

LECTURE 1. GRAMMAR IN THE SYSTEMIC CONCEPTION OF LANGUAGE. MORPHEMIC STRUCTURE OF THE WORD

Language is a means of forming and storing ideas as reflections of reality and exchanging them in the process of human intercourse.

Language incorporates the **three** constituent parts ("sides"), each being inherent in it by virtue of its social nature. These parts are the phonological system, the lexical system, the grammatical system. Only the unity of these three elements forms a language;

The **phonological system** is the subfoundation of language; it determines the material (phonetical) appearance of its significative units. The **lexical system** is the whole set of naming means of language, that is, words and stable word-groups. The **grammatical system** is the whole set of regularities determining the combination of naming means in the formation of utterances as the embodiment of thinking process.

The phonological description of language is effected by the science of phonology; the lexical description of language is effected by the science of lexicology; the grammatical description of language is effected by the science of grammar.

The **aim of theoretical grammar** of a language is to present a theoretical description of its grammatical system, i.e. to scientifically analyse and define its grammatical categories and study the mechanisms of grammatical formation of utterances out of words in the process of speech making.

In earlier periods of the development of linguistic knowledge, grammatical scholars believed that the only purpose of grammar was to give strict rules of writing and speaking correctly.

Worthy of note are the following two artificial utterances suggested as far back as 1956:

Colourless green ideas sleep furiously. Furiously sleep ideas green colourless.

According to the idea of their creator, the American scholar N. Chomsky, the first of the utterances, although nonsensical logically, was to be classed as grammatically correct, while the second one, consisting of the same words placed in the reverse order, had to be analysed as a disconnected, "ungrammatical" enumeration, a "non-sentence". Thus, the examples, by way of contrast, were intensely demonstrative (so believed the scholar) of the fact that grammar as a whole amounted to a set of non-semantic rules of sentence formation.

However, a couple of years later this assessment of the lingual value of the given utterances was disputed in an experimental investigation with informants — natural speakers of English, who could not come to a unanimous conclusion about the correctness or incorrectness of both of them. In particular, some of the informants classed the second utterance as "sounding like poetry".

The true grammatical rules or regularities cannot be separated from the expression of meanings; on the contrary, they are themselves meaningful. Namely, they are connected with the most general and abstract parts of content inherent in the elements of language. These parts of content, together with the formal means through which they are expressed, are treated by grammarians in terms of "grammatical categories". One thing and one thing only *could she do* for him (R. Kipling). (Inversion in this case is used to express emotional intensification of the central idea.)

Examples of this kinds will be found in plenty in Modern English literary texts of good style repute.

The nature of grammar as a constituent part of language is better understood in the light of the two planes of language: **the plane of content and the plane of expression**.

The plane of content comprises the purely semantic elements contained in language, while **the plane of expression** comprises the material (formal) units of language taken by themselves, apart from the meanings rendered by them. The two planes are inseparably connected.

The correspondence between the planes of content and expression is very complex. This complexity is illustrated by the phenomena of **polysemy, homonymy, and synonymy.**

In cases of **polysemy and homonymy**, two or more units of the plane of content correspond to one unit of the plane of expression. For instance:

1- the verbal form of the present indefinite (one unit in the plane of expression) polysemantically renders the grammatical meanings of habitual action, action at the present moment, action taken as a general truth (several units in the plane of content).

2- The morphemic material element *-s/-es* (in pronunciation [-s, -z, -iz]), i.e. one unit in the plane of expression (in so far as the functional semantics of the elements is common to all of them indiscriminately), homonymically renders the grammatical meanings of the third person singular of the verbal present tense, the plural of the noun, the possessive form of the noun, i.e. several units of the plane of content.

In cases of **synonymy** two or more units of the plane of expression correspond to one unit of the plane of content. For instance, the forms of the verbal future indefinite, future continuous, and present continuous (several units in the plane of expression) can in certain contexts synonymically render the meaning of a future action (one unit in the plane of content).

So the **purpose of grammar** is **to disclose and formulate the regularities of the correspondence between the plane of content and the plane of expression** in the formation of utterances .

Modern linguistics lays a special stress on the systemic character of language and all its constituent parts. It accentuates the idea that language is a system of signs (meaningful units) which are closely interconnected and interdependent.

Each system is a structured set of elements related to one another by a common function. The common function of all the lingual signs is to give expression to human thoughts.

But the scientifically principles of systemic approach to language and its grammar were developed in the works by the Russian scholar **Beaudoin de Courtenay and the Swiss scholar Ferdinand de Saussure.** These two great men demonstrated the difference between lingual **synchrony** (coexistence of lingual elements) and **diachrony** (different time-periods in the development of lingual elements, as well as language as a whole) and defined language as a synchronic system of meaningful elements at any stage of its historical evolution.

Language is a system of means of expression, while **speech** should be understood as the manifestation of the system of language in the process of intercourse.

The system of language includes, on the one hand, the body of material units — sounds, morphemes, words, word-groups; on the other hand, the regularities or "rules" of the use of these units. Speech comprises both the act of producing utterances, and the utterances themselves, i.e. the text. Language and speech are inseparable, they form together an organic unity. As for grammar (the grammatical system), being an integral part of the lingual macrosystem it dynamically connects language with speech, because it categorially determines the lingual process of utterance production.

The sign (meaningful unit) in the system of language has only a potential meaning. **In speech, the potential meaning of the lingual sign is "actualised".**

Lingual units stand to one another in two fundamental types

of relations: ***syntagmatic*** **and** ***paradigmatic.***

1/.Syntagmatic relations are **linear relations between units in a segmental sequence (string).** *E.g.:* The spaceship was launched without the help of a booster rocket.

In this sentence syntagmatically connected are the words and word-groups "the spaceship", "was launched", "the spaceship was launched", "was launched without the help", "the help of a rocket", "a booster rocket".

Morphemes within the words are also connected syntagmatically. *E.g.:* space/ship; launch/ed; with/out; boost/er.

Phonemes are connected syntagmatically within morphemes and words, as well as at various juncture points *(cf.* the processes of assimilation and dissimilation).

The combination of two words or word-groups one of which is modified by the other forms a unit which is referred to as a syntactic "syntagma". There are **four main types of notional syntagmas:**

- *predicative* (the combination of subject and a predicate), -*objective* (the combination of a verb and its object), -*attributive* (the combination of a noun and its attribute), -*adverbial* (the combination of a modified notional word, such as a verb, adjective, or adverb, with its adverbial modifier).

Since **syntagmatic relations** are observed in utterances, they are described by the Latin formula as relations "in **praesentia" ("in the presence").**

2/.The other type of relations, opposed to syntagmatic and called ***"paradigmatic",*** **are such as exist between elements of the system outside the strings where they co-occur.** These intra-systemic relations and dependencies find their expression in the fact that each lingual unit is included in a set or series of connections based on different formal and functional properties."

Unlike syntagmatic relations, **paradigmatic relations** cannot be directly observed in utterances, that is why they are referred to as relations "**in absentia"" ("in the absence").**

Paradigmatic relations coexist with syntagmatic relations in such a way that some sort of syntagmatic connection is necessary for the realisation of any paradigmatic series. This is especially evident -in **a classical grammatical paradigm which presents a productive series of forms each consisting of a syntagmatic connection of two elements:** one common for the whole of the series (stem), the other specific for every individual form in the series (grammatical feature — inflexion, suffix, auxiliary word). **Grammatical paradigms** express various grammatical categories.

The minimal paradigm consists of two form-stages. This kind of paradigm we see, for instance, in the expression of the category of number: *boy — boys.* A more complex paradigm can be divided into component paradigmatic series, i.e. into the corresponding sub-paradigms *(cf.* numerous paradigmatic series constituting the system of the finite verb). **With paradigms**, the same as with any other systemically organised material, **macro- and micro-series** are to be discriminated.

Units of language are divided into ***segmental*** **and** ***supra-segmental.*** Segmental units consist of phonemes, they form phonemic strings of various status (syllables, morphemes, words, etc.). Supra-segmental units do not exist by themselves, but are realised together with segmental units and express different modificational meanings (functions) which are reflected on the strings of segmental units. **To the supra-segmental units belong intonations (intonation contours), accents, pauses, patterns of word-order.**

The segmental units of language form a **hierarchy of levels.**

The **lowest level** of lingual segments is ***phonemic:*** it is formed by phonemes as the material elements of the higher -level segments. The phoneme has no meaning, its function is purely differential: it differentiates morphemes and words as material bodies. Since the phoneme has no meaning, it is not a sign.

Phonemes are combined into syllables. The syllable, a rhythmic segmental group of phonemes, is not a sign, either; it has a purely formal significance. Due to this fact, it could hardly stand to reason to recognise in language a separate syllabic level; rather, the syllables should be considered in the light of the intra-level combinability properties of phonemes.

Phonemes are represented by letters in writing. Since the letter has a representative status, it is a sign, though different in principle from the level-forming signs of language.

Units of all the higher levels of language are meaningful; they may be called "signemes" as opposed to phonemes (and letters as phoneme-representatives).

The level located above the phonemic one is the ***morphemic*** **level.** The morpheme is the elementary meaningful part of the word. It is built up by phonemes, so that the shortest morphemes include only one phoneme. *E.g.:* ros-y [-1]; a-fire [ə-]; come-s [-z].

The morpheme expresses abstract, "significative" meanings which are used as constituents for the formation of more concrete, "nominative" meanings of words.

The third level in the segmental lingual hierarchy is the level of words**, or *lexemic* level.**

The word, as different from the morpheme, is a directly naming (nominative) unit of language: it names things and their relations. Since words are built up by morphemes, the shortest words consist of one explicit morpheme only. *Cf.:* man; will; but; I; etc.

The next higher level is the level of phrases (word-groups), **or *phrasemic* level.**

To level-forming phrase types belong combinations of two or more notional words. These combinations, like separate words, have a nominative function, but they represent the referent of nomination as a complicated phenomenon, be it a concrete thing, an action, a quality, or a whole situation. *Cf.,* respectively: a picturesque village; to start with a jerk; extremely difficult; the unexpected arrival of the chief.

Notional phrases may be of a stable type and of a free type. The stable phrases (phraseological units) form the phraseological part of the lexicon, and are studied by the phraseological division of lexicology. Free phrases are built up in the process of speech on the existing productive models, and are studied in the lower division of syntax. The grammatical description of phrases is sometimes called "smaller syntax", in distinction to "larger syntax" studying the sentence and its textual connections.

Above the phrasemic level lies **the level of sentences, or *"proposemic"* level.**

The peculiar character of the sentence ("proposeme") as a signemic unit of language consists in the fact that, naming a certain situation, or situational event, it expresses predication, i.e. shows the relation of the denoted event to reality. Namely. it shows whether this event is real or unreal, desirable or obligatory, stated as a truth or asked about, etc. In this sense, as different from the word and the phrase, the sentence is a predicative unit. *Cf.:* to receive — to receive a letter — Early in June I received a letter from Peter Mel« rose.

The sentence is produced by the speaker in the process of speech as a concrete, situationally bound utterance. At the same time it enters the system of language by its syntactic pattern which, as all the other lingual unit-types, has both syntagmatic and paradigmatic characteristics.

But the sentence is not the highest unit of language in the hierarchy of levels. Above the proposemic level there is still another one, namely, **the level of sentence-groups, "supra-sentential constructions"**. For the sake of uni- fied terminology, this level can be

called ***"supra-proposemic".***

The supra-sentential construction is a combination of separate sentences forming a textual unity. Such combinations are subject to regular lingual patterning making them into syntactic elements. The syntactic process by which sentences are connected into textual unities is analysed under the heading of "cumulation". Cumulation, the same as formation of composite sentences, can be both syndetic and asyndetic. *Cf.:*

He went on with his interrupted breakfast. Lisette did not speak and there was silence between them. *But* his appetite satisfied, his mood changed; he began to feel sorry for himself rather than angry with her, and with a strange ignorance of woman's heart he thought to arouse Lisette's remorse by exhibiting himself as an object of pity (S. Maugham).

In the typed text, the supra-sentential construction commonly coincides with the paragraph (as in the example above). However, unlike the paragraph, this type of lingual since separate sentences, as a rule, are included in a discourse not sisigneme is realised not only in a written text, but also in all the varieties of oral speech.

So, we have surveyed six levels of language, each identified by its own functional type of segmental units.

MORPHEMIC STRUCTURE OF THE WORD

The morphological system of language reveals its properties through the morphemic structure of words. It follows from this that morphology as part of grammatical theory faces the two segmental units: the morpheme and the word. = the **morpheme** is not identified otherwise than part of the word; - the dental suffix is immediately related to the stem of the verb and together with the stem constitutes the temporal correlation in the paradigmatic system of verbal categories.

Thus, in studying the morpheme we actual study the word.

The **word i**s defined as the **minimal potential sentence,** the minimal free linguistic form, the elementary component of the sentence, the articulate sound-symbol, the grammatically arranged combination of sound with meaning, the meaningfully integral and immediately identifiable lingual unit, the uninterrupted string of morphemes, etc., etc.

American scholars — representatives of Descriptive Linguistics founded by **L. Bloomfield** — **recognised** not the word and the sen-

tence, but **the phoneme and the morpheme as the basic categories of linguistic description,** because these units are the easiest to be isolated in the continual text due to their "physically" minimal, elementary segmental character: the phoneme being the minimal formal segment of language, the morpheme, the minimal meaningful segment. Accordingly, only two segmental levels were originally identified in language by Descriptive scholars: t**he phonemic level and the morphemic level;** later on a third one was added to these — **the level of "constructions"**, i.e. the level of morphemic combinations.

As for the criterion according to which the **word is identified as a minimal sign capable of functioning alone** (the word understood as the "smallest free form", or interpreted as the "potential minimal sentence"), it is irrelevant for **functional words which cannot be used "independently" even in elliptical responses (to say nothing of the fact that the very notion of ellipsis is essentially the opposite of self-dependence**).

The notional **one-stem word and the morpheme** should be described as **the opposing polar phenomena** among the meaningful segments of language; it is these elements that can be defined by their formal and functional features most precisely and unambiguously. As for **functional words, they occupy intermediary positions between these poles,** and their very intermediary status is gradational.

Summing up **the morpheme is a meaningful segmental component of the word**; the morpheme is formed by phonemes; as a meaningful component of the word it is elementary (i.e. indivisible into smaller segments as regards its significative function).

The word is a nominative unit of language; it is formed by morphemes; it enters the lexicon of language as its elementary component ; together with other nominative units the word is used for the formation of the sentence — a unit of information in the communication process. In **traditional grammar** the study of the morphemic structure of the word was conducted in the light of the two basic criteria: **positional** (the location of the marginal morphemes in relation to the central ones) and **semantic or functional** (the correlative contribution of the morphemes to the general meaning of the word).

In accord with the traditional classification, morphemes on the upper level are divided into **root-morphemes (roots) and affixal morphemes (affixes).** The roots express the concrete, "material" part of the meaning of the word, while the affixes express the specificational part of the meaning of the word, the specifications being

of lexico-semantic and grammatico-semantic character.

The **roots of notional words are classical lexical morphemes.**

The affixal morphemes include prefixes, suffixes, and inflexions (in the tradition of the English school grammatical inflexions are commonly referred to as "suffixes"). Of these, prefixes and lexical suffixes have word-building functions, together with the root they form the stem of the word; inflexions (grammatical suffixes) express different morphological categories.

The root, according to the positional content of the term (i.e. the border-area between prefixes and suffixes), is **obligatory for any word,** while affixes are not obligatory. Therefore **one and the same morphemic segment of functional (i.e. non-notional) status, depending on various morphemic environments, can in principle be used now as an affix (mostly, a prefix), now as a root.** *Cf.:*

out — a root-word (preposition, adverb, verbal postposition, adjective, noun, verb);

throughout — a composite word, in which *-out* serves as one of the roots (the categorial status of the meaning of both morphemes is the same);

outing — a two-morpheme word, in which *out* is a root, and *-ing* is a suffix;

outlook, outline, outrage, out-talk, etc. — words, in which *out-* serves as a prefix;

look-out, knock-out, shut-out, time-out, etc. — words (nouns), in which *-out* serves as a suffix.

If we use the symbols St for stem, R for root, Pr for prefix, L for lexical suffix, Gr for grammatical suffix, and, besides, employ three graphical symbols of hierarchical grouping — braces, brackets, and parentheses, then the two morphemic word-structures can be presented as follows:

W_1 = {[Pr + (R + L)] +Gr}

W_2 = {[(Pr + R) +L] + Gr}

In the morphemic composition of more complicated words these model-types form different combinations.

The "allo-emic" theory put forward by Descriptive Linguistics and broadly used in the current linguistic research.

In accord with this theory, lingual units are described by means of two types of terms: ***allo*-terms and *eme*-terms. Eme-terms denote the generalised invariant units** of language characterised by a certain functional status: phonemes, morphemes. **Allo-**

terms denote the concrete manifestations, or variants of the generalised units dependent on the regular co-location with other elements of language: allophones, allomorphs.

The allo-emic identification of lingual elements is achieved by means of the so-called **"distributional analysis".** The immediate **aim of the distributional analysis** is to fix and study the units of language in relation to their textual environments.

The environment of a unit may be either "right" or "left", *e.g.:* un-pardon-able.

In this word the left environment of the root is the negative prefix *un-,* the right environment of the root is the qualitative suffix *-able.* Respectively, the root *-pardon-* is the right environment for the prefix, and the left environment for the suffix.

The distribution of a unit may be defined as the total of all its environments;

In the distributional analysis on the morphemic level, phonemic distribution of morphemes and morphemic distribution of morphemes are discriminated. The study is conducted in two stages.

At the first stage, the analysed text is divided into recurrent segments consisting of phonemes. These segments are called "morphs", i.e. morphemic units distributionally uncharacterised, *e.g.:* the/boat/s/were/gain/ing/speed.

At the second stage, the environmental features of the morphs are established and the corresponding identifications are effected.

Three main types of distribution are discriminated in the distributional analysis, namely, *contrastive* distribution, *non-contrastive* distribution, and *complementary* distribution.

Contrastive and non-contrastive distributions concern identical environments of different morphs.

The morphs are said to be in **contrastive distribution** if their meanings (functions) are different. -- the suffixes *-(e)d* and *-ing* in the verb-forms *returned, returning.*

The morphs are said to be in **non-contrastive distribution** (or free alternation) if their meaning (function) is the same. - the suffixes *-(e)d* and *-t* in the verb-forms *learned, learnt.*

Complementary distribution concerns different environments of formally different morphs which are united by the same meaning (function). If two or more morphs have the same meaning and the difference in (heir form is explained by different environments, these morphs are said to be in complementary distribution- the allomorphs of the plural morpheme /-s/, /-z/, /-iz/ which stand in phonemic complementary distri- bution; the plural allomorph *-en*

in *oxen, children,* which stands in morphemic complementary distribution with the other allomorphs of the plural morpheme.

The distributional classification of morphemes cannot abolish or in any way depreciate **the traditional morpheme types**.

On the basis of the *degree of self-dependence,* **"free" morphemes and "bound" morphemes are distinguished.** Bound morphemes cannot form words by themselves, they are identified only as component segmental parts of words. As different from this, **free morphemes can build up words by themselves, i.e. can be used "freely".**

For instance, in the word *handful* the root *hand* is a free morpheme, while the suffix *-ful* is a bound morpheme.

There are very few productive **bound morphemes** in the morphological system of English. Being extremely narrow, the list of them is complicated by the relations of homonymy. These morphemes are the following:

1) the segments *-(e)s* [-z, -s, -iz]: the plural of nouns, the possessive case of nouns, the third person singular present of verbs;the segments *-(e)d* [-d, -t, -id]: the past and past participle of verbs;

— the segments *-ing:* the gerund and present participle;

— the segments *-er, -est:* the comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives and adverbs.

On the basis of *formal presentation,* **"overt" morphemes and "covert" morphemes** are distinguished. Overt morphemes are genuine, explicit morphemes building up words; the covert morpheme is identified as a contrastive absence of morpheme expressing a certain function. **The notion of covert morpheme coincides with the notion of zero morpheme** in the oppositional description of grammatical categories .

For instance, the word-form *clocks* consists of two overt morphemes: one lexical (root) and one grammatical expressing the plural. The outwardly one-morpheme word-form *clock,* since it expresses the singular, is also considered as consisting of two morphemes, i.e. of the overt root and the co\ert (implicit) grammatical suffix of the singular. The usual symbol for the covert morpheme employed by linguists is the sign of the empty set: 0.

On the basis of segmental relation, **"segmental" morphemes and "supra-segmental" morphemes** are distinguished. Interpreted as **supra-segmental morphemes in distributional terms are intonation contours, accents, pauses**.

On the basis of grammati- cal alternation, **"additive" mor-**

phemes and "replacive" morphemes are distinguished.

Additive morphemes are outer grammatical suffixes, since, as a rule, they are opposed to the absence of morphemes in grammatical alternation. Cf. look+ed; small+er, etc. In distinction to these, the root phonemes of grammatical interchange are considered as replacive morphemes, since they replace one another in the paradigmatic forms. Cf. dr-i-ve — dr-o-ve — dr-i-ven; m-a-n — m-e-n; etc.

On the basis of linear characteristic, **"continuous" (or "linear") morphemes and "discontinuous" morphemes** are distinguished.

By **the discontinuous morpheme**, opposed to the common, i.e. uninterruptedly expressed, continuous morpheme, **a two-element grammatical unit is meant** - be ... ing — for the continuous verb forms (e.g. is going); have ... en — for the perfect verb forms (e.g. has gone); be ... en — for the passive verb forms (e.g. is taken).

LECTURE 2. CATEGORIAL STRUCTURE OF THE WORD.GRAMMATICAL CLASSES OF WORDS.

Notional words, first of all verbs and nouns, possess some morphemic features expressing grammatical (morphological) meanings.

Grammatical meanings are very abstract, very general.

For instance, the **meaning of the substantive plural** is rendered by the regular plural **suffix -(e)s,** and **phonemic interchange and a few lexeme-bound suffixes.** *Cf.:* faces, branches, matches, judges; books, rockets, boats, chiefs, heroes, pianos, cantos; oxen, children, brethren, kine; swine, sheep, deer; cod, trout, salmon; men, women, feet, teeth, geese, mice, lice; formulae, antennae; data, errata, strata, addenda, memoranda; radii, genii, nuclei, alumni; crises, bases, analyses, axes; phenomena, criteria.

The most general notions reflecting the most general properties of phenomena are referred as **"categories"**. The most general meanings rendered by language and expressed by systemic correlations of word-forms are interpreted in linguistics as categorial grammatical meanings. The forms themselves are identified within definite paradigmatic series.

The meaning of the **grammatical category** and the meaning of the g**rammatical form** are related to each other on the principle of the logical relation between the categorial and generic notions.

The grammatical category is a unity of form and meaning .

The grammatical category is a system of expressing a generalised grammatical meaning by means of paradigmatic correlation of grammatical forms.

The ordered set of grammatical forms expressing a categorial function constitutes **a paradigm.**

The paradigmatic correlations of grammatical forms in a category are exposed by "grammatical oppositions".

The opposition is a generalised correlation of lingual forms by means of which a certain function is expressed. **Three main types of oppositions** were established in phonology:

-privative",
-"gradual", and
-"equipollent".

By the number of members contrasted, oppositions were divided into **binary (two members)** and more than binary (**ternary, quaternary, etc.)**.

1. The binary privative opposition is formed by a contrastive pair of members in which one member is characterised by the presence of a certain differential feature ("mark"), while the other member is characterised by the absence of this feature. The member in which the feature is present is called the **"marked", or "strong", or "positive" member,** and is commonly designated by the symbol + (plus); the member in which the feature is absent is called the **"unmarked", or "weak", or "negative"** member, and is commonly designated by the symbol — (minus).

For instance, the **voiced and devoiced consonants** form a privative opposition **[b, d, g —p, t, k].** The differential feature of the opposition is "voice". This feature is present in the voiced consonants, so their set forms the marked member of the opposition. The devoiced consonants, lacking the feature, form the unmarked member of the opposition. To stress the marking quality of "voice" for the opposition in question, the devoiced consonants may be referred to as «non-voiced".

2. The gradual opposition is formed by a contrastive group of members which are distinguished not by the presence or absence of a feature, but **by the degree of it.**

For instance, **the front vowels [i:—i—e—ae] form a quaternary gradual opposition.**

3. The equipollent opposition is formed by a contrastive pair or group in which the **members are distinguished by different positive features.**

For instance, the phonemes **[m] and [b],** both bilabial consonants, form an equipollent opposition, **[m] being sonorous nazalised, [b] being plosive.**

Words as units of morphology are bilateral; therefore **morphological oppositions must reflect both the plane of expression (form) and the plane of content (meaning).**

The most important type of opposition in morphology, the same as in phonology, is **the binary privative opposition.**

The privative morphological opposition is based on a morphological differential feature which is present in its strong parked) member and absent in its weak (unmarked) member.

For instance, the expression of the verbal present and past tenses is based on a privative opposition the differential feature of which is the dental suffix *-(e)d.* This suffix, rendering the meaning of the past tense, marks the past form of the verb positively ***(we worked),*** and the present form negatively ***(we work).***

The meanings differen- tiated by the oppositions of sig-

nemic units (signemic oppositions) are referred to as **"semes"**.

For instance, the nounal form *cats* expresses the seme of plurality, as opposed to the form *cat* which expresses, by contrast, the seme of singularity.

The meaning of the **weak member** of the privative opposition is **more general and abstract** as compared with the **meaning of the strong member,** which is **more concrete.** .

Equipollent oppositions in the system of English morphology constitute a minor type and are mostly confined to formal relations only. An example of such an opposition can be seen in the correlation of the person forms of the verb *be:* ***am — are — is.***

4.Gradual oppositions in morphology are not generally recognised; in principle, they can be identified as a minor type on the semantic level only. An example of the gradual

morphological opposition can be seen in the **category of comparison:** ***strong — stronger — strongest.***

A grammatical category must be expressed by at least one opposition of forms.

In various contextual conditions, one member of an opposition can be used in the position of the other, counter-member. This phenomenon should be treated under the heading of **"oppositional reduction" or "oppositional substitution".** The first version of the term ("reduction") points out the fact that the opposition in this case is contracted, losing its formal distinctive force. The second version of the term ("substitution") shows the very process by which the opposition is reduced, namely, the use of one member instead of the other.

By way of example, let us consider the case of the singular noun-subject: *Man* conquers nature.

The noun *man* in the quoted sentence is used in the singular, but it is quite clear that it stands not for an individual person, but for people in general, for the idea of "mankind". In other words, the noun is used generically, it implies the class of denoted objects as a whole. Thus, in the oppositional light, here the weak member of the categorial opposition of number has replaced the strong member.

The oppositional reduction shown in the cited case is **stylistically indifferent,** the demonstrated use of the forms does not transgress the expressive conventions of ordinary speech. T**his kind of oppositional reduction is referred to as "neutralisation" of oppositions.** The position of neutralisation is, as a rule, filled in by the weak member of the opposi- tion due to its more general se-

mantics.

Alongside of the neutralising reduction of oppositions there exists another kind of reduction, by which one of the members of the opposition **is placed in contextual conditions uncommon for it;** in other words, the said reductional use of the form is stylistically marked. *E.g.:* That man *is* constantly *complaining* of something.

The form of the verbal present continuous in the cited sentence stands in sharp contradiction with its regular grammatical meaning "action in progress at the present time". The contradiction is, of course, purposeful: by exaggeration, it intensifies the implied disapproval of the man's behaviour.

This kind of oppositional reduction should be considered under the heading of **"transposition". Transposition is based on the contrast between the members of the opposition, it may be defined as a contrastive use of the counter-member of the opposition.** As a rule transpositionally employed is the strong member of the opposition, which is explained by its comparatively limited regular functions.

The means employed for building up member-forms of categorial oppositions are traditionally divided into ***synthetical*** **and** ***analytical;***

Synthetical grammatical forms are realised by the inner morphemic composition of the word, while analytical grammatical forms are built up by a combination of at least two words, one of which is a grammatical auxiliary (word-morpheme), and the other, a word of "substantial" meaning. **Synthetical grammatical forms** are based on inner inflexion, outer inflexion, and suppletivity; hence, the forms are referred to as inner-inflexional, outer-inflexional, and suppletive.

Inner inflexion, or phonemic (vowel) interchange, is not productive in modern Indo-European languages, but it is peculiarly employed in some of their basic, most ancient lexemic elements. By this feature, the whole family of Indo-European languages is identified in linguistics as typologically "inflexional".

Inner inflexion is used in English **in irregular verbs** for the formation of the past indefinite and past participle; besides, it is used in a few nouns for the formation of the plural. Since the corresponding oppositions of forms are based on phonemic interchange, the initial paradigmatic form of each lexeme should also be considered as inflexional. Cf.: take — took — taken, drive — drove — driven, keep — kept — kept, etc.; man — men, brother — brethren, etc.

Suppletivity, like inner inflexion, **is not productive** as a purely morphological type of form. **It is based on the correlation of different roots as a means of paradigmatic differentiation.-** . *Cf.:* be — am — are — is — was — were; go — went; good — better; bad — worse; much — more; little — less; I — me; we — us; she — her.

Can — be able; must — have (to), be obliged (to); may — be allowed (to); one — some; man — people; news — items of news; information — pieces of information; etc.

The shown **unproductive synthetical means of English** morphology are outbalanced by **the productive means of affixation** (outer inflexion), which amount to grammatical suffixation (grammatical prefixation could only be observed in the Old English verbal system).

Prof.Bloch comes to the conclusion that the total number of synthetical forms in English morphology, though certainly not very large, at the same time is not so small as it is commonly believed. Scarce in English are not the synthetical forms as such, but the actual affixal segments on which the paradigmatic differentiation of forms is based.

As for analytical forms which are so typical of modern English that they have long made this language into the "canonised" representative of lingual analytism. strong.

The grammatical categories which are realised by the described types of forms organised in functional paradigmatic oppositions, can either **be innate** for a given class of words, or **only be expressed on the surface** of it, serving as a sign of correlation with some other class.

For instance, the category of number is organically connected with the functional nature of the noun; it directly exposes the number of the referent substance, *e.g. one ship — several ships.* The category of number in the verb, however, by no means gives a natural meaningful characteristic to the denoted process: the process is devoid of numerical features such as are expressed by the grammatical number. Indeed, what is rendered by the verbal number is not a quantitative characterisation of the process, but a numerical featuring of the subject-referent. *Cf.:*

The *girl* is smiling. — The *girls* are smiling. The *ship* is in the harbour. — The *ships* are in the harbour.

Thus, from the point of view of referent relation, grammatical categories should be divided into **"immanent"** categories, i.e. cat-

egories innate for a given lexemic class, and **"reflective" categories**, i.e. categories of a secondary, derivative semantic value. Categorial forms based on subordinative grammatical agreement (such as the verbal person, the verbal number) are reflective, while categorial forms stipulating grammatical agreement in lexemes of a contiguous word-class (such as the substantive-pronominal person, the substantive number) are immanent. **Immanent - the tense of the verb, the comparison of the adjective and adverb, etc.**

Category can be either **constant** (unchangeable, "derivational"), **or variable** (changeable, "demutative").

An example of constant feature category can be seen in the category of gender, which divides the class of English nouns into non-human names, human male names, human female names, and human common gender names. This division is represented by the system of the third person pronouns serving as gender-indices

It (**non-human**): mountain, city, forest, cat, bee, etc.

He (**male human)**: man, father, husband, uncle, etc.

She **(female human)**: woman, lady, mother, girl, etc.

He or *she* (**common human):** person, parent, child, cousin, etc.

Variable feature categories can be exemplified by the substantive number (singular — plural) or the degrees of comparison (**positive — comparative — superlative).**

Constant feature categories reflect the static classifications of phenomena, while variable feature categories expose various connections between phenomena. Some marginal categorial forms may acquire intermediary status, being located in-between the corresponding categorial poles. For instance, **the nouns singularia tantum and pluralia tantum present a case of hybrid variable-constant formations, since their variable feature of number has become "rigid".**

GRAMMATICAL CLASSES OF WORDS

The words of language are divided into grammatically relevant sets or classes. The traditional grammatical classes of words are called **"parts of speech"**. This name was introduced *in* the grammatical teaching of Ancient Greece.

In modern linguistics, parts of speech are discriminated on the basis of the three criteria: "**semantic", "formal", and "functional".** The *semantic* criterion presupposes the evaluation of the generalised

meaning, which is characteristic of all the subsets of words constituting a given part of speech. The *formal* criterion - the specific inflexional and derivational (word-building) featuresof a part of speech. The *functional* criterion concerns the syntactic role of words in the sentence typical of a part of speech. These **"meaning", "form", and "function".**

In accord with the described criteria, words on the upper level of classification are divided into notional and functional.

To the **6 notional parts of speech** of the English language belong **the noun, the adjective, the numeral, the pronoun, the verb, the adverb.**

The *features of the noun* within the identificational triad "meaning — form — function" are, correspondingly, the following: 1) the categorial meaning of substance ("thingness"); 2) the changeable forms of number and case; the specific suffixal forms of derivation (prefixes in English do not discriminate parts of speech as such); 3) the substantive functions in the sentence (subject, object, substantival predicative); prepositional connections; modification by an adjective.

The *features of the adjective:* 1) the categorial meaning of property (qualitative and relative); 2) the forms of the

degrees of comparison (for qualitative adjectives); the specific suffixal forms of derivation; 3) adjectival functions in the sentence (attribute to a noun, adjectival predicative).

The *features of the numeral:* 1) the categorial meaning of number (cardinal and ordinal); 2) the narrow set of simple numerals; the specific forms of composition for compound numerals; the specific suffixal forms of derivation for ordinal numerals; 3) the functions of numerical attribute and numerical substantive.

The *features of the pronoun:* 1) the categorial meaning of indication (deixis); 2) the narrow sets of various status with the corresponding formal properties of categorial changeability and word-building; 3) the substantival and adjectival functions for different sets.

The *features of the verb:* 1) the categorial meaning of process (presented in the two upper series of forms, respectively, as finite process and non-finite process); 2) the forms of the verbal categories of person, number, tense, aspect, voice, mood; the opposition of the finite and non-finite forms; 3) the function of the finite predicate for the finite verb; the mixed verbal — other than verbal functions for the non-finite verb.

The *features of the adverb:* 1) the categorial meaning of the secondary property, i.e. the property of process or another property; 2) the forms of the degrees of comparison for qualitative ad-

verbs; the specific suffixal forms of derivation; 3) the functions of various adverbial modifiers.

Contrasted against the notional parts of speech are words of incomplete nominative meaning and non-self-dependent, mediatory functions in the sentence. These are f**unctional parts of speech.**

To the **6 basic functional words** in English belong the article, the preposition, the conjunction, the particle, the modal word, the interjection.

The *article* expresses the specific limitation of the substantive functions.

The *preposition* expresses the dependencies and interdependences of substantive referents.

The *conjunction* expresses connections of phenomena.

The *particle* unites the functional words of specifying and limiting meaning. To this series, alongside of other specifying words, should be referred verbal postpositions as functional modifiers of verbs, etc.

The *modal word,* occupying in the sentence a more pronounced or less pronounced detached position, expresses the attitude of the speaker to the reflected situation and its parts. Here belong the functional words of probability *(probably, perhaps,* etc.), of qualitative evaluation *(fortunately, unfortunately, luckily,* etc.), and also of affirmation and negation.

The *interjection,* occupying a detached position in the sentence, is a signal of emotions.

Each part of speech after its identification is further subdivided into subseries in accord with various particular semantico-functional and formal features of the constituent words. This **subdivision** is sometimes called **"subcategorisation" of parts of speech.**

Thus, **nouns** are subcategorised into proper and common, animate and inanimate, countable and uncountable, concrete and abstract, etc. *Cf.:*

Mary, Robinson, London, the Mississippi, Lake Erie — girl, person, city, river, lake;

man, scholar, leopard, butterfly — earth, field, rose, machine;

coin/coins, floor/floors, kind/kinds — news, growth, water, furniture;

stone, grain, mist, leaf — honesty, love, slavery, darkness.

Verbs are subcategorised into fully predicative and partially predicative, transitive and intransitive, actional and statal, factive and evaluative, etc. *Cf.:*

walk, sail, prepare, shine, blow — can, may, shall, be, become;

take, put, speak, listen, see, give — live, float, stay, ache, ripen, rain;

write, play, strike, boil, receive, ride — exist, sleep, rest, thrive, revel, suffer;

roll, tire, begin, ensnare, build, tremble — consider, approve, mind, desire, hate, incline.

Adjectives are subcategorised into qualitative and relative, of constant feature and temporary feature (the latter are referred to as "statives" and identified by some scholars as a separate part of speech under the heading of "category of state"), factive and evaluative, etc. *Cf.:*

long, red, lovely, noble, comfortable — wooden, rural, daily, subterranean, orthographical;

healthy, sickly, joyful, grievous, wry, blazing — well, ill, glad, sorry, awry, ablaze;

tall, heavy, smooth, mental, native — kind, brave, wonderful, wise, stupid.

The adverb, the numeral, the pronoun are also subject to the corresponding subcategorisations.

It is known that the distribution of words between different parts of speech may to a certain extent differ with different authors. The three celebrated names are especially notable for the elaboration of these criteria, namely, **V. V. Vinogradov** in connection with his study of Russian grammar, **A. I. Smirnitsky and B. A. Ilyish** in connection with their study of English grammar.

Alongside of the three-criteria principle of dividing the words into grammatical classes modern linguistics has developed another, narrower **principle of word-class identification** based on syntactic featuring of words only.

The original Ancient Greek grammatical teaching was based on t**he formal-morphological featuring.** At the present stage of the development of linguistic science, **syntactic characterisation of words** that has been made possible after the exposition of their fundamental morphological properties, i**s far more important** from the point of view of the general classificational requirements.

On the material of Russian, the principles of syntactic approach to the classification of word stock were outlined in the works **of A. M. Peshkovsky**. The principles of syntactic (syntactico-distributional) classification of English words were worked out by **L. Bloomfield** and his followers **Z. Harris** and espe- cially Ch. Fries.

The syntactico-distributional classification of words is based on the study of their combinability by means of substitution testing. The testing results in developing the standard model of four main "positions" of notional words in the English sentence: those of the noun (N), verb (V), adjective (A), adverb (D). Pronouns are included into the corresponding positional classes as their substitutes. Words standing outside the "positions" in the sentence are treated as function words of various syntactic values.

Here is how **Ch. Fries** presents his scheme of English word-classes [Fries].

As a result of his tests on the cited "frames" the following lists of positional words ("form-words", or "parts of speech") are established:

Class 1. (A) concert, coffee, taste, container, difference, etc. (B) clerk, husband, supervisor, etc.; tax, food, coffee, etc. (C) team, husband, woman, etc.

Class 2. (A) was, seemed, became, etc. (B) remembered, wanted, saw, suggested, etc. (C) went, came, ran,... lived, worked, etc.

Class 3. (A) good, large, necessary, foreign, new, empty, etc.

Class 4. (A) there, here, always, then, sometimes, etc.

(B)clearly, sufficiently, especially, repeatedly, soon, etc.

(C)there, back, out, etc.; rapidly, eagerly, confidently, etc.

Functional words form limited groups totalling 154 units.

The identified groups of functional words can be distributed among th**e three main** sets. The **words of the first set** are used as specifiers of notional words. Here belong determiners of nouns, modal verbs serving as specifiers of notional verbs, functional modifiers and intensifiers of adjectives and adverbs. The **words of the second set** play the role of inter-positional elements, determining the relations of notional words to one another. Here belong prepositions and conjunctions. **The words of the third set** refer to the sentence as a whole. Such are question-words *{what, how,* etc.), inducement-words *(lets, please,* etc.), attention-getting words, words of affirmation and negation, *sentence* introducers *(it, there)* and some others.

Comparing **the syntactico-distributional classification** of words with the traditional part of speech division of words, one cannot but see **the similarity of the general schemes** of the two: **the opposition of notional and functional words, the four absolutely cardinal classes of notional words** , the interpretation of **functional words as syntactic mediators** and their formal representation by the list.

LEXICAL PARADIGM OF NOMINATION

a recognising note — a notable recognition — to note recognisingly — to recognise notably; silent disapproval — disapproving silence — to disapprove silently — to silence disapprovingly; etc.

This series can symbolically be designated by the formula **St (n.v.a.d.)** where **St** represents the morphemic stem of the series, while the small letters in parentheses stand for the derivational features of the notional word-classes (parts of speech). Each stage of the series can in principle be filled in by a number of lexemes of the same stem with possible hierarchical relations between them. The primary presentation of the series, however, may be realised in a four-unit version as follows:

strength — to strengthen — strong — strongly peace — to appease — peaceful — peacefully nation — to nationalise — national — nationally friend — to befriend — friendly — friendly, etc.

This derivational series that unites the notional word-classes can be named the **"lexical paradigm of nomination".** The general order of classes in the series evidently corresponds to the logic of mental perception of reality, by which a person discriminates, first, objects and their actions, then the properties of the former and the latter.

N→ power — to empower — powerful — powerfully

V→ to suppose —supposition — supposed — supposedly

A→ clear — clarity — to clarify — clearly

D→ out — outing — to out — outer

There are **lexemes with a complete paradigm of nomination and lexemes with an incomplete paradigm of nomination,** both lexemic and phrasemic. *Cf.:*

an end — to end final — finally

good — goodness well — to better

evidence — evident — evidently to make evident

wise — wisely — wisdom to grow wise, etc.

Functional words re-interpreted by syntactic approach also reveal some important traits that remained undiscovered in earlier descriptions.

The lists of functional words may be regarded as paradigmatic series themselves — which, in their turn, are grammatical constituents of higher paradigmatic series on the level of phrases and especially sentences.

Pronouns considered in the light of t**he syntactic principles**

receive a special systemic status that characteristically stamps the general presentation of the structure of the lexicon as a whole.

Pronouns are traditionally recognised on the basis of indicatory (deictic) and substitutional semantic functions.It is the substitutional function that immediately isolates all the heterogeneous groups of pronouns into a special set of the lexicon.

So,the whole of the lexicon on the upper level of classification into **three unequal parts.**

The **first part** of the lexicon forming an open set includes an indefinitely large number of notional words which have a complete nominative function. In accord with the said function, these words can be referred to as "names": nouns as substance names, verbs as process names, adjectives as primary property names and adverbs as secondary property names. The whole notional set is represented by the four-stage derivational paradigm of nomination.

The second part of the lexicon forming a closed set includes substitutes of names (pro-names). Here belong **pronouns,** and also **broad-meaning notional words** which constitute various marginal subsets.

The third part of the lexicon also forming a closed set includes specifiers of names. These are **function-categorial words** of various servo-status.

LECTURE 3. NOUN: GENERAL AND GENDER

The noun as a part of speech has the categorial meaning of "substance" or "thingness".

The categorial functional properties of the noun are determined by its semantic properties.

The most characteristic substantive function of the noun is that of the s**ubject in the sentence**. The **function of the objec**t in the sentence is also typical of the noun as the substance word. Other syntactic functions, i.e**. attributive, adverbial, and even predicative** are not immediately characteristic of its substantive quality as such.

Prof.Blokh writes that the typical of the noun is the combinability with another noun, a verb, an adjective, an adverb. *E.g.:* an entrance to the house; to turn round the corner; red in the face; far from its destination.

The casal (possessive) combinability characterises the noun alongside of its prepositional combinability with another noun. *E.g.:* the speech of the President — the President's speech; the cover of the book — the book's cover.

English nouns can also combine with one another by sheer contact. In the contact group the noun in preposition plays the role of a semantic qualifier to the noun in post-position. *E.g.:* a cannon ball; a log cabin; a sports event; film festivals.

The noun is also characterised by a set of formal features. It has its word-building distinctions, including typical suffixes, compound stem models, conversion patterns. It discriminates the grammatical categories of gender, number, case, article determination.

The subclasses of nouns are grouped into four oppositional pairs.

The first nounal subclass opposition differentiates *proper* and *common* nouns. The foundation of this division is "type of nomination".

The second subclass opposition differentiates *animate* and *inanimate* nouns .

The third subclass opposition differentiates *human* and *non-human* nouns on the basis of "personal quality".

The fourth subclass opposition - *countable* and *uncountable* nouns on the basis of "quantitative structure".

Somewhat less explicitly and rigorously realised is the division of English nouns into *concrete* and *abstract.*

NOUN: GENDER

Ten pages of A. I. Smirnitsky's theoretical "Morphology of English" are devoted to proving the non-existence of gender in English either in the grammatical, or even in the strictly lexico-grammatical sense [Смирницкий, (2), 139-148]. On the other hand, the well-known practical "English grammar" by M. A. Ganshina and N. M. Vasilevskaya, after denying the existence of grammatical gender in English by way of an introduction to the topic, still presents a pretty comprehensive description of the would-be non-existent gender distinctions of the English noun as a part of speech [Ganshina, Vasilevskaya, 40 ff.].

The category of gender is expressed in English by the correlation of nouns with the personal pronouns of the third person. These serve as specific gender classifiers of nouns, being potentially reflected on each entry of the noun in speech.

The category of gender i**s strictly oppositional**. It is formed by two oppositions related to each other on a hierarchical basis.

One opposition functions in the whole set of nouns, dividing them into person (human) nouns and non-person (non-human) nouns. The other opposition functions in the subset of person nouns only, dividing them into **masculine nouns and feminine nouns.** Thus, the first, general opposition can be referred to as the upper opposition in the category of gender, while the second, partial opposition can be referred to as the lower opposition in this category.

Prof.Blokh writes that a specific system of three genders arises, which is somewhat misleadingly represented by the traditional terminology: t**he *neuter*** (i.e. non-person) gender, the ***masculine*** (i.e. masculine person) gender, the ***feminine*** (i.e. feminine person) gender.

The strong member of the upper opposition is the human subclass of nouns, its sememic mark being "person", or "personality". The weak member of the opposition comprises both inanimate and animate non-person nouns. Here belong such nouns as *tree, mountain, love,* etc.; *cat, swallow, ant,* etc.; *society, crowd, association,* etc.; *bull* and *cow, cock* and *hen, horse* and *mare,* etc.

In cases of oppositional reduction, non-person nouns and their substitute (it) are naturally used in the position of neutralisation. *E.g.:*

Suddenly *something* moved in the darkness ahead of us. Could *it* be a man, in this desolate place, at this time of night? The *object* of her maternal affection was nowhere to be found. *It* had disappeared,

leaving the mother and nurse desperate.

The strong member of the lower opposition is the feminine subclass of person nouns, its sememic mark being "female sex". Here belong such nouns as *woman, girl, mother, bride,* etc. The masculine subclass of person nouns comprising such words as *man, boy, father, bridegroom,* etc. makes up the weak member of the opposition.

The oppositional structure of the category of gender can be shown schematically on the following diagram (see Fig. I).

GENDER

Feminine Nouns, Masculine Nouns

A great many person nouns in English are capable of expressing both feminine and masculine person genders by way of the pronominal correlation in question. These are referred to as nouns of the "common gender". Here belong such words as *person, parent, friend, cousin, doctor, president,* etc. *E.g.:*

The President of our Medical Society isn't going to be happy about the suggested way of cure. In general *she* insists on quite another kind of treatment in cases like that.

The **capability of expressing both genders** makes the gender distinctions in the nouns of the common gender into a variable category. Prof.Blokh writes that when there is no special need to indicate the sex of the person referents of these nouns, they are used neutrally as masculine, i.e. they correlate with the masculine third person pronoun.

In the plural, all the gender distinctions are neutralised in the immediate explicit expression, though they are rendered obliquely through the correlation with the singular.

Alongside of the demonstrated grammatical (or lexico-grammatical, for that matter) gender distinctions, English nouns can show the sex of their referents lexically, either by means of being combined with certain notional words used as sex indicators, or else by suffixal derivation. *Cf.:* boy-friend, girl-friend; man-producer, woman-producer; washer-man, washer-woman; landlord, landlady; bull-calf, cow-calf; cock-sparrow, hen-sparrow; he-bear, she-bear; master, mistress; actor, actress; executor, executrix; lion, lioness; sultan, sultana.

The category of gender in English is inherently s**emantic, i.e.**

meaningful in so far as it reflects the actual features of the named objects.

In Russian, German, and many other languages characterised by the gender division of nouns, the gender has purely formal features that may even "run contrary" to semantics. Suffice it to compare such Russian words as *стакан — он, чашка—она, блюдце — оно,* as well as their German correspondences *das Glas — es, die Tasse — sie, der Teller — er,* etc.

Russian gender differs idiomatically from the English gender in so far as it divides the nouns by the higher opposition not into "person — non-person" ("human— non human"), but into "animate — inanimate", discriminating within the former (the animate nounal set) between masculine, feminine, and a limited number of neuter nouns. Thus, the Russian category of gender essentially divides the noun into the inanimate set having no meaningful gender, and the animate set having a meaningful gender. In distinction to this, the English category of gender is only meaningful, and as such it is represented in the nounal system as a whole.

LECTURE 4. NOUN: NUMBER AND CASE

The category of number is expressed by the opposition of the plural form of the noun to the singular form of the noun. The strong member of this binary opposition is the plural, its productive formal mark being the suffix -(e)s [-z, -s, -iz] as presented in the forms *dog — dogs, clock — clocks, box — boxes.* 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, as has been shown above, enables the grammarians to speak 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,* etc.), 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 of the noun is homonymous with the singular form *(sheep, deer, fish,* etc.).

The **semantic nature** of the difference between singular and plural may present some difficulties of interpretation.

On the surface of semantic relations, the meaning of the singular will be understood as simply "one", as opposed to the meaning of the plural as "many" in the sense of "more than one". This is apparently obvious for such correlations as *book — books, lake — lakes* and the like. However, alongside of these semantically unequivocal correlations, there exist plurals and singulars that cannot be fully accounted for by the above ready-made approach. This becomes clear when we take for comparison such forms as *tear* (one drop falling from the eye) and *tears* (treacles on the cheeks as tokens of grief or joy), *potato* (one item of the vegetables) and *potatoes* (food), *paper* (material) and *papers* (notes or documents), *sky* (the vault of heaven) and *skies* (the same sky taken as a direct or figurative background), etc. As a result of the comparison we conclude that the broader sememic mark of the plural, or "plurality" in the grammatical sense, should be described as the potentially dismembering reflection of the structure of the referent, while the sememic mark of the singular will be understood as the non-dismembering reflection of the structure of the referent, i.e. the presentation of the referent in its indivisible entireness.

The plural form presents both multiplicity of separate ob-

jects ("discrete" plural, *e.g. three houses)* and multiplicity of units of measure for an indivisible object ("plural of measure", *e.g. three hours)* [Ilyish, 36 ff.]. However, the difference here lies not in the content of the plural as such, but in the quality of the objects themselves. Actually, the singulars of the respective nouns differ from one another exactly on the same lines as the plurals do *{cf. one house — one hour).*

Prof.Blokh writes that there are semantic varieties of the plural forms that differ from one another in their plural quality as such. Some distinctions of this kind were shown above. Some further distinctions may be seen in a variety of other cases. Here belong, for example, cases where the plural form expresses a definite set of objects *{eyes* of the face, *wheels* of the vehicle, etc.), various types of the referent *{wines, tees, steels),* intensity of the presentation of the idea *{years and years, thousands upon thousands),* picturesqueness *{sands, waters, snows).* The extreme point of this semantic scale is marked by the lexicalisation of the plural form, i.e. by its serving as a means of rendering not specificational, but purely notional difference in meaning. *Cf. colours* as a "flag", *attentions* as "wooing", *pains* as "effort", *quarters* as "abode", etc.

The scope of the semantic differences of the plural forms might pose before the observer a question whether the category of number is a variable grammatical category at all.

The answer to the question, though, doesn't leave space or any uncertainty: the category of number is one of the regular variable categories in the grammatical system of he English language. The variability of the category is simply given in its form, i.e. in the forms of the bulk of English nouns, which do distinguish it by means of the described binary paradigm. As for the differences in meaning, these arise from the interaction between the underlying oppositional sememic marks of the category and the more concrete lexical differences in the semantics of individual words.

The two subclasses of **uncountable nouns** are singularia tantum (only singular) and pluralia tantum (only plural). The number opposition is "constantly" (lexically) reduced either to the weak member (singularia tantum) or to the strong member (pluralia tantum).

The **absolute singular** is characteristic of the names of abstract notions *{peace, love, joy, courage, friendship,* etc.), the names of the branches of professional activity *{chemistry, architecture, mathematics, linguistics,* etc.), the names of mass-materials *{water, snow, steel, hair,* etc.), the names of collective inanimate objects *{foliage, fruit, furniture, machinery,* etc.).

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

The absolute singular, by way of functional oppositional reduction, can be used with countable nouns.

Waltz is a lovely dance. There was dead *desert* all around them. The refugees needed *shelter.* Have we got *chicken* for the second course?

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

The necessity of expressing definite numbers in cases of uncountable pluralia tantum nouns, as well as in cases of countable nouns denoting objects in fixed sets, has brought about different suppletive combinations specific to the plural form of the noun, which exist alongside of the suppletive combinations specific to the singular form of the noun shown above. Here belong collocations with such words as *pair, set, group, bunch* and some others. *Cf.:* a pair of pincers; three pairs of bathing trunks; a few groups of police; two sets of dice; several cases of measles; etc.

The **first type of 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". *Cf.:*

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 oppositional reduction, consisting in the use of the **absolute plural with uncountable nouns in the plural form, concerns cases of stylistic marking**of nouns. Thus, the oppositional reduction **results in expressive transposition.**

- the sands of the desert; the snows of the Arctic; the waters of the ocean; the fruits of the toil; etc,

The third type of oppositional reduction concerns common countable nouns used in r**epetition groups**. The acquired implication is indefinitely large quantity in- tensely presented. The nouns in

repetition groups may themselves be used either in the plural ("featured" form) or in the singular ("unfeatured" form). Cf.:

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

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

NOUN: CASE

Case is the immanent morphological category of the noun manifested in the forms of noun declension and showing the relations of the nounal referent to other objects and phenomena. Thus, the case form of the noun, or contractedly its "case" (in the narrow sense of the word), is a morphological-declensional form.

This category is expressed in English by the opposition of the form in *-'s* [-z, -s, -iz], usually called the **"possessive" case,** or more traditionally, the "**genitive" case** (to which term we will stick in the following presentation*), to the unfeatured form of the noun, usually called the "common" case. **The apostrophised -s serves to distinguish in writing the singular noun in the genitive case from the plural noun in the common case. *E.g.:* the man's duty, the President's decision, Max's letter; the boy's ball, the clerk's promotion, the Empress's jewels**.

Functionally, the forms of the English nouns designated as "case forms" relate to one another in an extremely peculiar way. The peculiarity is, that t**he common form is absolutely indefinite from the semantic point of view, whereas the genitive form in its productive uses is restricted to the functions which have a parallel expression by prepositional constructions.** Thus, the common form, as appears from the presentation, is also capable of rendering the genitive semantics (namely, in contact and prepositional collocation), which makes the whole of the genitive case into a kind of subsidiary element in the grammatical system of the English noun. This feature stamps the English noun declension as something utterly different from every conceivable declension in principle. In fact, the inflexional oblique case forms as normally and imperatively expressing the immediate functional parts of the ordinary sentence in "noun-declensional" languages do not exist in English at all. Suffice it to compare a German sentence taken at random with its English rendering:

Erhebung der Anklage gegen die Witwe Capet scheint wünschenswert aus Rucksicht auf die Stimmung der Stadt Paris (L. Feuchtwanger). *Eng.:* (The bringing of) the accusation against the Widow Capet appears desirable, taking into consideration the mood of the City of Paris.

Prof.Blokh writes that the five entries of nounal oblique cases in the German utterance (rendered through article inflexion), of which two are genitives, all correspond to one and the same indiscriminate common case form of nouns in the English version of the text. By way of further comparison, we may also observe the Russian translation of the same sentence with its four genitive entries: Выдвижение обвинения против вдовы Капет кажется желательным, если учесть настроение города Парижа.

Under the described circumstances of fact, there is no wonder that in the course of linguistic investigation the category of case in English has become one of the vexed problems of theoretical discussion.

1-The first view may b**e called 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. Linguistic formulations of the theory, with various individual variations (the number of cases recognised, the terms used, the reasoning cited), may be found in the works of **J. C. Nesfield, M. Deutschbein, M. Bryant** and other scholars.

In accord with the theory of positional cases, 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, on the analogy of classical Latin grammar, would distinguish, besides the inflexional genitive case, also the non-inflexional, i.e. purely positional cases: nominative, vocative, dative, and accusative. The uninflexional cases of the noun are taken to be supported by the parallel inflexional cases of the personal pronouns. The would-be cases in question can be exemplified as follows.*

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 object to a preposition): The man killed a *rat.* The earth is moistened by *rain.*

In the light of all that has been stated in this book in connection with the general notions of morphology, the fallacy of the

positional case theory is quite obvious. 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, since the case form, by definition, is the variable morphological form of the noun. **In reality, the case forms as such serve as means of expressing the functions of the noun in the sentence, and not vice versa**. Thus, what the described view does do on the positive lines,is that within the confused conceptions of form and meaning, it still rightly illustrates the fact that the functional meanings rendered by cases can be expressed in language by other grammatical means, in particular, by word-order.

2-The second view may be called the **"theory of prepositional cases".** Like the theory of positional cases, it is also connected with the old school grammar teaching, and was advanced as a logical supplement to the positional view of the case.

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 would-be prepositional cases are generally taken (by the scholars who recognise them) as coexisting with positional cases, together with the classical inflexional genitive completing the case system of the English noun.

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 (prepositional case-government); this fact, together with a mere semantic observation of the role of prepositions in the phrase, shows that any preposition by virtue of its functional nature stands in essentially the same general grammatical relations to nouns. It should follow from this that not only the *of-, to-,* and *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 either to theory or practice [Ilyish, 42].

3 -The third view of the English noun case recognises a

limited inflexional system of two cases in English, one of them featured and the other one unfeatured. This view may be called the "limited case theory".

The limited case theory is at present most broadly accepted among linguists both in this country and abroad. It was formulated by such scholars as H. Sweet, O. Jespersen and has since been radically developed by the Soviet scholars A. I. Smirnitsky, L. S. Barkhudarov and others.

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 or genitive form as the strong member of the categorial opposition and the common, or "non-genitive" form as the weak member of the categorial opposition.

4-Another view of the problem of the English noun cases has been put forward which sharply counters the theories hitherto observed. This view approaches the English noun as having completely lost the category of case in the course of 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). This view, advanced in an explicit form by G. N. Vorontsova [Воронцова, 168 и сл.], may be called the "theory of the possessive postposition" ("postpositional theory").

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

First, 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. Compare some examples cited by G. N. Vorontsova in her work: somebody else's daughter; another stage-struck girl's stage finish; the man who had hauled him out to dinner's head.

Second, 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; . ..→ the head of the man who had hauled him out to dinner.

One cannot but acknowl- edge the rational character of the

cited reasoning. Its strong point consists in the fact that it is based on a careful observation of the lingual data. For all that, 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 beyond any doubt that the noun form in -'s is systemically, i.e. on strictly structural-functional basis, 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, however specific it might be.

As the basic arguments for the recognition of the noun form in *-'s* in the capacity of grammatical case, besides the oppositional nature of the general functional correlation of the featured and unfeatured forms of the noun, we will name the following two.

First, the broader phrasal uses of the postpositional -'s like those shown on the above examples, display a clearly expressed stylistic colouring; they are, as linguists put it, **stylistically marked,** which fact proves their transpositional nature. In this connection we may formulate the following regularity: the more self-dependent the construction covered by the case-sign -'s, the stronger the stylistic mark (colouring) of the resulting genitive phrase. This functional analysis is corroborated by the statistical observation of the forms in question in the living English texts. According to the data obtained by B. S. Khaimovich and B. I. Rogovskaya, the *-'s* sign is attached to individual nouns in as many as 96 per cent of its total textual occurrences [Khaimovich, Rogovskaya, 64]. Thus, the immediate casal relations are realised by individual nouns, the phrasal, as well as some non-nounal uses of the - 's sign being on the whole of a secondary grammatical order.

Second, the -'s sign from the point of view of its segmental status in language differs from ordinary functional words. It is morpheme-like by its phonetical properties; it is strictly postpositional unlike the prepositions; it is semantically by far a more bound element than a preposition, which, among other things, has hitherto prevented it from being entered into dictionaries as a separate word.

As for the fact that the "possessive postpositional construction" is correlated with a parallel prepositional construction, it only shows the functional peculiarity of the form, but cannot disprove its case-like nature, since cases of nouns in general render much the same functional semantics as prepositional phrases (reflecting a wide range of situational relations of noun referents).

But, unlike the casA two case declension of nouns should

be recognised in English, with its common case as **a "direct" case,** and its g**enitive case** as the only oblique case.e 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, rendering the same essential semantics of appurtenance in the broad sense of the term. Thus, within the expression of the genitive in English, two subtypes are to be recognised: the first (principal) is the word genitive; the second (of a minor order) is the phrase genitive. Both of them are not inflexional, but particle case-forms.

Prof. Blokh writes that the English genitive case, on the whole, may be regarded as subsidiary to the syntactic system of prepositional phrases. However, it still displays some differential points in its functional meaning, which, though neutralised in isolated use, are revealed in broader syntagmatic collocations with prepositional phrases.

One of such differential points may be defined as"animate appurtenance" against "inanimate appurtenance" rendered by a prepositional phrase in contrastive use. Cf.:

The *people's* voices drowned in the roar of the started engines. The *tiger's* leap proved quicker than the click of the rifle.

Prof. Blokh writes that there are the following basic **semantic types of the genitive** can be pointed out.

First, the form which can be called t**he "genitive of possessor"** *(Lat.* "genetivus possessori"). Its constructional meaning will be defined as "inorganic" possession, i.e. possessional relation (in the broad sense) of the genitive referent to the object denoted by the head-noun. *E.g.:* Christine's living-room; the assistant manager's desk; Dad's earnings; Kate and Jerry's grandparents; the Steel Corporation's hired slaves.

Second, the form which can be called the **"genitive of integer"** *(Lat.* "genetivus integri"). Its constructional meaning will be defined as "organic possession", i.e. a broad possessional relation of a whole to its part. *E.g.:* Jane's busy hands; Patrick's voice; the patient's health; the hotel's lobby.

A subtype of the integer genitive expresses a qualification received by the genitive referent through the headword. *E.g.:* Mr. Dodson's vanity; the computer's reliability.

This subtype of the genitive can be called the "genitive of received qualification" *(Lat.* "gene- tivus qualificationis receptae").

Third, the "genitive of agent" *(Lat.* "genetivus agentis"). The more traditional name of this genitive is "subjective" *(Lat.* "genetivus subjectivus"). The latter term seems inadequate because of its unjustified narrow application: nearly all the genitive types stand in subjective relation to the referents of the head-nouns. The general meaning of the genitive of agent is explained in its name: this form renders an activity or some broader processual relation with the referent of the genitive as its subject. *E.g.:* the great man's arrival; Peter's insistence; the councillor's attitude; Campbell Clark's gaze; the hotel's competitive position.

A subtype of the agent genitive expresses the author, or, more broadly considered, the producer of the referent of the head-noun. Hence, it receives the name of the **"genitive of author"** *(Lat.* "genetivus auctori"). *E.g.:* Beethoven's sonatas; John Galsworthy's "A Man of Property"; the committee's progress report.

Fourth, the "genitive of patient" *(Lat.* "genetivus patientis").

This type of genitive, in contrast to the above, expresses the recipient of the action or process denoted by the head-noun. *E.g.:* the champion's sensational defeat; Erick's final expulsion; the meeting's chairman; the St Gregory's proprietor; the city's business leaders; the Titanic's tragedy.

Fifth, the "genitive of destination" *(Lat.* "genetivus destinationis"). This form denotes the destination, or function of the referent of the head-noun. *E.g.:* women's footwear; children's verses; a fishers' tent.

Sixth, the "genitive of dispensed qualification" *(Lat.* "genetivus qualificationis dispensatae"). The meaning of this genitive type, as different from the subtype "genitive of received qualification", is some characteristic or qualification, not received, but given by the genitive noun to the referent of the head-noun. *E.g.:* a girl's voice; a book-keeper's statistics; Curtis O'Keefe's kind (of hotels — *M.B.).*

Prof. Blokh writes that under the heading of this general type comes a very important subtype of the genitive which expresses a comparison. The comparison, as different from a general qualification, is supposed to be of a vivid, descriptive nature. The subtype is called the "genitive of comparison" *(Lat.* "genetivus comparationis"). This term has been used to cover the whole class. *E.g.:* the cock's self-confidence of the man; his perky sparrow's smile.

Seventh, the "genitive of adverbial" *(Lat.* "genetivus adverbii"). The form denotes adverbial factors relating to the referent of the head-noun, mostly the time and place of the event. Strictly speaking, this genitive may be considered as another subtype of the genitive of dispensed qualification. Due to its adverbial meaning, this type of genitive can be used with adverbialised substantives. *E.g.:* the evening's newspaper; yesterday's encounter; Moscow's talks.

Eighth, the "genitive of quantity" *(Lat.* "genetivus quantitatis"). This type of genitive denotes the measure or quantity relating to the referent of the head-noun. For the most part, the quantitative meaning expressed concerns units of distance measure, time measure, weight measure. *E.g.:* three miles' distance; an hour's delay; two months' time; a hundred tons' load.

Prof. Blokh writes that the given survey of the semantic types of the genitive is by no means exhaustive in any analytical sense. That the inflexional case of nouns in English has ceased to exist. In its place a new, peculiar two case system has developed based on the particle expression of the genitive falling into two segmental types: the word-genitive and the phrase-genitive.

The personal pronouns are commonly interpreted as having a case system of their own, differing in principle from the case system of the noun. The two cases traditionally recognised here are the nominative case *(I, you, he,* etc.) and the objective case *(me, you, him,* etc.). To these forms the two series of forms of the possessive pronouns are added — respectively, the conjoint series *(my, your, his,* etc.) and the absolute series *(mine, yours, his,* etc.).

As a matter of fact, the categories of the substitute have to reflect the categories of the antecedent, not vice versa. As an example Prof. Blokh writes that we may refer to the category of gender the English gender is expressed through the correlation of nouns with their pronominal substitutes by no other means than the reflection of the corresponding semantics of the antecedent in the substitute. But the proclaimed correlation between the case forms of the noun and the would-be case forms of the personal pronouns is of quite another nature: the nominative "case" of the pronoun has no antecedent case in the noun; nor has the objective "case" of the pronoun any antecedent case in the noun. On the other hand, the only oblique case of the English noun, the genitive, does have its substitutive reflection in the pronoun, though not in the case form, but in the lexical form

of possession (possessive pronouns). And this latter relation of the antecedent to its substitute gives us a clue to the whole problem of pronominal "case": the inevitable conclusion is that there is at present no case in the English personal pronouns; **the personal pronominal system of cases has completely disintegrated,** and in its place the four individual word-types of pronouns have appeared: the nominative form, the objective form, and the possessive form in its two versions, conjoint and absolute.

An analysis of the pronouns based on more formal considerations can only corroborate the suggested approach proceeding from the principle of functional evaluation. In fact, what is traditionally accepted as case-forms of the pronouns are not the regular forms of productive morphological change implied by the very idea of case declension, but individual forms sustained by suppletivity and given to the speaker as a ready-made set. The set is naturally completed by the possessive forms of pronouns, so that actually we are faced by a lexical paradigmatic series of four subsets of personal pronouns, to which the relative *who* is also added*: I — me — my — mine, you — you — your — yours,... who — whom — whose — whose.* Whichever of the former case correlations are still traceable in this system (as, for example, in the sub-series *he—him—his),* they exist as mere relicts, i.e. as a petrified evidence of the old productive system that has long ceased to function in the morphology of English.

Prof. Blokh writes that what should finally be meant by the suggested terminological name "particle case" in English, is that the former system of the English inflexional declension has completely and irrevocably disintegrated, both in the sphere of nouns and their substitute pronouns; in its place a new, limited case system has arisen based on a particle oppositional feature and subsidiary to the prepositional expression of the syntactic relations of the noun.

LECTURE 5. NOUN: ARTICLE DETERMINATION AND VERB: GENERAL

Prof. Blokh writes that article is a determining unit of specific nature accompanying the noun in communicative collocation.

Oppositions constitute the basis of the structure of grammatical paradigms. The article determination is represrnted by 3 member opposition-definite article: indefinite article: zero article. In this opposition the definite article should be interpreted as the strong member by virtue of its identifying and individualising function, while the other forms of article determination should be interpreted as the weak member,

The semantic purpose of the article is to define it in the most general way.

Will you give me *this* pen, Willy? (I.e. the pen that I am pointing out, not one of your choice.) — Will you give me *the* pen, please? (I.e. simply the pen from the desk, you understand which.)

In the absence of a determiner**, the use of the article with the noun is quite obligatory**.

The problem – is the article is a **purely auxiliary element** of a special grammatical form of the noun , **or it is a separate word, i.e. a lexical unit** in the determiner word set.

There are **three** meaningful characterisations of the nounal referent : - one rendered by **the definite article**,one rendered by **the indefinite article**, and one rendered by **the absence (or non-use) of the article.**

The **definite article** expresses the identification or individualisation of the referent of the noun: the use of this article shows that the object denoted is taken in its concrete, individual quality. This meaning can be brought to explicit exposition by a substitution test.

But look at *the* apple-tree!→ But look at *this* apple-tree!

The **indefinite article** expresses a classifying generalisation of the nounal referent, or takes it in a relatively general sense.

We passed *a* water-mill. →We passed *a certain* water-mill. It is *a* very young country, isn't it? → It is *a* very young *kind of* country, isn't it? What *an* arrangement!

As for the various uses of nouns without an article, from the semantic point of view they all should be divided into two types.

1. In the first place, there are uses where the articles are deliberately omitted out of stylistic considerations, for instance, in telegraphic speech, in titles and headlines, in various notices. E.g.: Tele-

gram received room reserved for week end. (The text of a telegram.) Conference adjourned until further notice. (The text of an announcement.) Big red bus rushes 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 in the constructions in the simplest "back-directed" refilling procedures. Cf.:

...→ The telegram is received, a room is reserved for the week-end. ...→ The conference is adjourned until further notice. ...→ A big red bus rushes food to the strikers.

2.There are cases of non-use of the article in various **combinations of fixed type,** such as prepositional phrases (on fire, at hand, in debt, etc.), f**ixed verbal collocations** (take place, make use, cast anchor, etc.), d**escriptive coordinative groups and repetition groups** (man and wife, dog and gun, day by day, etc.), 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 (cf.: in a hurry, at a loss, have a look, give a start, etc.; in the main, out of the question, on the look-out, etc.).

Outside the elliptical constructions and fixed uses, however, we know a really semantic **absence of the article with the noun.**

First. The meaningful absence of the article before the **countable** noun in the singular signifies that the noun is taken in a**n abstract sens**e, expressing the most general idea of the object denoted. This meaning, which may be called the meaning of **"absolute generalisation".**

Law (in general) begins with the beginning of human society.

Second. The absence of the article before the uncountable noun corresponds to the **two kinds of generalisation: both relative and absolute.** To decide which of the two meanings is realised in any particular case, the described tests should be carried out alternately. *Cf.:*

Coffee (a kind of beverage served at the table: r**elative generalisation)** or *tea,* please? *Coffee* (in general: **absolute generalisation**) stimulates the function of the heart.

Third. The absence of the article before **the countable noun in the plura**l, corresponds to both kinds of generalisation.

Stars, planets and *comets* (these kinds of objects: relative generalisation) are different celestial bodies (not terrestrial bodies: relative generalisation).

Prof. Blokh writes that in the situational estimation of the

article uses the definite article serves as an indicator of the type of nounal information which is presented as the "facts already known", i.e. as the starting point of the communication. In contrast to this, the indefinite article or the meaningful absence of the article introduces informative data to be conveyed from the speaker to the listener. 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**".

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 th**e indefinite article or by the meaningful absence** of the article is the "rhematic" predicative. *Cf.:*

The day (subject) was drawing to a close, *the busy noises of the city* (subject) were dying down. How to handle the situation was *a big question* (predicative). The sky was *pure gold* (predicative) above the setting sun.

The next 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 article 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. *Cf.:*The events *chronicled in this narrative* took place some four years ago. (A limiting attribute) She was a person of *strong will and iron self-control.* (A descriptive attribute. The articles become intensely self-dependent in the expression of their categorial semantics, and, against the alien contextual background, traces of transposition can be seen in their use.

Prof. Blokh writes that within the system of the determiners two separate subsets can be defined, one of which is centred around the definite article with its i**ndividualising semantics** *(this — these, that — those, my, our, your, his, her, its, their),* and the other one around the indefinite article with its generalising semantics *(another, some, any*. *The whispering voices* caught the attention of the guards. —*Those whispering voices* caught their attention. What could *a woman* do in a situation like that? — What could *any woman* do in that sort of situation? At least I saw *interest* in her eyes. —At least I saw *some interest* in her eyes. *Not a word* had been pronounced about the terms of the document.— *No word* had been pronounced about those terms.

The English noun, besides the variable categories of number

and case, distinguishes also the category of determination expressed by the article paradigm of **three grammatical forms: the definite, the indefinite, the zero.** The paradigm is generalised for the whole system of the common nouns, being transpositionally outstretched also into the system of proper nouns. On the other hand, the analysis of these cases clearly stamps the traditional proper name combinations with embedded articles, both of the onomastic set *{Alexander the Great,* etc.) and the toponymic set *{The Hague,* etc.)

So the status of the combination of the article with the noun should be defined **as basically analytical,** the article construction as such being localised by its segmental properties between the free syntactic combination of words (the upper bordering level) and the combination of a grammatical affix with a notional stem in the morphological composition of an indivisible word (the lower bordering level). **The article itself is a special type of grammatical auxiliary.**

VERB: GENERAL

In the second part of lecture we will speak about 1.the general notions of the English verb, 2.non-finite verbs(verbids), 3.finite verbs, 4.verb"s person and number, 5.tense, 6.aspect, 7.voice ,8. mood of the English verbs.

Verb is a part of speech which denotes process or state.

Oppositions:finite forms(cat:person.№,tense,aspect,correlation,voice mood)**: non finite forms (** inf+ger+par1+part2; cat: correlation,voice.aspect)**.**

Inf,GER= V+ N,Part1=v+adj,adv,Part2=v+adj

Non verbal character of verbids is revealed through their syntactic F.

Every verb form expresses all his categories simultaneously.

Grammatically the verb is **the most complex part of speech** in its various subclass divisions, as well as in its falling into two sets of forms profoundly different from each other: the finite set and the non-finite set.

The general categorial meaning of the verb is process presented dynamically, i**.e. developing in time.**

Prof. Blokh writes that **the finite verb** performs the function of the verb-predicate, expressing the processual categorial features of predication, i.e. time, aspect, voice, and mood.

The **non-finite verb** performs different functions of the syntactic subject, object, adverbial modifier, attribute.

The verb stems may be s**imple, sound-replacive, stress-replacive, expanded, composite, and phrasal.**

Simple verbs are such verbs as *go, take, read,* etc. But **conversion (zero-suffixation) of the** "noun — verb" type, greatly enlarges the simple stem set of verbs, a cloud — to cloud, a house — to house; a man — to man; a park — to park, etc.

The **sound-replacive type** of derivation food —to feed,

The typical suffixes expanding the stem of the verb are: *-ate -en -ify , -ise(-ize).*

The **composite (compound) verb stems** of the conversion type *(blackmail n. — blackmail v.)* and of the reduction type *(proof-reader n.—proof-read v.).*

Prof. Blokh writes that **the infinitive** occupies a unique position. the principal representative of the verb-lexeme The second factor determining the representative status of the infinitive consists in the infinitive serving as the actual derivative base for all the other regular forms of the verb.

There are **two unequal sets** are identified: the set of verbs of ***full nominative* value (notional verbs),** and the set of verbs of *partial nominative* value (semi-notional and functional verbs). These "predicators" include auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, semi-notional verbid introducer verbs, and link-verbs.

Auxiliary verbs constitute grammatical elements of the categorial forms of the verb. These are the verbs *be, have, d*By way of extension of meaning, they also express relational probability, serving as probability predicators. These two types of functional semantics can be tested by means of*o, shall, will, should, would, may, might.*

Modal verbs are used with the infinitive as predicative markers expressing relational meanings of the subject attitude type, i.e. ability, obligation, permission, advisability, etc.

Prof.Blokh writes that the verbs ***be* and *have*** in the modal meanings "be planned", "be obliged" and the like are considered by many modern grammarians as modal verbs.

Link-verbs introduce the nominal part of the predicate (the predicative) which is commonly expressed by a noun, an adjective, or a phrase

Prof. Blokh writes that ***be* as a link-verb** can be referred to as the "pure link-verb".The link- verbs fall into two main groups:

those that express perceptions and those that express nonperceptional, or "factual" link-verb connection. The main perceptional link-verbs are *seem, appear, look, feel, taste;* the main factual link-verbs are *become, get, grow, remain, keep.*

Prof. Blokh writes that there are some **notional verbs in language that have the power to perform the function of link-verbs** without losing their lexical nominative value.The moon *rose* red.

All the notional verbs can be divided into actional and statal.

Actional verbs express the action performed by the subject, *do, act, perform, make, go, read, learn, discover,*. Statal verbs, denote the state of their subject. *be, live, survive, worry, suffer, rejoice, stand, see, know.*

As representatives of the "purely processual" subclass one might point out the verbs *thaw, ripen, deteriorate, consider, neglect, support, display.*

There are the verbal sets of **mental processes and sensual processes.** Within the first of them we recognise the correlation between the verbs of mental perception and mental activity. *E.g.:* know — think; understand — construe; notice — note; admire — assess; forget — reject; see — look; hear — listen; feel (inactive) — feel 93

While the actional verbs take the form of the continuous aspect quite freely, the statal verbs, in the same contextual conditions, are mainly used in the indefinite form.

Aspective verbal semantics exposes the inner character of the process denoted by the verb. It represents the process as **(continual), (repeated), (concluded), (not concluded), (momentary), (starting), (not developed to its full extent)**, *(begin, start, resume, set out, get down), (burst, click, knock, bang, jump, drop), (terminate, finish, end, conclude, close, solve, resolve, sum up, stop),.*

The verbs presenting a process as potentially limited, can be called **"limitive".** To the subclass of limitive belong such verbs as *arrive, come, leave, find, start, stop, conclude, aim, drop, catch,* etc. Here also belong phrasal verbs with limitive postpositions, *e.g. stand up, sit down, get out, be off,* etc.

The verbs of the second order presenting a process as **not limited** by any border point, should be called, correspondingly, "unlimitive" To this subclass belong such verbs as *move, continue, live, sleep, work, behave, hope, stand,* etc.

Prof. Blokh writes that the combining power of words in relation to other words in syntactically subordinate positions (the positions of "adjuncts") is called their syntac- tic **"valency".**

The syntactic valency falls into two cardinal types: ***obligatory*** **and** ***optional.***

The *obligatory valency* is such as must necessarily be realised for the sake of the grammatical completion of the syntactic construction. the subject and the direct are obligatory valency partners of the verb. Consequently, we say that the subjective and the direct objective valencies of the verb are obligatory. *We* saw a *house* in the distance.

The *optional valency,* this type of valency may or may not be realised adverbial modifiers are optional parts of the sentence, so in terms of valency we say that the adverbial valency of the verb is mostly optional.

The predicative valency of the link-verbs proper is obligatory.

The reporters seemed *pleased* with the results of the press conference. That young scapegrace made *a good husband,* after all.

The adverbials of place, time, and manner (quality) may sometimes be obligatory, as in the examples below:

Mr. Torrence was staying *in the Astoria Hotel.* The described events took place *at the beginning of the century.* The patient is doing *fine.*

SO the notional verbs should be classed as "**complementive" or "uncomplementive**",

Verbal transitivity, as one of the specific qualities of the general "completivity", is the ability of the verb to take a direct object, i.e. an object which is immediately affected by the denoted process. The direct object is joined to the verb "directly", without a preposition. Verbal objectivity is the ability of the verb to take any object, be it direct, or oblique.

The general division of verbs i**nto transitive and intransitive** is morphologically more relevant for Russian than English.

Uncomplementive verbs fall into **two subclasses of "personal" and "impersonal" verbs.**

The personal uncomplementive verbs form a large set: *work, start, pause, hesitate, act, function, materialise, laugh, cough, grow, scatter,* etc.

The subclass of impersonal verbs is small and strictly limited*: rain, snow, freeze, drizzle, thaw,* etc.

Complementive verbs, as follows from the above, are divided into the predicative, objective and adverbial sets.

The main link-verb subsets are, first, the pure link *be;* second,

the specifying links *become, grow, seem, appear, look, taste,* etc.; third, the **notional links.**

The objective complementive verbs fall into **monocomplementive** verbs (taking one object-complement) and **bicomplementive** verbs (taking two complements).

The **monocomplementive objective** verbs fall into five main subclasses. The first subclass is the possession objective verb The second subclass includes direct objective verbs, *e. g. take, grasp, forget, enjoy, like.* The third subclass is formed by the prepositional

objective verbs e.g. *look at, point to, send for, approve of, think about.* The fourth subclass includes non-passivised direct objective verbs, *e.g. cost, weigh, fail, become, suit.* The fifth subclass includes non-passivised prepositional objective verbs, *e. g. belong to, relate to, merge with, confer with, abound in.*

The **bicomplementive objective verbs** fall into **five main subclasses. The first subclass** is formed by addressee-direct objective verbs, i.e. verbs taking a direct object and an addressee object, *e.g.* a) *give, bring, pay, hand, show* (the addressee object with these verbs may be both non-prepositional and prepositional); b) *explain, introduce, mention, say, devote* (the addressee object with these verbs is only prepositional).

The second subclass includes double direct objective verbs, i.e. verbs taking two direct objects, *e.g. teach, ask, excuse, forgive, envy, fine.* **The third subclass** includes double prepositional objective verbs, i.e. verbs taking two prepositional objects, *e.g. argue, consult, cooperate, agree.*

The fourth subclass is formed by addressee prepositional objective verbs, i.e. verbs taking a prepositional object and an addressee object, *e.g. remind of, tell about, apologise for, write of, pay for.*

The fifth subclass includes adverbial objective verbs, i.e. verbs taking an object and an adverbial modifier (of place or of time), *e.g. put, place, lay, bring, send, keep.*

This phenomenon of the **"subclass migration" of verbs** is widely known,

Who *runs* faster, John or *Nick?-(run* — uncomplementive). The man *ran* after the bus. *(run* — adverbial complementive, non-objective). I *ran* my eyes over the uneven lines. *(run* — adverbial objective, transitive). And *is* the fellow still *running* the show? *(run* — monocomplementive, transitive).

The railings *felt* cold. *(feel* — link-verb, predicative complementive).

Prof. Blokh writes that the most plausible solution will be to

interpret the "migration forms" as cases of specific syntactic variation, i.e. to consider the different subclass entries of migrating units as syntactic variants of the same lexemes.

LECTURE 6.
NON-FINITE VERBS (VERBIDS) AND FINITE VERB: INTRODUCTION

Prof. Blokh writes that **verbids are the forms of the verb intermediary between the verb and the non-processual parts of speech.**

They render processes as peculiar kinds of substances and properties. They are formed by special morphemic elements which do not express either grammatical time or mood.

The verbids do betray intermediary features. Still, their fundamental grammatical meaning is processual.

While **the finite forms** serve in the sentence only one syntactic function, namely, that of the finite predicate, **the non-finite forms** serve various syntactic functions other than that of the finite predicate.

The opposition between the finite and non-finite forms of the verb creates a special grammatical category. the verbid has no immediate means of expressing time-mood categorial semantics and therefore presents the weak member of the opposition.

Prof. Blokh writes that **the verbids**, still do express the so-called **"secondary" or "potential" predication**, forming syntactic complexes directly related to certain types of subordinate clauses.

Have you ever had *anything caught in your head?* Have you ever had anything *that was caught in your head?*

That the opposition of the finite verbs and the verbids is based on the expression of the functions of full predication and semi-predication. While the finite verbs express predication in its genuine and complete form, the function of the verbids is to express semi-predication, building up semi-predicative complexes within different sentence constructions.

The English verbids include four forms distinctly differing from one another within the general verbid system: the infinitive, the gerund, the present participle, and the past participle.

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 should be considered as the **head-form** of the whole paradigm of the verb. A. A. Shakhmatov called the infinitive the "verbal nominative". it represents the actual derivation base for all the forms of regular verbs.

The combinability of the infinitive also reflects its dual semantic

nature, in accord with which we distinguish between its verb-type and noun-type connections. The verb-type combinability of the infinitive is displayed in its combining, first, with nouns expressing the object of the action; second, with nouns expressing the subject of the action; third, with modifying adverbs; fourth, with predicator verbs of semi-functional nature forming a verbal predicate; fifth, with auxiliary finite verbs (word-morphemes) in the analytical forms of the verb. The noun-type combinability of the infinitive is displayed in its combining, first, with finite notional verbs as the object of the action; second, with finite notional verbs as the subject of the action.

The self-positional infinitive, in due syntactic arrangements, performs the functions of all types of notional sentence-parts, i. e. the subject, the object, the predicative, the attribute, the adverbial modifier. *Cf.: To meet* the head of the administration and not *to speak* to him about your predicament was unwise, to say the least of it. (Infinitive subject position) The chief arranged *to receive* the foreign delegation in the afternoon. (Infinitive object position) The parents' wish had always been *to see* their eldest son the continuator of their joint scientific work. (Infinitive predicative position) Here again we are faced with a plot *to overthrow* the legitimately elected government of the republic. (Infinitive attributive position) Helen was far too worried *to listen* to the remonstrances. (Infinitive adverbial position)

If the infinitive in free use has its own subject, different from that of the governing construction, it is introduced by the preposition-particle for. The whole infinitive construction of this type is traditionally called the "for-to infinitive phrase". Cf.: For that shy-looking young man to have stated his purpose so boldly — incredible!

The English infinitive exists in **two presentation forms.** One of them, characteristic of the **free uses of the infinitive,** is distinguished by the pre-positional marker to. This form is called traditionally the "to-infinitive", or in more recent linguistic works, the "marked infinitive". The other form, characteristic of the **bound** uses of the infinitive, does not employ the marker to, thereby presenting the infinitive in the shape of the pure verb stem, which in modern interpretation is understood as the zero-suffixed form. This form is called traditionally the "bare infinitive", or in more recent linguistic works, respectively, the "unmarked infinitive".

The infinitive marker to is a word-morpheme, i.e. a special formal particle analogous, mutatis mutandis, to other auxiliary elements in the English grammatical structure. Its only function is to build up and identify the infinitive form as such. The particle to can be used in an isolated position to represent the whole correspond-

ing construction syntagmatically zeroed in the text. Cf.: You are welcome to acquaint yourself with any of the documents if you want to.

Prof.Blokh writes that it can also be separated from its notional, i.e. infinitive part by a word or a phrase, usually of adverbial nature, forming the so-called "split infinitive". Cf.: My task is not to accuse or acquit; my task it to thoroughly investigate, to clearly define, and to consistently systematise the facts.

The infinitive is a categorially changeable form. It distinguishes the three grammatical categories sharing them with the finite verb, namely, the aspective category of development (continuous in opposition), the aspective category of retrospective coordination (perfect in opposition), the category of voice (passive in opposition). Prof.Blokh writes that the categorial paradigm of the infinitive of the objective verb includes **eight forms**: the indefinite active, the continuous active, the perfect active, the perfect continuous active; the indefinite passive, the continuous passive, the perfect passive, the perfect continuous passive. *E.g.:* to take — to be taking — to have taken — to have been taking; to be taken —to be being taken — to have been taken — to have been being taken.

Prof. Blokh writes that **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 a process, but its substantive quality is more strongly pronounced than that of the infinitive. 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.

Since the gerund, like the infinitive, is an abstract name of the process denoted by the verbal lexeme, a question might arise, why the infinitive, and not the gerund is taken as the head-form of the verbal lexeme as a whole, its accepted representative in the lexicon.

As a matter of fact, the gerund cannot perform the function of the paradigmatic verbal head-form for a number of reasons. In the first place, it is more detached from the finite verb than the infinitive semantically, tending to be a far more substantival unit categorially. Then, as different from the infinitive, it does not join in the conjugation of the finite verb. Unlike the infinitive, it is a suffixal form, which makes it less generalised than the infinitive in terms of the formal properties of the verbal lexeme (although it is more abstract in the purely semantic sense). Finally, it is less definite than the infinitive from the lexico-grammatical point of view, being subject to easy

neutralisations in its opposition with the verbal noun in *-ing,* as well as with the present participle. Hence, the gerund is no rival of the infinitive in the paradigmatic head-form function.

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, first, with nouns expressing the object of the action; second, with modifying adverbs; third, with certain semi-functional predicator verbs, but other than modal. Of the noun-type is the combinability of the gerund, first, with finite notional verbs as the object of the action; second, with finite notional verbs as the prepositional adjunct of various functions; third, with finite notional verbs as the subject of the action; fourth, 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, i.e. the subject, the object, the predicative, the attribute, the adverbial modifier. Cf.:

Repeating your accusations over and over again doesn't make them more convincing. (Gerund subject position) No wonder he delayed *breaking* the news to Uncle Jim. (Gerund direct object position) She could not give her mind to *pressing* wild flowers in Pauline's botany book. (Gerund addressee object position) Joe felt annoyed at *being shied* by his roommates. (Gerund prepositional object position) You know what luck is? Luck is *believing* you're lucky. (Gerund predicative position) Fancy the pleasant prospect of *listening* to all the gossip they've in store for you! (Gerund attributive position) He could not push against the furniture without *bringing* the whole lot down. (Gerund adverbial of manner position)

One of the specific gerund patterns is its combination with the noun in the possessive case or its possessive pronominal equivalent expressing the subject of the action. This gerundial construction is used in cases when the subject of the gerundial process differs from the subject of the governing sentence-situation, i.e. when the gerundial sentence-part has its own, separate subject. *E.g.:*

Powell's being rude like that was disgusting. How can she know about *the Morions' being connected* with this unaccountable affair? Will he ever excuse *our having interfered?*

The possessive with the gerund displays one of the distinctive categorial properties of the gerund as such, establishing it in the English lexemic system as the form of the verb with nounal characteristics. As a matter of fact, from the point of view of the inner seman-

tic relations, this combination is of a verbal type, while from the point of view of the formal categorial features, this combination is of a nounal type. It can be clearly demonstrated by the appropriate transformations, i.e. verb-related and noun-related re-constructions. Cf.: I can't stand *his criticising* artistic works that are beyond his competence. (T-verbal →He is criticising artistic works. T-nounal→ His criticism of artistic works.)

Besides combining with the possessive noun-subject, the verbal *ing-form* con also combine with the noun-subject in the common case or its objective pronominal equivalent. *E.g.:* I read in yesterday's paper about *the hostages having been released.*

This gerundial use as presenting very peculiar features of categorial mediality will be discussed after the treatment of the participle.

The formal sign of the gerund is wholly homonymous with that of the present participle: it is the suffix *-ing* added to its grammatically (categorially) leading element.

Like the infinitive, the gerund is a categorially changeable (variable, demutative) form; it distinguishes the two grammatical categories, sharing them with the finite verb and the present participle, namely, the aspective category of retrospective coordination (perfect in opposition), and the category of voice (passive in opposition). Consequently, the categorial paradigm of the gerund of the objective verb includes four forms: the simple active, the perfect active; the simple passive, the perfect passive. *E.g.:* taking — having taken — being taken — having been taken.

The gerundial paradigm of the non-objective verb, correspondingly, includes two forms. *E.g.:* going — having gone. The perfect forms of the gerund are used, as a rule, only in semantically strong positions, laying special emphasis on the meaningful categorial content of the form.

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 is wholly homonymous with the gerund, ending in the suffix *-ing* and distinguishing the same grammatical categories of retrospective coordination and voice.

Prof.Blokh writes that the present participle has no categorial time distinctions, and the attribute "present" in its conventional name is not immediately explanatory; it is used in this book from force of tradition. Still, both terms "present participle" and "past participle" are not altogether devoid of elucidative signification, if not in the categorial sense, then in the deriva- tional-etymological sense, and

are none the worse in their quality than their doublet-substitutes "participle I" and "participle II".

The present participle has its own place in the general paradigm of the verb.

Since it possesses some traits both of adjective and adverb, the present participle is not only dual, but triple by its lexico-grammatical properties, which is displayed in its combinability, as well as in its syntactic functions.

The verb-type combinability of the present participle is revealed, first, in its being combined, in various uses, with nouns expressing the object of the action; second, with nouns expressing the subject of the action (in semi-predicative complexes); third, with modifying adverbs; fourth, with auxiliary finite verbs (word-morphemes) in the analytical forms 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 performs the functions of the predicative *,* the attribute, the adverbial modifier of various types:

The questions became more and more *irritating.* (Present participle predicative position)

She had thrust the crucifix on to the *surviving* baby. (Present participle attributive front-position)

Norman stood on the pavement like a man *watching* his loved one go aboard an ocean liner. (Present participle attributive back-position)

He was no longer the cocky, pugnacious boy, always *squaring up* for a fight. (Present participle attributive back-position, detached).

She went up the steps, *swinging* her hips and *tossing* her fur with bravado. (Present participle manner adverbial back-position)

And *having read* in the papers about truth drugs, of course Gladys would believe it absolutely. (Present participle cause adverbial front-position)

The present participle can build up semi-predicative complexes of objective and subjective types. The two groups of complexes, i.e. infinitival and present participial, may exist in parallel, the *:*

Nobody noticed *the scouts approach the enemy trench.* — Nobody noticed *the scouts approaching the enemy trench with slow, cautious, expertly calculated movements.* Suddenly *a telephone* was heard *to buzz,* breaking the spell. — *The telephone* was heard *vainly buzzing* in the study.

A peculiar use of the present participle is seen in the absolute participial constructions, forming complexes of detached semi-predication. Cf.:

The messenger waiting in the hall, we had only a couple of minutes to make a decision. The dean sat at his desk, *with an electric fire glowing warmly behind the fender at the opposite wall.*

The past participle is the non-finite form of the verb which combines the properties of the v**erb with those of the adjective,** serving as the qualifying-processual name. T**he past participle is a single form, having no paradigm of its own,** it conveys implicitly the categorial meaning of the perfect and the passive.It has no distinct combinability features or syntactic function features specially characteristic of the adverb. The main self-positional functions of the past participle in the sentence are those of the attribute and the predicative. Moyra's *softened* look gave him a new hope. (Past participle attributive front-position).

It is a face *devastated* by passion. (Past participle attributive back-position).

The light is bright and inconveniently *placed* for reading. (Past participle predicative position).

Prof.Blokh writes that the attributive past participle of **limitive verbs** in a neutral context expresses priority, while the past participle of **unlimitive verbs** expresses simultaneity*:*

A tree *broken* by the storm blocked the narrow passage between the cliffs and the water. (Priority in the passive; the implication is "a tree that had been broken by the storm")

I saw that the picture *admired* by the general public hardly had a fair chance with the judges. (Simultaneity in the passive; the implication is "the picture which was being admired by the public")

Prof.Blokh writes that the past participle is capable of making up semi-predicative constructions of complex object, complex subject, as well as of absolute complex.

The past participial complex object is specifically characteristic with verbs of wish and oblique causality *(have, get). Cf.:*

I want *the document prepared* for signing by 4 p.m. Will you have *my coat brushed up,* please?

The absolute past participial complex expresses priority in the correlation of two events. Cf.: *The preliminary talks completed,* it became possible to concentrate on the central point of the agenda.

The past participles of non-objective verbs are included in phraseological or cliche combinations like *faded photographs, fallen*

leaves, a retired officer, a withered flower, dream come true, etc. In these and similar cases the idea of pure quality rather than that of processual quality is expressed, the modifying participles showing the features of adjectivisation.

Prof. Blokh writes that **the past participle** is interpreted as being capable of adverbial-related use, notably in detached syntactical positions, after the introductory subordinative conjunctions. Cf.:

Called up by the conservative minority, the convention failed to pass a satisfactory resolution. Though *welcomed* heartily by his host, Frederick felt at once that something was wrong.

Prof.Blokh writes that past participial constructions display clear cases of syntactic compression. The true categorial nature of the participial forms employed by them is exposed by the corresponding transformational correlations ("back transformations") as being not of adverbial, but of definitely adjectival relation. Cf.:

...→ The convention, *which was called up* by the conservative minority, failed to pass a satisfactory resolution. ...→ Though *he was welcomed* heartily by his host, Frederick felt at once that something was wrong.

Prof.Blokh writes that the infinitive-gerund correlation should first be brought under observation.

Both forms are **substance-processual**, and the natural question that one has to ask about them is, whether the two do not repeat each other by their informative destination and employment. Observations of the actual uses of the gerund and the infinitive in texts do show the clear-cut semantic difference between the forms, which consists in the gerund being, on the one hand, of a more substantive nature than the infinitive, i.e. of a nature nearer to the thingness-signification type; on the other hand, of a more abstract nature in the logical sense proper. Hence, the forms do not repeat, but complement each other.

The difference between the forms in question may be demonstrated by the following examples:

Seeing and *talking* to people made him tired. (As characteristic of a period of his life; as a general feature of his disposition) It made him tired *to see* and *talk* to so many people. (All at a time, on that particular occasion);

Comparing examples like these, we easily notice the **more dynamic**, more actional character of the infinitive as well as of the whole collocations built up around it, and the **less dynamic character** of the corresponding gerundial collocations.

Another category specifi- cally identified within the frame-

work of **substantival verbids** and relevant for syntactic analysis is **the category of modal representation.** This category, pointed out by L. S. Barkhudarov marks the infinitive in contrast to the gerund, and it is revealed in the infinitive having a modal force, in particular, in its attributive uses, but also elsewhere.*:*

This is a kind of peace *to be desired* by all. (A kind of peace that should be desired)

Is there any hope for us *to meet* this great violinist in our town? (A hope that we may meet this violinist)

It was arranged for the mountaineers *to have a rest* in tents before climbing the peak. (It was arranged so that they **could** have a rest in tents)

As for the exclusive use **of the gerund with a set of transitive verbs** *(e.g. avoid, delay, deny, forgive, mind, postpone)* and especially prepositional-complementive verbs and word-groups *(e.g. accuse of, agree to, depend on, prevent from, think of, succeed in, thank for; be aware of, be busy in, be indignant at, be sure of),* we clearly see here the tendency of mutual differentiation and complementation of the substantive verbid forms based on the demonstrated category of processual representation.

Within the gerund-participle correlation, the central point of our analysis will be the very lexico-grammatical identification of the two verbid forms in *-ing* in their reference to each other. Do they constitute two different verbids, or do they present one and the same form with a somewhat broader range of functions than either of the two taken separately?

In the American linguistic tradition which can be traced back to the school of Descriptive Linguistics the two forms are recognised as one integral *V-ing.*

In treating the *ing*-forms as constituting one integral verbid entity, opposed, on the one hand, to the infinitive *(V-to),* on the other hand, to the past participle *(V-en),* appeal is naturally made to the alternating use of the possessive and the common-objective nounal element in the role of the subject of the *ing-form* (mostly observed in various object positions of the sentence).*:*

The comparative evaluations of the actually different uses of the *ing-forms* can't fail to show their distinct categorial differentiation: one range of uses is definitely **noun-related,** definitely of process-substance signification; the other range of uses is definitely **adjective-adverb related,** definitely of process-quality signification. This differentiation can easily be illustrated by specialised gerund-testing

and participle-testing, as well as by careful textual observations of the forms.

The gerund-testing, partly employed while giving a general outline of the gerund, includes the noun-substitution procedure backed by the question-procedure. *Cf.:*

My chance of *getting,* or *achieving,* anything that I long for will always be gravely reduced by the interminable existence of that block. → My chance of *what?* → My chance of *success.*

He insisted on *giving* us some coconuts. → *What* did he insist *on?* → He insisted on *our acceptance* of the gift.

All his relatives somehow disapproved of his *writing* poetry. → *What* did all his relatives disapprove *of?*→ His relatives disapproved of *his poetical work.*

The other no less convincing evidence of the nounal featuring of the form in question is its natural occurrence **in coordinative connections with the noun.***:*

I didn't stop to think of an answer; it came immediately off my tongue without any *pause* or *planning.*

The participle-testing, for its part, includes the adjective-adverb substitution procedure backed by the corresponding question-procedure, as well as some other analogies. *Cf.:*

He was in a *terrifying* condition. → In *what kind* of condition was he?→He was in an *awful* condition. (Adjective substitution procedure)

The participle also enters into easy coordinative and parallel associations with qualitative and stative adjectives*:*

That was a *false,* but *convincing* show of affection.

Of especial significance for the differential verbid identification purposes are the two different types of conversion the compared forms are subject to, namely, **the nounal conversion of the gerund and, correspondingly, the adjectival conversion of the participle.**

Compare the gerund-noun conversional pairs: your *airing* the room to take *an airing* before going to bed; his *breeding* his son to the profession - a person of unimpeachable *breeding;* their *calling* him a liar - the youth's choice of

a *calling* in life.

Compare the participle-adjective conversional pairs: animals *living* in the jungle *living* languages; a man never

daring an open argument - a *daring* inventor; a car *passing* by a *passing* passion.

Prof.Blokh writes that the analysis of the cases presenting

the clear-cut gerund versus present participle difference can be considered as fulfilled. The two ing-forms in question are shown as possessing categorially differential properties establishing them as two different verbids in the system of the English verb.

FINITE VERB: INTRODUCTION

The finite forms of the verb express the processual relations of substances and phenomena making up the situation reflected in the sentence. These forms are associated with one another in an extremely complex and intricate system. The peculiar aspect of the complexity of this system lies in the fact that, as we have stated before, the finite verb is directly connected with the structure of the sentence as a whole. Prof.Blokh writes that the finite verb, through the working of its categories, is immediately related to such sentence-constitutive factors as morphological forms of predication, communication purposes, subjective modality, subject-object relation, gradation of probabilities.

Prof.Blokh writes that each fundamental type of grammatical expression capable of being approached in terms of generalised categories in the domain of the finite verb has created a subject for a scholarly dispute. For instance, taking as an example the sphere of the categorial person and number of the verb, we are faced with the argument among grammarians about the existence or non-existence of the verbal-pronominal forms of these categories. In connection with the study of the verbal expression of time and aspect, the great controversy is going on as to the temporal or aspective nature of the verbal forms of the indefinite, continuous, perfect, and perfect-continuous series. Grammatical expression of the future tense in English is stated by some scholars as a matter-of-fact truth, while other linguists are eagerly negating any possibility of its existence as an element of grammar. The verbal voice invites its investigators to exchange mutually opposing views regarding both the content and the number of its forms. The problem of the subjunctive mood may justly be called one of the most vexed in the theory of grammar: the exposition of its structural properties, its inner divisions, as well as its correlation with the indicative mood vary literally from one linguistic author to another.

As a matter of fact, it is the verb system that, of all the spheres of morphology, has come under the most intensive and fruitful analysis undertaken by contemporary linguistics. In the course of these

studies the oppositional nature of the categorial structure of the verb was disclosed and explicitly formulated; the paradigmatic system of the expression of verbal functional semantics was described competently, though in varying technical terms, and the correlation of form and meaning in the composition of functionally relevant parts of this system was demonstrated explicitly on the copious material gathered.

The following presentation of the categorial system of the English verb is based on **oppositional criteria** worked out in the course of grammatical studies of language by Soviet and foreign scholars.

LECTURE 7.
VERB: PERSON AND NUMBER AND TENSE

Prof. Blokh writes that the c**ategories of person and numbe**r are closely connected with each other.

The analysis of the verbal person and number leads the grammarian to the statement of the converging and diverging features of their forms.

The expression of the c**ategory of person** is essentially confined to the singular form of the verb in the present tense of the indicative mood. As for the past tense, the person is alien to it.

In the present tense the expression of th**e category of person** is divided into t**hree peculiar subsystems.**

The first subsystem includes the modal verbs that have no personal inflexions: *can, may, must, shall, will, ought, need, dare.*

The second subsystem is made up by the unique verbal lexeme *be.* Do not convey the indication of person in any morphemic sense at all, the verb *be* has three different.

The third subsystem presents just the regular, normal expression of person with the remaining multitude of the English verbs.

As for the most of the verbs, the blending of the morphemic expression of the two categories is complete, for the only explicit morphemic opposition in the integral categorial sphere of person and number is reduced with these verbs to the third person singular (present tense, indicative mood) being contrasted against the unmarked finite form of the verb.

The semantic core of the substantival (or pronominal, for that matter) category of person is understood nowadays in terms of deictic, or indicative signification.

The semantic content of the first person is the indication of the person who is speaking. This self-indicative role is performed lexically by the personal pronoun *I.* This listener-indicative function is performed by the personal pronoun *you.* The third person indicates beings, things, and phenomena not immediately included in the communicative situation, first, the speaker himself; second, his listener; third, the non-participant of the communication.

Prof. Blokh writes that t**he category of number** represented in the forms of personal pronouns.

The universal and true indicator of person and number of the subject of the verb will be the subject itself.

There is the obligatory connection between the verb and its

subject.

The English finite verb presented without its person-subject is grammatically almost meaningless. *Thou* plus the verb specific variant of the second person singular with its respective stylistic connotations.

There are some special cases of the subject-verb categorial relations. The bulk of these cases have been treated by traditional grammar in terms of "agreement in sense", or "notional concord".

Here belong, combinations of the finite verb with collective nouns. The verb is used either in the plural, or in the singula*.:*

The government *were* definitely against the bill.

The newly appointed government *has gathered* for its first session.

The verb being given an option of treating it either as a plural or as a singular. *E.g.:*

My heart and soul *belongs* to this small nation .

My emotional self and rational self *have been* at variance.

There are cases of dialectal and colloquial person-number neutralisation. *:*

"Ah! It's pity *you* never *was trained* " (B. Shaw).

"*He don't feel* well" (E. Hemingway).

VERB: TENSE

PRESENT TENSES

(The present indifinite, the present continuous, the present perfect continuous)

All the present tenses refer the actions they denote to the present, that is to the time of speaking. The difference between them lies in the way they treat the categories of aspect and correlation.

The Present Indifinite (The present tense, common aspect, non-perfect)

Meaning. As a present tense fom the present indifinite refers the action which it denotes to the present time in the broad sense. As a common aspect form it bears no indication as to the manner in which the action is performed, that is whether it is perfective (complete) or imperfective (incomlete), momentery or durative (continuous), iterative or inchoative, etc. Any of these meanings can be given to the form by the lexical meaning of the verb or by the context.

Formation. Some of the forms of the present indifinite are synthetic

(affirmative forms), some – analytic (interrogative and negative forms).

The Present Indefinite is used:

1. To state simple facts in the present.
I live in Leningrad.

2. To state laws of nature, the so called general truths and various other rules.
It snows in winter.

3. To denote habitual actions in the present.
I go to the DSTU every day.

4. To denote a succession of actions going on at the moment of speaking.
She comes in, takes off her coat, flungs it on the chair and walks over to the mirror.

5. To expess declarations, announcements, etc. referring to the moment of speaking.
I declare the meeting open.

6. To denote continuous actions goins on the moment og speaking (with statal verbs)

7. To denote future actions
a) With verbs of motion (to go, to come, to start, to leave, to return, to arrive, to sail), ussually if the actions denote a settled plan: I go to Moscow next week
b) In adverbial clauses of time and condition after the conjunctions (when, till, until, as soon as, as long as, before, after, etc): When she comes, ring me up, please.

8. To denote past actions.
a) In newspapers headlines, in the outlines of novels, plays, films, etc.: Dog Saves Its Master.
b) In narratives or stories to express past actions more vividly (the so-called historic present) : It was all so unexpected.

9. To denote completed actions with the meaning of the present perfect (with the verbs to forget, to hear, to be told): I forget your telephone.

The Present Continuous tense.

As a present tense form the present continuous refers the action which denotes to the present, bringing it into direct relation with the moment of speaking. It is used to:

1. To denote continuous actions going on at the moment

of speaking. How happily they are playing.

2. To denote actions characteristic of a certain period of present time, the moment included. As a rule these actions are temporary.

We are studing English now.

3. To denote (for the sake of emphasis) actions in progress referring to all or any time, the moment of speaking included. In this case the adverbials ever, for ever, constantly, always are obligatory. Our solar system together with the Milky Way is constantly moving towardsVega.

4. To denote actions characteristic of certain person within more or less prolonged periods of present time, the moment of speaking included and provoking certain emotions in the speaker (impatience, irritation, disapproval, praise, etc.) Sentences with such forms are always emotionally coloured.

Oh, I have no patience with you. Why are you always losing your things?

5. To denote actions regularly in progress under certain circumstances.

She never smiles when she is dancing.

6. To denote future actions.

She is leaving tomorrow.

7. To denote past actions which form the background to a new development in a narration.

While Fleur is having tea, Little John comes up to her holding her handkerchief.

The Present Perfect

Meaning. As a present tense form the present perfect refers the action it denotes to the action it denotes to the present. Formation. All the forms of the present perfect are depicting actions which took place, but not in the time of it.Has Mum returned? **The Present Perfect Continuous.(has, have been+ part2) i**s used to denote actions in progress. I have been writing since morning.

Usage: The speaker is interested in the mere fac tof the naction. **PAST TENSES** in the English language are represented by the past indefinite, the past continuous, the past perfect and the past perfect cont).

Future tenses are represented by the future indefinite, the future continuous, the future perfect and the future perfect cont).

FUTURE IN THE PAST TENSES in the English language are represented by the future in the past indefinite, the future in the past continuous,the the future in past perfect and the future in the past perfect cont).He said he would soon take up French. She thought that at this time she would be approaching London. He realized that he would have finished this work long before midnight.He SAID THAT HE WOULD HAVE BEEN LIVING FOR 10 YEARS HERE NEXT YEAR.

The sequence of tenses -dependence of the predicate of a subordinate clause on the tense form of the predicate of its principal clause.

Prof. Blokh writes that the immediate expression of grammatical time, or "tense" *(Lat.* tempus), is one of the typical functions of the finite verb.

Time exposes change of phenomena.

Time, as well as space are the basic forms of the existence of matter, time is reflected by man through his perceptions.

This moment of immediate perception, or "present moment", which is continually shifting in time, and the linguistic content of which is the "moment of speech", serves as the demarcation line between the past and the future.

T**he category of primary time**, provides for the absolutive expression of the time of the process denoted by the verb, in reference to the moment of speech. The formal sign of the opposition constituting this category is, with regular verbs, the dental suffix ***-(e)d*** **[-d, -t, -id]**, and with irregular verbs, phonemic interchanges of more or less individual specifications. The opposition is to be rendered by the formula "the past tense — the present tense",

Prof.Blokh writes that there are utterances where the meaning of the past tense stands in contrast with the meaning of some adverbial phrase referring the event to the present moment*: Today* again I *spoke* to Mr. Jones on the matter, and again he *failed* to see the urgency of it.

The seeming linguistic paradox of such cases consists exactly in the fact that their two-type indications of time, one verbal-grammatical, and one adverbial-lexical, approach the same event from two opposite angles. The verb-form shows the process as past and gone, as for the adverbial modifier, it presents the past event as a particular happening, belonging to a more general time situation which is stretched out up to the present moment inclusive.

Transpositional use of the present tense of the verb with the past adverbials, either included in the utterance as such, or else expressed in its contextual envi- ronment.

Then he *turned* the corner, and what do you think *happens* next?

The stylistic purpose of this transposition, known under the name of the "historic present" *(Lat.* praesens historicum) is to create a vivid picture of the event reflected in the utterance.

The combinations of the verbs *shall* and *will* with the infinitive have of late become subject of renewed discussion. Whether these combinations really constitute, together with the categorial expression of verbal tense, or are just modal phrases. The view that *shall* and *will* retain their modal meanings in all their uses was defended by such a recognised linguists as O. Jespersen. Descriptive Linguistics, consider these verbs as part of the general set of modal verbs.

L. S. Barkhudarov objection consists in the demonstration of the double marking of this would-be tense form by one and the same category. Prof. Blokh writes that in analysing the English future tenses, the **modal factor,** naturally, should be thoroughly taken into consideration. **A certain modal colouring of the meaning of the English future cannot be denied**, especially in the verbal form of the first person. But then, as is widely known, the expression of the future in other languages is not disconnected from modal semantics either; and this is conditioned by the mere fact that the future action, as different from the present or past action, cannot be looked upon as a genuine feature of reality. Indeed, it is only foreseen, or anticipated, or planned, or desired, or otherwise prospected for the time to come.

Prof Blokh M. J. writes that **the future of the English verb is highly specific** in so far as its auxiliaries in their very immediate etymology are words o**f obligation and volition,** and the survival of the respective connotations in them is backed by the inherent quality of the future as such. Still, on the whole, the English categorial future differs distinctly from the modal constructions with the same predicator verbs.

In the clear-cut modal uses of the verbs *shall* and *will* the idea of the future either is not expressed at all, or else is only rendered by way of textual connotation, the central semantic accent being laid on the expression of obligation, necessity, inevitability, promise, intention, desire. These meanings may be easily seen both on the examples of ready phraseological citation, and genuine everyday conversation exchanges. *Cf.:* None are so deaf as those who *will not hear* (phraseological citation). → None are so deaf as those who do not want to hear. ...

Granted our semantic intui- tions about the exemplified

uses are true, the question then arises: what is the real difference, if any, between the two British first person expressions of the future, one with *shall,* the other one with *will?* Or are they actually just semantic doublets, i.e. units of complete synonymy, bound by the paradigmatic relation of free alternation?

A solution to this problem is to be found on the basis of syntactic distributional and transformational analysis backed by a consideration of the original meanings of both auxiliaries.

Prof Blokh M. J. writes that observing combinations with ***will*** in stylistically neutral collocations, as the first step of our study we note **the adverbials of time used with this construction.** The environmental expressions, as well as implications, of future time do testify that from this point of view there is no difference between *will* and *shall,* both of them equally conveying the idea of the future action expressed by the adjoining infinitive.

The first person ***will*-future expresses an action which is to be performed by the speaker for choice, of his own accord.** But this meaning of free option does not at all imply that the speaker actually wishes to perform the action, or else that he is determined to perform it, possibly in defiance of some contrary force. The exposition of the action shows it as being not bound by any extraneous circumstances or by any special influence except the speaker's option; this is its exhaustive characteristic. In keeping with this, the form of the *will*-future in question may be tentatively called the **"voluntary future".**

Comparing the environmental characteristics of *shall* with the corresponding environmental background of *will,* it is easy to see that, as different from *will,* **the first person *shall* expresses a future process that will be realised without the will of the speaker, irrespective of his choice.** In accord with the exposed meaning, the *shall*-form of the first person future should be referred to as the **"non-voluntary"**, i.e. as the weak member of the corresponding opposition.

Prof Blokh M. J. writes that within the system of the English future tense a peculiar minor category is expressed which affects only the forms of the first person. The category is constituted by the opposition of the forms *will +* Infinitive and *shall +* Infinitive expressing, respectively, the voluntary future and the non-voluntary future. Accordingly, this category may tentatively be called the **"category of futurity option"**.

This **category is neutralised in the contracted form *-'ll,*** which is of necessity indifferent to the expression of futurity option. As is known, the traditional anal- ysis of the contracted future

states that *-'ll* stands for *will,* not for *shall.* However, this view is not supported by textual data. Indeed, bearing in mind the results of our study, it is easy to demonstrate that the contracted forms of the future may be traced both to *will* and to *shall. Cf.:*

I'll marry you then, Archie, if you really want it (M. Dickens). → I *will marry* you. I *'ll have* to think about it (M. Dickens). → *I shall have* to think about it.

Prof Blokh M. J. writes that **in American English,** where the future form of the first person is functionally equal with the other persons. In British English a possible tendency to a similar levelled expression of the future is actively counteracted by the two structural factors.

The first is the existence of the two functionally differing contractions of the future auxiliaries in the negative form, i. e. *shan't* and *won't,* which imperatively support the survival of *shall* in the first person against the levelled positive (affirmative) contraction *-'ll.*

The second is the use of the future tense in interrogative sentences, where with the first person only *shall* is normally used. Indeed, it is quite natural that a genuine question directed by the speaker to himself, i.e. a question showing doubt or speculation, is to be asked about an action of non-wilful, involuntary order, and not otherwise. *Cf.:* What *shall* we *be shown* next? *Shall* I *be able* to master shorthand professionally? The question was, *should* I *see* Beatrice again before her departure?

H. W. Fowler made his significant statement: ".. o**f the English of the English *shall* and *will* are the shibboleth."(slogans)**

. Apart from ***shall/will* + Infinitive construction,** there is another construction in English which has a potent appeal for being analysed within the framework of the general problem of the future tense. This is the combination of the predicator *be going* with the infinitive. I

The combination may denote a sheer intention (either the speaker's or some other person's) to perform the action expressed by the infinitive, thus entering into the vast set of "classical" modal constructions. *E.g.:*

I *am going to ask* you a few more questions about the mysterious disappearance of the document, Mr. Gregg.

But these simple modal uses of *be going* are countered by cases where the direct meaning of intention rendered by the predicator stands in contradiction with its environmental implications and is subdued by them. *Cf.:*

You are trying to frighten me. But you *are not going to*

frighten me any more (L. Hellman). I did not know how I *was going to get out* of the room (D. du Maurier).

Moreover, the construction, despite its primary meaning of intention, presupposing a human subject, is not infrequently used with non-human subjects and even in impersonal sentences. *Cf.:*

She knew what she was doing, and she was sure it *was going to be* worth doing (W. Saroyan).

Prof Blokh M. J. writes that the non-intention uses of the predicator *be going* are **not indifferent stylistically.** Far from being neutral, they more often than not display **emotional colouring** mixed with semantic connotations of oblique modality.

For instance, when the girl from the first of the above examples appreciates something as "going to be worth doing", she is expressing her assurance of its being so. When one labels the rain as "never going to stop", one clearly expresses one's annoyance at the bad state of the weather. When a future event is introduced by the formula "there to be going to be", as is the case in the second of the cited examples, the speaker clearly implies his foresight of it, or his anticipation of it, or, possibly, a warning to beware of it, or else some other modal connotation of a like nature.

The process of neutralisation is connected with the shifting of the forms of primary time (present and past) from the sphere of absolute tenses into the sphere of relative tenses.

One of the typical cases of the neutralisation in question consists in using a non-future temporal form to express a future action which is to take place according to some plan or arrangement. *Cf.:*

The government *meets* in emergency session today over the question of continued violations of the cease-fire.

Another type of neutralisation of the prospective time opposition is observed in modal verbs and modal word combinations. The basic peculiarity of these units bearing on (he expression of time is, that the prospective implication is inherently in-built in their semantics, which reflects not the action as such, but the attitude towards the action expressed by the infinitive. For that reason, the present verb-form of these units actually renders the idea of the future (and, respectively, the past verb-form, the idea of the future-in-the-past). *Cf.:*

There's no saying what *may happen* next. At any rate, the woman *was sure to come* later in the day. But you *have to present* the report before Sunday, there's no alternative.

Sometimes the explicit ex- pression of the future is

sary even with modal collocations. To make up for the lacking categorial forms, special modal substitutes have been developed in language, some of which have received the status of **suppletive units*:***

But do not make plans with David. You *will not be able* to carry them out. Things *will have to go* **one** way **or the other**

There is still **another typical case of neutralisation** of the analysed categorial opposition, which is strictly obligatory. It occurs in clauses of time and condition whose verb-predicate expresses a future action. *Cf.:*

If things *turn out* as has been arranged, the triumph will be all ours. I repeated my request to notify me at once whenever the messenger *arrived.*

The latter type of neutralisation is syntactically conditioned. In point of fact, the neutralisation consists here in the primary tenses shifting from the sphere of absolutive time into the sphere of relative time, since they become dependent not on their immediate orientation towards the moment of speech, but on the relation to another time level, namely, the time level presented in the governing clause of the corresponding complex sentence.

This kind of neutralising relative use of absolutive tense forms occupies a restricted position in the integral tense system of English.

1.He *said* that he *was learning* German (then).

2.He *said* that he *had learned* German (before).

3.He *said* that he *would learn* German (in the time to come).

LECTURE 8.
VERB: ASPECT AND VOICE

VOICE

Voice is the gratmmaical category of the verb denoting the relationship between the action expressed by the verb and the peraon or non-person denoted by the subject of the sentence. There are two voices in English: the active voice and the passive voice. **The active voice** indicates thet the action is directed from the subject or issues from the subject, thes subject denotes the doer (agent) of the action. **The passive voice** indicates that the action is directed towards the subject. Hare the subject expresses a person or non-person who is the receive of the acton. It does not act, but is acted upon and therefore affected by the action of the verd. The subject of an active construction denotes the agent (doer) or the action, which may be a living being, or any source of the action (a thing, a natural phenomenon, an abstract notion). The subject of a passive construction has the meaning of the receiver of the action. The **passive verb forms** are analytical:Students are examined twice a year. Students are being exained. Our students have already been examined.

There is a certain group of monotransitive verbs which are never used in the passive voice at all , or in some of their meanings, they are : to have , to lack, to become, to fit , to suit, to resemble:John resembles his father. (John looks like his father.) No passive construction is possible, if the object is a that-clause, an infinitive or a gerund.John said that everything was all right.

The Use of the Passive Voice.

The passive voice is widely used in English. It is used alongiside the active voice in written and spoken English. Passive constructions are often used instead of active constructions in sentences beginning with an indefinite pronoun: Somebody left the dog in the garden- the dog was left in the garden by somebody. The speaker is interested in what happens to the person or thing denoted by the subgect :We were brought up together.

There are a nuber of conventional expression where the passive voice is constantly used: The novel was published in 1929. Shakespeare was born in 1564. Stylisti- cally the passive voice is more

characteristic of scientific than of imaginative prose. It constantly occurs in newspaper items, which are meant to inform the reader of what has happened to people, things or nations.

Prof. Bloch M.J. writes that the voice of the English verb is expressed by the opposition of the passive form of the verb to the active form of the verb. The sign marking the passive form is the combination of the auxiliary *be* with the past participle of the conjugated verb. The passive form as the strong member of the opposition expresses reception of the action by the subject of the syntactic construction (i.e. the "passive" subject, denoting the object of the action); the active form as the weak member of the opposition leaves this meaning unspecified, i.e. it expresses "non-passivity".

The category of voice has a much broader representation in the system of the English verb than in the system of the Russian verb, since in English not only transitive, but also intransitive objective verbs including prepositional ones can be used in the passive (the preposition being retained in the absolutive location). Besides, verbs taking not one, but two objects, as a rule, can feature both of them in the position of the passive subject*:*

I've just *been rung up* by the police.

The diplomat *was refused* transit facilities through London.

Prof.Blokh writes that not all the verbs capable of taking an object are actually used in the passive. In particular, the passive form is alien to many verbs of the statal subclass (displaying a weak dynamic force), such as *have* (direct possessive meaning), *belong, cost, resemble, fail, misgive,* etc. Thus, in accord with their relation to the passive voice, all the verbs can be divided into two large sets: the set of passivised verbs and the set of non-passivised verbs.

As a regular categorial form of the verb, the passive voice is combined in the same lexeme with other oppositionally strong forms of the verbal categories of the tense-aspect system, i.e. the past, the future, the continuous, the perfect. The future continuous passive, as well as the perfect continuous passive are practically not used in speech.

All the previously described categories reflect various characteristics of processes, both direct and oblique, as certain facts of reality existing irrespective of the speaker's perception. For instance, the verbal category of person expresses the personal relation of the process. The verbal number, together with person, expresses its person-numerical relation. The verbal primary time denotes the absolutive timing of the process, i.e. its timing in reference to the moment of speech. The category of prospect expresses the timing of the

process from the point of view of its relation to the plane of posteriority. Finally, the analysed aspects characterise the respective inner qualities of the process. So, each of these categories does disclose some actual property of the process denoted by the verb, adding more and more particulars to the depicted processual situation. But we cannot say the same about the category of voice. All the functional distinctions of the passive, both categorial and contextual-connotative, are sustained in its use with verbids.

For instance, in the following passive infinitive phrase the categorial object-experience-featuring is accompanied by the logical accent of the process characterising the quality of its situational object (expressed by the subject of the passive construction): This is an event never *to be forgotten.*

Cf. the corresponding sentence-transform: This event *will* never *be forgotten.*

The gerundial phrase that is given below, conveying the principal categorial meaning of the passive, suppresses the exposition of the indefinite subject of the process: After *being* wrongly *delivered,* the letter found its addressee at last.

Cf. the time-clause transformational equivalent of the gerundial phrase: After the letter *had been* wrongly *delivered,* it found its addressee at last.

The following passive participial construction in an absolutive position accentuates the resultative process: The enemy batteries *having been put* out of action, our troops continued to push on the offensive.

Cf. the clausal equivalent of the construction: When the enemy batteries *had been put* out of action, our troops continued to push on the offensive.

The past participle of the objective verb is passive in meaning, and phrases built up by it display all the cited characteristics. *E. g.: Seen* from the valley, the castle on the cliff presented a fantastic sight.

Cf. the clausal equivalent of the past participial phrase: When it *was seen* from the valley, the castle on the cliff presented a fantastic sight. The big problem in connection with the voice identification in English is the problem of "medial" voices, i.e. the functioning of the voice forms in other than the passive or active meanings.

1)I *will shave* and *wash,* and be ready for breakfast in half an hour. I'm afraid Mary *hasn't dressed up* yet. Now I see your son *is* thoroughly *preparing* for the entrance examinations.

This kind of verbal mean- ing of the action performed by

the subject upon itself is classed as "reflexive"

2)The same meaning can be rendered explicit by combining the verb with the reflexive "self-pronoun: I *will shave myself, wash myself;* Mary *hasn't dressed herself up* yet; your son *is* thoroughly *preparing himself.*

3)Let us take examples of another kind:

The friends *will be meeting* tomorrow. Unfortunately, Nellie and Christopher *divorced* two years after their magnificent marriage. *Are* Phil and Glen *quarrelling* again over their toy cruiser?

This verbal meaning of the action performed by the subjects in the subject group on one another is called "reciprocal". As is the case with the reflexive meaning, the reciprocal meaning can be rendered explicit by combining the verbs with special pronouns, namely, the reciprocal pronouns: the friends will be meeting one another; Nellie and Christopher divorced each other; the children are quarrelling with each other.

Prof.Blokh writes that it is natural to understand the "middle" voice uses of verbs as cases of neutralising reduction of the voice opposition. The peculiarity of the voice neutralisation of this kind is, that the weak member of opposition used in the position of neutralisation does not fully coincide in function with the strong member, but rather is located somewhere in between the two functional borders. Hence, its "middle" quality is truly reflected in its name. Compare the shown middle type neutralisation of voice in the infinitive: She was delightful *to look at,* witty *to talk to* — altogether the most charming of companions. You have explained so fully everything there is *to explain* that there is no need for me to ask questions.

ASPECT

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 corresponding category is effected between the continuous and the non-continuous (indefinite) verbal forms.

The perfect, as different from the continuous, does reflect a kind of timing, though in a purely relative way. Namely, it coordinates two times, locating one of them in retrospect towards the other. The true nature of the perfect is temporal aspect reflected in its own opposition, which cannot be reduced to any other opposition of the otherwise recognised verbal categories. The suggested name for this cat-

egory will be "retrospective coordination", or, contractedly, "retrospect".

The aspective category of development is non-continuous, or indefinite forms of the verb. The marked member of th constituted by the opposition of the continuous forms of the verb to thee opposition is the continuous, which is built up by the auxiliary *be* plus the present participle of the conjugated verb. In symbolic notation it is represented by the formula *be...ing.* The categorial meaning of the continuous is "action in progress"; the unmarked member of the opposition, the indefinite, leaves this meaning unspecified, i.e. expresses the non-continuous..

The traditional analysis placed them among the tense-forms of the verb, defining them as expressing an action going on simultaneously with some other action. This temporal interpretation of the continuous was most consistently developed in the works of **H. Sweet and O. Jespersen.** In point of fact, the continuous usually goes with a verb which expresses a simultaneous action, but, as we have stated before, the timing of the action is not expressed by the continuous as such — rather, the immediate time-meaning is conveyed by the syntactic constructions, as well as the broader semantic context in which the form is used, since action in progress, by definition, implies that it is developing at a certain time point.

At the second stage of the interpretation of the continuous, the form was understood as rendering a blend of temporal and aspective meanings — the same as the other forms of the verb obliquely connected with the factor of time, i.e. the indefinite and the perfect. This view was developed by I. P. Ivanova.

The combined temporal-aspective interpretation of the continuous, in general, should be appraised as an essential step forward, because, first, it introduced on an explicit, comprehensively grounded basis the idea of aspective meanings in the grammatical system of English; second, it demonstrated the actual connection of time and aspect in the integral categorial semantics of the verb.

This latter phase of study, initiated in the works of A. I.Smirnitsky, V. N. Yartseva and B. A. Ilyish, was developed further by B. S. Khaimovich and B. I. Rogovskaya and exposed in its most comprehensive form by L. S. Barkhudarov.

The opposition of the category of development undergoes various reductions, in keeping with the general regularities of the grammatical forms functioning in speech, as well as of their paradigmatic combinability

The easiest and most regu- lar neutralisational relations in the

sphere **continuous — indefinite** are observed in connection with the subclass division of verbs into limitive and unlimitive, and within the unlimitive into actional and statal.

Namely, the unlimitive verbs are very easily neutralised in cases where the continuity of action is rendered by means other than aspective. *Cf.:*

The night is wonderfully silent. The stars *shine* with a fierce brilliancy, the Southern Cross and Canopus; there is not a breath of wind. On the other hand, the continuous can be used transpositionally to denote habitual, recurrent actions in emphatic collocations. *Cf.:* Miss Tillings said you *were* always *talking* as if there had been some funny business about me (M. Dickens). **The category of retrospective coordination (retrospect)** is constituted by the opposition of the perfect forms of the verb to the non-perfect, or imperfect forms. The marked member of the opposition is the perfect, which is built up by the auxiliary *have* in combination with the past participle of the conjugated verb. In symbolic notation it is expressed by the formula *have ... en.*

The functional meaning of the category has been interpreted in linguistic literature in four different ways, each contributing to the evolution of the general theory of retrospective coordination.

The first grammatical exposition of the perfect verbal form was the "tense view": by this view the perfect is approached as a peculiar tense form. The tense view of the perfect is presented in the works of **H. Sweet, G. Curme, M. Bryant and J. R. Aiken,** and some other foreign scholars. In the Soviet linguistic literature this view was consistently developed by N. F. Irtenyeva. The tense interpretation of the perfect was also endorsed by the well-known course of English Grammar by M. A. Ganshina and N. M. Vasilevskaya.

The difference between the perfect and non-perfect forms of the verb, according to the tense interpretation of the perfect, consists in the fact that the perfect denotes a secondary temporal characteristic of the action.

The second grammatical interpretation of the perfect was the "aspect view": according to this interpretation the perfect is approached as an aspective form of the verb. The aspect view is presented in the works of M. Deutschbein, E.A. Sonnenschein, A. S. West, and other foreign scholars. In the Soviet linguistic literature the aspective interpretation of the perfect was comprehensively developed by G. N. Vorontsova. This subtle observer of intricate interdependencies of language masterly demonstrated the idea of the successive connection of two events ex- pressed by the perfect, promi-

nence given by the form to the transference or "transmission" of the accessories of a pre-situation to a post-situation. The great merit of **G. N. Vorontsova's** explanation of the aspective nature of the perfect lies in the fact that the resultative meaning ascribed by some scholars to the perfect as its determining grammatical function is understood in her conception within a more general destination of this form, namely as a particular manifestation of its transmissive functional semantics.

The third grammatical interpretation of the perfect was the "tense-aspect blend view"; in accord with this interpretation the perfect is recognised as a form of double temporal-aspective character, similar to the continuous. The tense-aspect interpretation of the perfect was developed in the works of **I. P. Ivanova.** According to I. P. Ivanova, the two verbal forms expressing temporal and aspective functions in a blend are contrasted against the indefinite form as their common counterpart of neutralised aspective properties.

The achievement of the tense-aspect view of the perfect is the fact that it demonstrates the actual double nature of the analysed verbal form, its inherent connection with both temporal and aspective spheres of verbal semantics.

The categorial individuality of the perfect was shown as a result of study conducted by the eminent Soviet linguist **A. I. Smirnitsky.** His conception of the perfect, the fourth in our enumeration, may be called the "time correlation view", to use the explanatory name he gave to the identified category. What was achieved by this brilliant thinker, is an explicit demonstration of the fact that the perfect form, by means of its oppositional mark, builds up its own category, different from both the "tense" (present — past — future) and the "aspect" (continuous — indefinite), and not reducible to either of them.

LECTURE 9.
MOOD OF THE VERB AND ADJECTIVE

Prof. Blokh writes that the meaning of this category is the attitude of the speaker or writer towards the content of the sentence.

The indicative mood indicates that what is said must be regarded as a fact, as something which has occurred or is occurring at the moment of speaking or will occur in the future.

The imperative mood expresses a command or a request to perform an action addressed to somebody,. As it does not actually denote a specific action it has no tense category; the action always refers to the future. Aspect distinctions are not characteristic of the imperative mood.

The imperative mood form with the plain stem of the verb, for example: *Come here! Sit down.* The negative form is built by means of the auxiliary do. Do not take it away. Do is also used in commands or requests to make them more emphatic: Do be quiet.

In commands and requests addressed to a third person or persons the analytical form let ... +infinitive is used. When the person addressed is denoted by a personal pronoun, it is used in the objective case: Let us go together.

In negative sentences the analytical forms take the particle not without an auxiliary: Let us not argue on the matter. Thus let us do smth denotes an invitation for action, not an order or a request. Let him do it retains to some extent the meaning of permission.

In the form let me (let me do it) the first person singular does not convey any imperative meaning and should not therefore be regarded as the imperative. It conveys the meaning of I am eager to do it, allow me to do it.

The Subjunctive Mood

The subjunctive mood is the category of the verb which is used

to express unreal or hypothetical actions or states. A hypothetical action or state may be viewed upon as desired, necessary, possible, supposed. imaginary, or contradicting reality.

The Synthetic Forms

I. The present subjunctive coincides with the verb stem (be, go, see) for all persons in both the singular and the plural.

He required that all be kept secret.

II. The past subjunctive is even more restricted in its usage; it exists in Modern English only in the form were, which is used for all persons both in the singular and the plural. It refers the hypothetical action to the present or future and shows that it contradicts reality.- If I were you!

The Analytical Forms

Most of the later formations are analytical, built by means of the auxiliaries, which have developed from the modal verbs should and would, plus any from of the infinitive. The auxiliaries, generally called mood auxiliaries, have lost their lexical meaning. However much you may argue, he will do as he pleases (expresses possibility).

I. The forms should + infiitive (for the first person singular and plural) and would + infinitive (for the other persons). This system coincides in form with the future in the past and is parallel to the future indefinite tense in the indicative mood. These forms may be used either in a simple sentence or in a subordinate clause. These forms dendote hypothetical actions, either imagined as resulting from hypothetical conditions, or else presented as a real possibility.

I should not praise the boy so much. He may get spoiled.

II. The form would + infinitive for all persons, both singular and plural. This form is highly specialised in meaning; it expresses a desirable action in the future. It may be used both in simple and complex senteces. He would gladly accept the invitation.

If I were you would go there too.

The Subjunctive Mood and the Tense Category

The category of tense in the subjuncitive mood is different from that in the indicative mood: unlike the indicative mood system in which there are three distinct time-spheres (past, present, future), time-reference of unreality is based on the following opposition in meaning: imagined, but still possible : imagined, no longer possible (referring to the present or (referring to the past) future i)

The difference in meaning is expressed by means of the following contrasting forms:

1) The indefinite or continuous infinitive as contrasted with the perfect or perfect contiuous infinitive in the analytical forms with should, would, and quasi-subjunctive forms with "may (might)" .
Referring to the Present or Future Referring to the Past
I fear lest he should escape. I fear lest he sould have escaped.

2) The old synthetic forms (he be, he come, he were). These have no corresponding opposition in time-reference.

3) The form of the non-factual past perfect and past perfect continuous.

Referring to the Present or Future Referring to the Past

If I knew. If I had known.

Structurally Determind Use of Subjunctive Mood Forms
In Modern English the choice of the subjuncitive mood form is determined by the structure of the sentence or clause.

The Use of the Subjunctive Mood in Subject Clauses

1. The use of the subjunctive mood forms in subject clauses in complex senteces of the type It is necessary that you should come.

Should + infinitive or present subjunctive is generally used in this pattern of the subordinate clause.

It is cruel that I should make him suffer.

In exclamatory complex sentences: How wonderful that she should have such a feelig for you!

If the principal clause expresses possibility (it is probable, possible, likely) may (might) + infinitive is used.

It is likely the weather may change. In negative and interrogative sentences, however, should + infinitive is used:

It is not possible that he should have guessed it.

2. After the principal clause expressing time-it is time, it is high time-the past subjuncitive or non-factual forms are used.

It is time you went to bed.

It is high time he were more serious.

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 a 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.

The category of mood expresses the outer interpretation of the action as a whole, namely, the speaker's introduction of it as actual or imaginary.

Thus, we distinguish the indicated mood form of the verb in sentences like *"Happen* what may", "God *forgive* us", "Long *live* our friendship", "It is important that he *arrive* here as soon as possible", and also "The agreement stipulates that the goods *pass* customs free", "It is recommended that the elections *start* on Monday", "My orders are that the guards *draw up",* etc.

Semantical observation of the constructions with the analysed verbal form shows that within the general meaning of desired or hypothetical action, it signifies different attitudes towards the process denoted by the verb and the situ- ation denoted by the construction

built up around it, namely, besides desire, also supposition, speculation, suggestion, recommendation, inducement of various degrees of insistence including commands.

Thus, the analysed form-type presents the *mood of attitudes.* Traditionally it is called "subjunctive" So, what we are describing now, is the spective form of the subjunctive mood, or, in keeping with the usual working linguistic parlance, simply the *spective mood,* in its pure, classical manifestation. The imperative form displays every property of a form of attitudes, which can easily be shown by means of equivalent transformations. *Cf.:Be* off! → I demand that you *be* off. *Do be* careful with the papers! → My request is that you *do be* careful with the papers. *Do* as I ask you! → I insist that you *do* as I ask you. About *turn!* → I command that you *turn* about.

Let us take it for demonstrated, then, that the imperative verbal forms may be looked upon as a variety of the spective manifestation.

The first construction type of attitude series is formed by the combination *may/might +* Infinitive. It is used to express wish, desire, hope in the contextual syntactic conditions similar to those of the morphemic (native) spective forms. *Cf.: May* it *be* as you wish!

The second construction type of attitude series is formed by the combination *should +* Infinitive. It is used in various subordinate predicative units to express supposition, speculation, suggestion, recommendation, inducements of different kinds and degrees of intensity. *Cf.:*Whatever they *should say* of the project, it must be considered seriously.

The third construction type of the same series is formed by the combination *let* + Objective Substantive+Infinitive. It is used to express inducement (i.e. an appeal to commit an action) in relation to all the persons, but preferably to the first person plural and third person both numbers*: Let's agree* to end this wait-and-see policy. *Let him repeat* the accusation in Tim's presence. They are more universal stylistically than the pure spective form, in so far as they are less bound by conventions of usage and have a wider range of expressive connotations of various kinds. we propose to unite them under the tentative heading of **the "modal" spective mood forms,** or, by way of the usual working contraction, the modal spective mood, as contrasted against the "pure" spective expressed by native morphemic means .

The functional varieties of the modal spective, i.e. its specialised forms, as is evident from the given examples, should be classed as, first, the "desiderative" series (*may*-spective, the form of de-

sire); second, the "considerative" series *(should*-spective, the form of considerations); third, the "imperative" series (*let*-spective, the form of commands).

The approach based on the purely morphemic principles leads us here also to the identification of the specific form of the conjugated *be* as the only native manifestation of the categorial expression of unreal process. *E.g.:*Oh, that he *were* together with us now!

Discriminative marks of the subjunctive elsewhere. Luckily, we don't have to wander very far in search of them, but discover them in the explicitly distinctive, strikingly significant correlation of the aspective forms of retrospective coordination.

I'*m sure* if she *tried,* she *would manage* to master riding not later than by the autumn, for all her unsporting habits

(simultaneity — posteriority in the present). I *was sure*

if she *tried,* she *would manage* it by the next autumn (simultaneity — posteriority in the past).

Pure spective modal spective, the past subjunctive is mood of reasoning by the rule of contraries, The difference is, that the systemic sets of the past subjunctive are functional invariants, semantically complementing each other in the construction of complex sentences reflecting the causal-conditional relations of events.

The subjunctive past is called by some grammarians "subjunctive two". Since we have reserved the term "subjunctive" for denoting the mood of unreality as a whole, another functional name should be chosen for this particular form-type of the subjunctive.

We have already stated that the most typical use of the past unposterior subjunctive is connected with the expression of unreal actions in conditional clauses (see examples cited above).In all the other cases of its use the idea of unreal condition is, if not directly expressed, then implied by way of "subtext". These are constructions of concession and comparison, expressions of urgency, expressions of wish introduced independently and in object clauses. Let us examine them separately.

The subjunctive form under analysis in its various uses does express the unreality of an action which constitutes a condition for the corresponding consequence. Provided our observation is true, and the considered subjunctive uses are essentially those of stipulation, the appropriate explanatory term for this form of the subjunctive would be "stipulative". Thus, the subjunctive form-type which is referred to on the structural basis as the past unposterior, on the functional basis will be referred to as stipulative.

Now let us consider the form-type of the subjunctive which structurally presents the past posterior.Prof. Blokh writes that 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. *Cf.*: If the peace-keeping force had not been on the alert, the civil war in that area *would have resumed* anew.implication.

And the appropriate term for this united system of the past-tense subjunctive will be "conditional".

The non-modal forms of the subjunctive can be called, respectively, **subjunctive one (spective), subjunctive two (stipulative), subjunctive three (consective);** against this background, the modal spective can simply be referred to as the modal subjunctive, which will exactly correspond to its functional nature in distinction to the three "pure" subjunctive forms.

ADJECTIVE

Prof.Blokh writes that **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, dimensions, position, state, and other characteristics both permanent and temporary.

Prof. Blokh writes that **adjectives do not possess a full nominative value.** Indeed, words like *long, hospitable, fragrant* cannot effect any self-dependent nominations; as units of informative sequences they exist only in collocations showing what is long, who is hospitable, what is fragrant.

The semantically bound character of the adjective is emphasised in English by the use of the prop-substitute *one* in the absence of the notional head-noun of the phrase. *E.g.:* I don't want *a yellow balloon,* let me have *the green one* over there.

Adjectives are distinguished by a specific combinability with nouns, which they modify.

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

***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 — a *wooden* hut; mathematics — *mathematical* precision;

Qualitative **adjectives** denote various qualities of substances which admit of a quantitative estimation*:* an *awkward* situation — a *very awkward* situation; a *difficult* task — *too difficult* a task; an *enthusiastic* reception — *rather* an *enthusiastic* reception; a *hearty* welcome — *not* a *very hearty* welcome; etc.

Relative adjective is incapable of forming degrees of comparison by definition. *Cf.:* a *pretty* girl — a *prettier* girl; a *quick* look — a *quicker* look; a *hearty* welcome — the *heartiest* of welcomes; a *bombastic* speech — the *most bombastic* speech.

For instance, **the adjective *good* is basically qualitative**. On the other hand, when employed as a grading term in teaching, i.e. a term forming part of the marking scale together with the grading terms *bad, satisfactory, excellent,* it acquires the said specificative value; in other words, it becomes a specificative, not an evaluative unit in the grammatical sense

Prof.Blokh writes that the adjective ***wooden*** is basically relative, but when used in the broader meaning "expressionless" or "awkward" it acquires an evaluative force and, consequently, can presuppose a greater or lesser degree ("amount") of the denoted properly in the corresponding referent. *E.g.:*

Prof.Blokh writes that the morphological category of comparison (comparison degrees) is potentially represented in the whole class of adjectives and is constitutive for it. Among the words signifying properties of a nounal referent there is a lexemic set which claims to be recognised as a separate part of speech. **These are words built up by the prefix *a-* and denoting different states, mostly of temporary duration. Here belong lexemes like *afraid, agog, adrift, ablaze.* In traditional grammar these words were generally considered under the heading of "predicative adjectives"** (some of them also under the heading of adverbs), since their most typical position in the sentence is that of a predicative and they are but occasionally used as prepositional attributes to nouns.

Notional words signifying states and specifically used as predicatives were first identified as a separate part of speech in the Russian language by **L. V. Shcherba and V. V. Vinogradov.-** words making up this category, "words of the category of state"). Here belong the Russian words mostly ending in **-o,** but also having other suffixes: ***тепло, зябко, одиноко, радостно, жаль, лень,*** **etc.**

The English qualifying a- words of the corresponding

meanings were subjected to **a lexico-grammatical analysis** and given the part-of-speech heading "category of state".

First, **the statives,** called by the quoted authors "ad-links" are opposed to adjectives on **a purely semantic** basis, since adjectives denote "qualities", and statives-adlinks denote "states".

-As different from adjectives, statives-adlinks are characterised by the specific prefix *a-.*

*T*hey **do not** possess the category of the degrees of comparison.

The combinability of statives-adlinks is different from that of adjectives : they **are not used** in the pre-positional attributive function, i.e. are characterised by the absence of the right-hand combinability with nouns.

Prof.Blokh writes that the re-consideration of the stative on the basis of comparison with the classical adjective inevitably discloses the fundamental relationship between the two, — such relationship as should be interpreted in no other terms than identity on the part-of-speech level, though, naturally, providing for their distinct differentiation on the subclass level.

The first scholar who undertook this kind of re-consideration of th**e lexemic status of English statives was L. S. Barkhudarov.**

First, considering the basic meaning expressed by the stative,one formulates it as **"stative property"**, i.e. a kind of property of a nounal referent. As we already know, the adjective as a whole signifies not "quality" in the narrow sense, but "property", which is categorially divided into "substantive quality as such" and "substantive relation" **Prof.Blokh writes** that the the main meaning types conveyed by statives are: **the psychic state of a person** *(afraid, ashamed, aware);* the physical state of a person *(astir, afoot);* **the physical state of an object** *(afire, ablaze, aglow);* **the state of an object in space** *(askew, awry, aslant).* Meanings of the same order are rendered by pre-positional adjectives. The *living* predecessor — the predecessor *alive;*

Many other adjectives and participles convey the meanings of various states irrespective of their analogy with statives. Cf. such words of the order of psychic state as *despondent,* ***curious, happy, joyful;*** such words of the order of human physical state as ***sound, refreshed, healthy, hungry****;* such words of the order of activity state as ***busy, functioning, active, employed,*** **etc.**

Second, though differing from those of the common adjectives in one point negatively, they basically coincide with them in the other points sTATIVES not used in at- tributive pre-position, but, like

adjectives, **they are distinguished by the left-hand categorial combinability both with nouns and link-verbs**. *Cf.:*

The household was all *astir.* was strange to see the household *astir* at this hour of the day.It was strange to see the household *active* at this hour of the day.

Third, analysing the functions of the stative corresponding to its combinability patterns, we see that essentially **they do not differ from the functions of the common adjective. Namely, the two basic functions of the stative are th**e **predicative and the attribute.**

Prof.Blokh writes that the **the predominant function of the stative, as different from the common adjective, is that of the predicative**.

Fourth, from our point of view, **strictly out of the category of compariso**n.

The cat.ocomparison is connected with the functional division of **adjectives into evaluative and specificativ**e. Like common adjectives, **statives are subject to t**his division, and so they are included into the expression of the quantitative estimation of the corresponding properties conveyed by them. True, statives do not take the synthetical forms of the degrees of comparison, but they are capable of expressing comparison analytically,

Of us all, Jack was the one *most aware* of the delicate situation in which we found ourselves. I saw that the adjusting lever stood *far more askew* than was allowed by the directions.

Fifth, quantitative considerations, though being a subsidiary factor of reasoning

Why, then, an honour of the part-of-speech status to be granted to a small group of words not differing in their fundamen**tal lexico-grammatical features from one of the established large word-classes?**

As for the set-forming prefix *a-,* it hardly deserves a serious consideration as a formal basis of the part-of-speech identification of statives simply because formal features cannot be taken in isolation from functional features. BUT the basic statives such as can hardly be analysed into a genuine combination of the type "prefix+root", because their morphemic parts have become fused into one indivisible unit in the course of language history, *e.g. aware, afraid, aloof.*

Thus, the undertaken semantic and functional analysis shows that statives, should be looked upon as a subclass within the general class of adjectives statives are not directly opposed to the notional parts of speech taken together, but are quite opposed to the rest

of adjectives. It means that the general subcategorisation of the class of adjectives should be effected on the two levels: on the upper level the class will be divided into the subclass of stative adjectives and common adjectives; on the lower level the common adjectives fall into qualitative and relative.

Prof.Blokh writes that the lexico-grammatical nature of statives appears to have placed by traditional grammar and from which they were alienated in the course of subsequent linguistic ANALISYS.

The later study of statives resulted in the exposition of their Prof.Blokh writes that we are now in a position, though having rejected the fundamental separation of the stative from the adjective, to name the subclass of statives as one of the peculiar, idiomatic lexemic features of Modern English.

Adjectives display the ability to be easily substantivised by conversion, i.e. by zero-derivation. Among the noun-converted adjectives we find both old units, well-established in the system of lexicon, and also new ones, whose adjectival etymology conveys to the lexeme the vivid colouring of a new coinage.

For instance, the words *a relative* or *a white* or *a dear* bear an unquestionable mark of established tradition, while such a noun as *a sensitive* used in the following sentence features a distinct flavour of purposeful conversion: He was a regional man, a man who wrote about *sensitives* who live away from the places where things happen (M. Bradbury).

Compare this with the noun *a high* in the following example: The weather report promises *a new high* in heat and humidity (Ibid.).

From the purely categorial point of view, however, there is no difference between the adjectives cited in the examples and the ones given in the foregoing enumeration, since both groups equally express constitutive categories of the noun, i.e. the number, the case, the gender, the article determination, and they likewise equally perform normal nounal functions.

On the other hand, among the substantivised adjectives there is a set characterised by hybrid lexico-grammatical features, as in the following examples:

The new bill concerning the wage-freeze introduced by the Labour Government cannot satisfy either *the poor,* or *the rich* (Radio Broadcast). A monster.

On the analogy of verbids these words might be called "adjectivids", since they are rather noun- al forms of adjectives than nouns

as such.

The adjectivids fall into two main grammatical subgroups, namely, the subgroup *pluralia tantum (the English, the rich, the unemployed, the uninitiated,* etc.), and the subgroup *singularia tantum (the invisible, the abstract, the tangible,* etc.). Semantically, the words of the first subgroup express sets of people (personal multitudes), while the words of the second group express abstract ideas of various types and connotations.

The category of adjectival comparison expresses the quantitative characteristic of the quality of a nounal referent, The category is constituted by the opposition of the three forms known under the heading of degrees of comparison; the basic form *(positive degree),* having no features of comparison; the *comparative degree* form, having the feature of restricted superiority (which limits the comparison to two elements only); *the superlative degree* form, having the feature of unrestricted superiority.

Some linguists approach the number of the degrees of comparison as problematic Prof.Blokh writes that the the oppositional interpretation of grammatical categories underlying our considerations does not admit of such an exclusion; on the contrary, the non-expression of superiority by the basic form is understood in the oppositional presentation of comparison as a pre-requisite for the expression of the category as such. In this expression of the category the basic form is the unmarked member, not distinguished by any comparison suffix or comparison auxiliary, while the superiority forms (i.e. the comparative and superlative) are the marked members, distinguished by the comparison suffixes or comparison auxiliaries.

The synthetical forms of comparison in *-er* and *-(e)st* coexist with the analytical forms of comparison effected by the auxiliaries *more* and *most.* The analytical forms of comparison perform a double function. Cf.: The audience became *more* and *more noisy,* and soon the speaker's words were drowned in the general hum of voices.

The structure of the analytical degrees of comparison is meaningfully overt; these forms are devoid of the feature of "semantic idiomatism" characteristic of some other categorial analytical forms, such as, for instance, the forms of the verbal perfect. For this reason the analytical degrees of comparison invite some linguists to call in question their claim to a categorial status in English grammar.

In particular, scholars point out the following two factors in support of the view that the combinations of *more/most* with the basic form of the adjective are not the analytical expressions of the morphological category of com- parison, but free syntactic con-

structions: first, the *more/most-combinations* are semantically analogous to combinations of *less/least* with the adjective which, in the general opinion, are syntactic combinations of notional words; second, the *most*-combination, unlike the synthetic superlative, can take the indefinite article, expressing not the superlative, but the elative meaning (i.e. a high, not the highest degree of the respective quality).

Prof.Blokh writes that the parallelism of functions between the two forms of comparison (the comparative degree and the superlative degree) is unquestionable.

Thus, from a grammatical point of view, the elative superlative, though semantically it is "elevated", is nothing else but a degraded superlative, and its distinct featuring mark with the analytical superlative degree is the indefinite Aticle: the two forms of the superlative of different functional purposes receive the two different marks (if not quite rigorously separated in actual uses) by the article determination treatment.

Thus, the *less*/*least*-combinations, similar to the *more*/ *most*-combinations, constitute specific forms of comparison, which may be called forms of "reverse comparison". The two types of forms cannot be syntagmatically combined in one and the same form of the word, which shows the unity of the category of comparison. The whole category includes not three, but five different forms, making up the two series — respectively, direct and reverse. Of these, the reverse series of comparison is of far lesser importance than the direct one, which evidently can be explained by semantic reasons. As a matter of fact, it is more natural to follow the direct model of comparison based on the principle of addition of qualitative quantities than on the reverse model of comparison based on the principle of subtraction of qualitative quantities, since subtraction in general is a far more abstract process of mental activity than addition. Prof.Blokh writes that the reverse comparatives and superlatives are rivalled in speech by the corresponding negative syntactic constructions.

LECTURE 10.
ADVERB. SYNTAGMATIC CONNECTIONS OF WORDS

ADVERB

The adverb is usually defined as a word expressing either property of an action,or circumstances in which an action occurs. Prof.M.J.Bloch defines the adverb as a notional word expressing a non-substantive property. Adverbs are characterised by a combinability with verbs, adjectivesand nouns . The functions of adverbs consist in expressing different adverbial modifiers. Adverbs can also refer to whole situations; in this function they are considered as situation-"determinants"*.:*

The student was crying *hysterically.* (an adverbial modifier of manner)

Adverbs can also combine with nouns acquiring an adverbial-attributive function, essentially in post-position.:The world *today* presents a picture radically different from what it was before the Second World War.

According to the structure adverbs may be ***simple*** **and** ***derived.***

Simple adverbs are rather few, and nearly all of them display function of pronominal character: *here, there, now, then, so, quite, why, how, where, when.*

Among the adverbs there are also phrasal formations of prepositional, conjunctional types: *at least, at most, at last; to and fro; upside down;* etc.

A peculiar set of adverbs is formed by adjective-stem conversives, such as *fast, late, hard, high, close, loud, tight,* etc. The peculiar feature of these adverbs is that practically all of them have a parallel form in *-ly,* the two component units of each pair differentiated in meaning or connotation. *Cf.:* to work *hard* — *hardly* to work at all; to fall *flat* into the water — to refuse *flatly;* to speak *loud* — to criticise *loudly;* to fly *high* over the lake — to raise a *highly* theoretical question; etc.

Among the adjective-stem converted adverbs there are a few words with the non-specific *-ly* originally in-built in the adjective: *daily, weekly, lively, timely,* etc.

Preposition-adverb-like elements which, placed in post-position to the verb, form a semantical blend with it. By combining with these elements, verbs of broader meaning are subjected to

a regular, systematic multiplication of their semantic functions.*:* to give — to give *up,* to give *in,* to give *out,* to give *away,* to give *over,* etc.; to set — to set *up,* to set *in,* to set *forth,* to set *off,* to set *down,* etc.; to get — to get *on,* to get *off,* to get *up,* to get *through,* to get *about*, etc.; to work — to work *up,* to work *in,* to work *out,* to work *away*, to work *over,* etc.; to bring — to bring *about,* to bring *up,* to bring *through,* to bring *forward,* to bring *down*, etc.

The grammatical standing of these elements has been interpreted in different ways. Some scholars have treated them as a variety of adverbs (H. Palmer, A. Smirnitsky); others, as preposition-like functional words (I. Anichkov, N. Amosova); still others, as prefix-like suffixes similar to the German separable prefixes (Y. Zhluktenko); finally, some scholars have treated these words as a special set of lexical elements intermediate between words and morphemes (B. A. Ilyish; B. S. Khaimovich and B. I. Rogovskaya).

Prof.Bloch uses the term **"post-positives"** introduced by N. Amosova.

Adverbs are commonly divided into ***qualitative, quantitative*** **and *circumstantial.***

Qualitative adverbs express immediate qualities of actions and other qualities. The typical adverbs of this kind are qualitative adverbs in *-ly:*The little boy was crying *bitterly* .

These are specific lexical units of semi-functional nature expressing gradational evaluation of qualities. They may be subdivided into 9 classes.

The first set is formed by **adverbs of high degree.** These adverbs are sometimes classed as "intensifiers": *very, quite, entirely, utterly, highly, greatly, perfectly, absolutely, strongly, considerably, pretty, much.*

The second set includes **adverbs of excessive degree** : *too, awfully, tremendously, dreadfully, terrifically.*

The third set is made up of **adverbs of unexpected degree**: *surprisingly, astonishingly, amazingly.*

The fourth set is formed by **adverbs of moderate degree**: *fairly, comparatively, relatively, moderately, rather.*

The fifth set includes **adverbs of low degree**: *slightly, a little, a bit.*

The sixth set is constituted by **adverbs of approximate degree**: *almost, nearly.*

The seventh set includes **adverbs of optimal degree**: *enough, sufficiently, adequately.*

The eighth set is formed by **adverbs of inadequate de-**

gree: *insufficiently, intolerably, unbearably, ridiculously.*

The ninth set is made up of **adverbs of under-degree**: *hardly, scarcely.*

The functional circumstantial adverbs are words of pronominal nature. They include adverbs of time, place, manner, cause, consequence. Many of these words are used as syntactic connectives and question-forming functionals. Here belong such words as *now, here, when, where, so, thus, how, why,* etc.

As for **circumstantial adverbs** , they include two basic sets: first, **adverbs of time**; second, **adverbs of place**: *today, tomorrow, already, ever, never, shortly, recently, seldom, early, late; homeward, eastward, near, far, outside, ashore,* etc. The two varieties express a general idea of temporal and spatial orientation . Prof .Bloch names them "orientative" adverbs.

Thus, the whole class of adverbs will be divided, first, into nominal and pronominal, and the nominal adverbs will be subdivided into qualitative and orientative, the former including genuine qualitative adverbs and degree adverbs, the latter falling into temporal and local adverbs.

Among the various types of adverbs, those formed from adjectives by means of the suffix *-ly* occupy the most representative . But each qualitative adjective has a parallel adverb in *-ly. E. g.:* silent — silently, slow — slowly, tolerable — tolerably, pious — piously, sufficient — sufficiently, tired — tiredly, explosive — explosively, etc.

Prof. A. I. Smirnitsky thinks that both sets of words belong to the same part of speech, the qualitative adverbs in *-ly* being in fact adjectives of specific combinability [Смирницкий, (2), 174-175].But prof. Bloch argues saying that "since the English does distinguish adjectives and adverbs; since adjectives are substantive-qualifying words in distinction to adverbs, which are non-substantive qualifying words; — there can't be any question of their being "adjectives" in any rationally conceivable way. "

SYNTAGMATIC CONNECTIONS OF WORDS.

Syntagma - is a group consisting of 2 or more notional elements, syntagmatic means connected on linear basis.

Words in an utterance form various syntagmatic connections with one another.

Prof.Blokh writes that one should distinguish between syntag-

matic groupings of notional words alone, syntagmatic groupings of notional words with functional words, and syntagmatic groupings of functional words alone.

Different combinations of notional words (notional phrases) have a nominative destination, they denote complex phenomena and their properties in their inter-connections, including semi-predicative combinations..*:* a sudden trembling; a soul in pain; hurrying along the stream; to lead to a cross-road; strangely familiar..

Combinations of a notional word with a functional word are equivalent to separate words by their nominative function. Since a functional word expresses some abstract relation, such combinationsare stamped as artificially isolated from the context*:* in a low voice; with difficulty; must finish; but a moment; and Jimmy; too cold; so unexpectedly.

As for syntagmatic groupings of functional words, they are used as connectors and specifiers of notional elements of various status. *:* from out of; up to; so that; such as; must be able; don't let's.

Groupings of notional words fall into two mutually opposite types by their grammatical and semantic properties.

Groupings of the first type are constituted by words related to one another on an equal rank,, neither of them serves as a modifier of the other.These combinations can be called "equipotent".

Groupings of the second type are formed by words which are syntactically unequal , one of them plays the role of a modifier of the other. Combinations of the latter type can be called "dominational".

Equipotent connection in groupings of notional words is realised either with the help of conjunctions (syndetically), or without the help of conjunctions (asyndetically). *Cf.:* prose and poetry; came and went; on the beach or in the water; quick but not careless; — no sun, no moon;; Mary's, not John's.

The term "cumulation" is commonly used to mean connections between separate sentences. It is "outer cumulation" .”Inner cumulation"- cumulation within the sentence. Cumulative connection in writing is signalled by a comma or a hyphen.*:* *Eng.* agreed, but reluctantly; quick — and careless; satisfied, or nearly so. *Russ.* сыт, но не очень; согласен, или почти согласен; дал — да неохотно.

Dominational connection - one of the constituents of the combination is principal (dominating) and the other is subordinate (dominated). The principal element is commonly called the "kernel", "kernel element", or "headword"; the subordinate element, respectively, the "adjunct", "adjunct-word", "expansion".

Dominational connection is achieved by different forms of the

word agreement, governmen, connective words , word-order.

The predicative connection of words, uniting the subject and the predicate, builds up the basis of the sentence. The reciprocal nature of this connection consists in the fact that the subject dominates the predicate determining the person of predication, while the predicate dominates the subject, determining the event of predication..

There exist in language partially predicative groupings formed by a combination of a non-finite verbal form with a substantive element. Such are infinitival, gerundial, and participial constructions.

The predicative person is expressed in the infinitival construction by the prepositional *for*-phrase, in the gerundial construction by the possessive or objective form of the substantive, in the participial construction by the nominative (common) form of the substantive. *for the pupil* to understand his mistake —*the pupil* understanding his mistake.

Thus, among the syntagmatic connections of the reciprocal domination the two basic subtypes are distinguished: first, complete predicative connections, second, incomplete predicative connections (semi-predicative, potentially-predicative connections).

The completive domination- the syntactic status of the whole combination is determined by the kernel element (head-word)*.*.She would be reduced to a nervous wreck. → She would be reduced to a wreck. → She would be reduced.

All the completive connections fall into two main divisions: objective connections and qualifying connections.

Objective connections reflect the relation of the object to the process . These connections are subdivided into non-prepositional (word-order, the objective form of the adjunct substantive) and prepositional, direct (the immediate transition of the action to the object) and indirect (the indirect relation of the object to the process). Direct objective connections are non-prepositional. Indirect objective connections may be both prepositional and non-prepositional.

Qualifying completive connections are divided into attributive and adverbial. Both are expressed in English by word-order and prepositions.

Attributive connection unites a substance with its attribute expressed by an adjective or a noun*:* an *enormous* appetite; an *emerald* ring; a woman of *strong character,* the case *for the prosecution;* etc.

Adverbial connection is subdivided into primary and secondary.

The primary adverbial connection is established between the verb and its adverbial modifiers: to talk *glibly,* to come *nowhere;* to

receive (a letter) *with surprise;* to throw (one's arms) *round a person's neck;* etc.

The secondary adverbial connection is established between the non-verbal kernel expressing a quality and its adverbial modifiers*.: marvellously* becoming; *very much* at ease; *strikingly* alike; *no longer* oppressive; *unpleasantly* querulous; etc.

LECTURE 11.
SENTENCE, THE ACTUAL DIVISION OF A SENTENCE IN ENGLISH

The sentence is the unit of speech built up of words according to a definite syntactic pattern and distinguished by a communicative purpose. The sentence is the main object of syntax.

The sentence, being composed of words, may consist of only one word*.:* Night. Congratulations. Away! Why? Certainly.

Prof.Blokh writes that sometimes the sentence and the word may coincide.But a word-sentence as a unit of the text is radically different from a word- as a unit of lexicon,because of the different places occupied by the sentence and the word in the hierarchy of language levels. While the word is a nominative unit of language, the sentence is a predicative utterance-unit. It means that the sentence does not only names some referents , but also, first, presents these referents as making up a certain situation, and second, shows the time of the event, its being real or unreal, desirable or undesirable, necessary or unnecessary :

I am satisfied, the meeting has succeeded. I would have been satisfied if the meeting had succeeded. The experiment seems to have succeeded — why then am I not satisfied?

The sentence does not exist in the system of language as a ready-made unit; with the exception of a limited number of utterances of phraseological citation, it is created by the speaker in the course of communication. Linguists point out that the sentence, as different from the word, is not a unit of language proper.

Traditional grammar has never regarded the sentence as part of the system of means of expression; it has always interpreted the sentence as speech itself.

Within each sentence definite standard syntactic-semantic features are revealed which make up a typical model, a generalised pattern repeated in an indefinite number of actual utterances.This complicated predicative pattern does enter the system of language.

Thus, the sentence is characterised by its category of predication which establishes the relation of the named phenomena to actual life.

The general semantic category of modality is also defined by linguists as exposing the connection between the named objects and surrounding reality. Here belong such words of full notional standing as "probability", "desirability", "necessity" ;

- semi-functional words and phrases of probability and evaluation, such as *perhaps, may be, by all means,* etc.;

- word-particles of specifying modal semantics, such as *just, even, would-be,* etc.;

- modal verbs expressing a broad range of modal meanings.

The centre of predication in a sentence of verbal type is a finite verb. The finite verb expresses essential predicative meanings by its categorial forms, first of all, the categories of tense and mood. Prof. Bloch M.J. states that predication is effected also by such means of expression as intonation, word order, different functional words. Besides the verbal categories, in the predicative semantics are included purposes of communication (declaration — interrogation — inducement), modal probability, affirmation and negation.

The general semantic content of the sentence is not at all reduced to predicative meanings only. Indeed, in order to establish the connection between some substance and reality, it is first necessary to name the substance itself. This latter task is effected in the sentence with the help of its nominative means. Hence, the sentence as a lingual unit performs not one, but two essential meaningful functions: first, substance-naming or nominative function; second, reality-evaluating, or predicative function.

Predication has been understood in linguistics as the expression of the relation of the utterance (sentence) to reality, or,as the expression of the relation between the content of the sentence and reality.

ACTUAL DIVISION OF THE SENTENCE IN ENGLISH

Alongside of the nominative division of the sentence, the idea of the so-called "actual division" of the sentence has been put forward in theoretical linguistics. The purpose of the actual division of the sentence, called also the **"functional sentence perspective"**, is **to reveal the correlative significance of the sentence parts from the point of view of their actual informative role in an utteranc**e, i.e. from the point of view of the immediate semantic contribution they make to the total information conveyed by the sentence in the context of connected speech. The actual division of the sentence in fact exposes its i**nformative perspective.**

The main components of the actual division of the sentence are the ***theme* and the *rheme.*** The t**heme expresses the starting point of the communication,** i.e. it denotes an object or a pheno-

menon about which something is reported. The **rheme expresses the basic informative part of the communication**. Between the theme and the rheme are positioned intermediary parts of the actual division of various degrees of informative value (these parts are sometimes called **"transition"**).

The theme of the actual division of the sentence **may or may not coincide with the subject of the sentence.**

The rheme of the actual division, in its turn, **may or may not coincide with the predicate** of the sentence .

Thus, in the following sentences the theme is expressed by the subject, while the rheme is expressed by the predicate:**Max** bounded forward. **Again Charlie** is being too clever! **Her advice** can't be of any help to us. -themes

The prominent linguist J. Mathesius considered this kind of sentence division as a purely **semantic factor** opposed to the "formally grammatical" or "purely syntactic" division of the sentence.

The purpose of such constructions is to reveal t**he meaningful centre** of the utterance (rheme) in distinction to th**e starting point of its content** (theme).

The actual division corresponds to the natural development of thought from the starting point of communication to its semantic centre, or, from the **"known data" to the "unknown (new) data"**. In other contextual conditions, **the reversed order** of positioning the actual division components is used, which can be shown by the following transformation:

It was unbelievable to all of them. → Utterly unbelievable it was to all of them.

The reversed order of the actual division, i.e. the positioning of the **rheme** at the beginning of the sentence, **is connected with emphatic speech.**

Emphatic positionof the rheme expressed by various parts of the sentence is achieved **by constructions with the anticipatory *it.*** Grandma gave them *a moment's deep consideration.* → **It was a moment's deep consideration** that Grandma gave them.

The articles, used as means of forming certain patterns of actual division, divide their functions so that the **definite determiners** serve as identifiers of the **theme** while the **indefinite determiners** serve as identifiers of the **rheme. The** *man* walked up and down the platform. ***A*** *man* walked up and down the platform.

Intensifying particles identify the rheme, giving emotional colouring to the whole of the utterance. Mr. Stores had a part in the

general debate. → ***Even*** *Mr. Stores* had a part in the general debate.

The universal **rheme-identifying function of intonation** has been described in traditional philological literature, in terms of **"logical accent".** The "logical accent" amounts linguistically to the "**rhematic** accent".

Functional units as well can be phrasally stressed in an utterance, which in modern printed texts is shown by i**talics, bold type,** etc.It would be incorrect to think that only those word-units are logically, i.e. rhematically, marked out as are stressed phonetically. Functional elements cannot express any self-dependent nomination; but make up units of nomination together with the notional elements of utterances whose meanings they specify.

The immediate contextual relevance of the actual division is the regular deletion **(ellipsis) of the thematic parts of utterances** in dialogue speech. By this syntactic process, the rheme of the utterance or its most informative part (**peak of informative perspective)** is placed in isolation, thereby being very graphically presented to the listener. "You've got the letters?" — **"In *my bag*" . The thematic reduction of sentences in the context, resulting in a constructional economy of speech, performs an informative function in parallel with the logic, accent: it serves to identify the rheme of the utterance.**

LECTURE 12.
COMMUNICATIVE TYPES OF SENTENCES. SIMPLE SENTENCE: CONSTITUENT STRUCTURE

OMMUNICATIVE TYPES OF SENTENCES

The sentence is a communicative unit.

In accord with the purpose of communication three cardinal sentence-types have long been recognised in linguistic tradition: first, the declarative sentence; second, the imperative (inducive) sentence; third, the interrogative sentence. These communicative sentence-types stand in strict opposition to one another, and their inner properties of form and meaning are immediately correlated with the corresponding features of the listener's responses.

Prof.Blokh writes that the declarative sentence expresses a statement, either affirmative or negative.

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 to perform a certain action. As such, the imperative sentence is situationally connected with the corresponding "action response" (Ch. Fries), and lingually is systemically correlated with a verbal response showing that the inducement is either complied with, or else rejected.:"Let's go and sit down up there, Dinny." — "Very well" (J. Galsworthy).

Since the communicative purpose of the imperative sentence is to make the listener act as requested, silence on the part of the latter (when the request is fulfilled), strictly speaking, is also linguistically relevant. This gap in speech, which situationally is filled in by the listener's action, is set off in literary narration by special comments and descriptions:"Knock on the wood." — Retan's man leaned forward and knocked three times on the barrera (E. Hemingway).

The interrogative sentence expresses a question, i.e. a request for information wanted by the speaker from the listener. By virtue of this communicative purpose, the interrogative sentence is naturally connected with an answer, forming together with it a question-answer dialogue unity. "What do you suggest I should do, then?" said Mary helplessly. — "If I were you I should play a waiting game," he replied

Ways of expressing different purproses of communication of the speaker, i.e. is "communicative inrentions" , are studied by the branch of linguistic called "pragmatic linguistic" or contractedly "pragmalinguistisc" in the theory of speech acts.

An early attempt to revise the traditional communicative classification of sentences was made by the American scholar Ch. Fries who classed them, as a deliberate challenge to the "accepted routine", not in accord with the purposes of communication, but according to the responses they elicit .

In Fries's system, as a universal speech unit subjected to communicative analysis was chosen not immediately a sentence, but an utterance unit (a "free" utterance, i.e. capable of isolation) understood as a continuous chunk of talk by one speaker in a dialogue. The sentence was then defined as a minimum free utterance.

1)Utterances that are regularly followed by oral responses only. These are greetings, calls, questions. *E.g.*Hello! Good-bye! See you soon! ... Dad! Say, dear! Colonel Howard! ... Have you got moved in? What are you going to do for the summer? ...

2)Utterances regularly eliciting action responses. These are requests or commands. *E.g.*Read that again, will you?

3) Utterances regularly eliciting conventional signals of attention to continuous discourse. These are statements.I've been talking with Mr. D — in the purchasing department about our type-writer. (— Yes?).

Alongside of the described "communicative" utterances, i.e. utterances directed to a definite listener, another, minor type of utterances were recognised as not directed to any listener but, as Ch. Fries puts it, "characteristic of situations such as surprise, sudden pain, disgust, anger, laughter, sorrow" *:* Oh, oh! Goodness! My God! Darn! Gosh! Such interjectional units were classed by Ch. Fries as "non-communicative" utterances.

Alongside of the three cardinal communicative sentence-types, another type of sentences is recognised in the theory of syntax, namely, the so-called exclamatory sentence. In modern linguistics it has been demonstrated that exclamatory sentences do not possess any complete set of qualities that could place them on one and the same level with the three cardinal communicative types of sentences. The property of exclamation should be considered as an accompanying feature which is effected within the system of the three cardinal communicative types of sentences. In other words, each of the cardinal communicative sentence types can be represented in the two variants, viz. non-exclamatory and exclamatory.

Similarly, exclamatory questions are immediately related in the syntactic system to the corresponding non-exclamatory interrogative sentences.

The unique quality of the **interrogative actual division**

is determined by the fact that the interrogative sentence, instead of conveying some relatively self-dependent content, expresses an inquiry about information which the speaker (as a participant of a typical question-answer situation) does not possess. Therefore the rheme of the interrogative sentence, as the nucleus of the inquiry, is informationally open (gaping); its function consists only in marking the rhematic position in the response sentence and programming the content of its filler in accord with the nature of the inquiry.

Different types of questions present different types of open rhemes.

In the pronominal ("special") question, the nucleus of inquiry is expressed by an interrogative pronoun. The pronoun is immediately connected with the part of the sentence denoting the object or phenomenon about which the inquiry ("condensed" in the pronoun) is made. The gaping pronominal meaning is to be replaced in the answer by the wanted actual information. Thus, the rheme of the answer is the reverse substitute of the interrogative pronoun: the two make up a rhematic unity in the broader question-answer construction. As for the thematic part of the answer, it is already expressed in the question, therefore in common speech it is usually zeroed*:*

"Why do you think so?" — "Because mostly I keep my eyes open, miss, and I talk to people" (A. Hailey).

Thus, in terms of rhematic reverse substitution, t**he pronominal question** is a question of unlimited substitution choice, while the alternative question is a question of a limited substitution choice, the substitution of the latter kind being, as a rule, expressed implicitly. This can be demonstrated by a transformation applied to the first of the two cited examples of alternative questions: Will you take it away or open it here? → Where will you handle it — take it away or open it here?

The non-pronominal question requiring either confirmation or negation ("general" question of *yes-no* response type) is thereby implicitly alternative, though the inquiry inherent in it concerns not the choice between some suggested facts, but the choice between the existence or non-existence of an indicated fact.

By "**purely exclamatory sentences"** are meant no other things than interjectional exclamations of ready-made order such as "Great Heavens!", "Good Lord!", "For God's sake!" "Fiddle-dee-dee!", "Oh, I say!" and the like, which, due to various situational conditions, find themselves in self-dependent, proposemically isolated positions in the text.-"Oh, for God's sake!" — "Oh, for God's sake!" the boy had repeated (W. Saroyan).

Of quite another nature are exclamatory s**entences with emphatic introducers** derived on special productive syntactic patterns. *:*

Oh, that Mr. Thornspell hadn't been so reserved! How silly of you! If only I could raise the necessary sum! Etc.

These constructions also express emotions, but they are meaningfully articulate and proposemically complete. They clearly display a definite nominative composition which is predicated, i.e. related to reality according to the necessary grammatical regularities. And they inevitably belong to quite a definite communicative type of sentences, namely, to the declarative type.

The vast set of constructional sentence models possessed by language is formed not only by cardinal, mono-functional communicative types; besides these, it includes also intermediary predicative constructions distinguished by mixed communicative features. The true nature of such intermediary constructions can be disclosed in the light of the

actual division theory combined with the general theory of paradigmatic oppositions.

Observations conducted on the said principles show that intermediary communicative sentence models may be identified between all the three cardinal communicative correlations (viz., statement — question, statement — inducement, inducement — question); they have grown and are sustained in language as a result of the transference of certain characteristic features from one communicative type of sentences to another.

In the following dialogue sequence the utterance which is declarative by its formal features, at the same time contains a distinct pronominal question:"*I wonder why they come to me about it.* "I should like to hear your views on that," replied Utterson (R. L. Stevenson).

They present a suggestion to the listener to perform a certain action or imply a request for permission to perform an action, etc.

On the other hand, in the structural framework of the interrogative sentence one can express a statement. This type of utterance is classed as th**e "rhetorical question".**

Can a leopard change his spots? Can man be free if woman be a slave?

The next pair of correlated communicative sentence types between which are identified predicative constructions of intermediary nature **are declarative and imperative sentences.**

The expression of induce- ment within the framework of a

declarative sentence is regularly achieved by means of constructions with modal verbs.-You ought to get rid of it, you know (C. P. Snow). "You can't come in," he said. "You mustn't get what I have".

This kind of **declarative inducement**, similar to rhetorical questions, is used in **maxims and proverbs :**Talk of the devil and he will appear. Roll my log and I will roll yours. Live and learn.

There are also corresponding **negative statements of the formal imperative** order: Don't count your chickens before they are hatched. Don't cross the bridge till you get to it.

Imperative sentences performing the essential function of interrogative sentences are such as induce the listener not to action, but to speech. They may contain i**ndirect questions:**"Tell me about your upbringing." — "I should like to hear about yours"

The reverse intermediary construction, i.e. inducement effected in the form of question, is employed in order to convey such additional shades of meaning as request, invitation, suggestion, softening of a command:"Why don't you get Aunt Em to sit instead, Uncle?

In common use is the expression of inducement effected in the **form of a disjunctive question**. The post-positional interrogative tag imparts a more pronounced or less pronounced shade of a **polite request** or a **pleading appeal:**Find out tactfully what he wants, will you?

Within each of the **three cardinal communicative oppositions** two different intermediary communicative sentence models are established, so that the communicative classification of sentences should be expanded by six subtypes of **sentences of mixed communicative features.** These are, **first**, mixed sentence patterns of declaration (interrogative-declarative, imperative-declarative); **second,** mixed sentence patterns of interrogation (declarative-interrogative, imperative-interrogative); **third** mixed sentence-patterns of inducement (declarative-imperative, interrogative-imperative).

SIMPLE SENTENCE: CONSTITUENT STRUCTURE

Sentences may be "monopredicative" and "polypredicative".The simple sentence is a sentence in which o**nly one predicative line is expressed.-**Bob has never *left* the stadium.

The simple sentence is organised as a system of function-expressing positions, the content of the functions being the reflection

of a situational event. The **nominative parts of the simple sentence,** each occupying a notional position in it, are **subject, predicate, object, adverbial, attribute, parenthetical enclosure, addressing enclosure; a special, semi-notional position is occupied by an interjectional enclosure.** The parts are arranged in a hierarchy. Through the sentence, the reflection of the situation (situational event).

Thus, the **subject is** a person-modifier of the predicate.

The predicate is a process-modifier of the subject-person

The object is a substance-modifier of a processual part (actional or statal).

The adverbial is a quality-modifier (in a broad sense) of a processual part or the whole of the sentence (as expressing an integral process inherent in the reflected event).

The attribute is a quality-modifier of a substantive part.

The parenthetical enclosure is a detached speaker-bound modifier of any sentence-part or the whole of the sentence

The addressing enclosure (address) is a substantive modifier of the destination of the sentence and hence, from its angle, a modifier of the sentence as a whole.

The interjectional enclosure is a speaker-bound emotional modifier of the sentence.

The model of immediate constituents is based on the group-parsing of the sentence which has been developed by traditional grammar together with the sentence-part parsing scheme. It consists in dividing the whole of the sentence into two groups: that of the subject and that of the predicate, which, in their turn, are divided into their sub-group constituents according to the successive subordinative order of the latter.

Thus, structured by th**e IC-model,** the sentence THE SMALL LADY LISTENED TO ME ATTENTIVELY on the upper level of analysis is looked upon as a united whole (the accepted symbol S); on the next lower level it is divided into two maximal constituents — the subject noun-phrase (NP-subj) and the predicate verb-phrase (VP-pred);

Prof. Bloch M.J. defines the *unexpanded simple sentence* as a monopredicative sentence formed only by obligatory notional parts. The *expanded simple sentence* will, accordingly, be defined as a monopredicative sentence which includes, besides the obligatory parts, also some optional parts, i.e. some supplementive modifiers which do not constitute a predicative enlargement of the sentence.

The notions "**elementary sentence" and "sentence model"** do not exclude each other, but, on the contrary, supplement

each other: a model is always an abstraction, whereas an elementary sentence can and should be taken both as an abstract category (in the capacity of the "model of an elementary sentence") and as an actual utterance of real speech.

Sentences are classed into **"two-member" and "one-member"** ones.

Scholars point out that "genuine" one-member sentences are characterised not only as expressing one member in their outer structure; in addition, as an essential feature, they do not imply the other member on the contextual lines. Prof Ilyish,n accord with this view, elliptical sentences in which the subject or the predicate is contextually omitted, are analysed as "two-member" sentences .

Prof Bloch M.J. does not accept the cited approach.

All simple sentences of English should be divided into *two-axis* constructions and ***one-axis* constructions.**

In a two-axis sentence, the subject axis and the predicate axis are directly and explicitly expressed in the outer structure. This concerns all the three cardinal communicative types of sentences.The books come out of the experiences. What has been happening here? You better go back to bed.

In a **one-axis sentence** only one axis or its part is explicitly expressed, the other one being non-presented in the outer structure of the sentence."Who will meet us at the airport?" — "Mary."

Reflecting the categories of the subject, simple sentences are divided into ***personal* and *impersonal*.** The further division of the personal sentences is into *human* and *non-human;* human — into *definite* and *indefinite;* non-human — into *animate* and *inanimate.* The further essential division of impersonal sentences is into *factual* (It rains, It is five o'clock) and *perceptional* (It smells of hay here).

Reflecting the categories of the **predicate,** simple sentences are divided into ***process-featuring* ("verbal") and, in the broad sense, *substance-featuring*** (including substance as such and substantive quality — "nominal").

LECTURE 13.
SIMPLE SENTENCE: PARADIGMATIC STRUCTURE. COMPOSITE SENTENCE: POLYPREDICATIVE CONSTRUCTION

SIMPLE SENTENCE: PARADIGMATIC STRUCTURE

Traditional grammar studied the sentence from the point of view of its syntagmatic structure: the sentence was approached as a string of certain parts fulfilling the corresponding syntactic functions.

Sentences were classified according to the purpose of communication, according to the types of the subject and the predicate, according to whether they are simple or composite, expanded or unexpanded, compound or complex.From the paradigmatic point of view the sentences are studied with the help of the derivational transformations.

Prof.Blokh writes that a question can be described as transformationally produced from a statement; a negation can be presented as transformationally produced from an affirmation*:*

You are fond of the kid. → *Are you fond of the kid?*

You are fond of the kid. → *You are not fond of the kid.*

A composite sentence also can be presented as derived from two or more simple sentences. *: He turned waiter to the.+The waiter stood in the door.* → He turned to the waiter who stood in the door.

The basic element of syntactic derivation is the ***"kernel sentence".***

Structurally the **kernel sentence** coincides with the elementary sentence . The kernel sentence forms the **base of a paradigmatic derivation. Syntactic derivation is a paradigmatic production of more complex sentences out of kernel constructions.** The derivation of the sentences can be analysed as the **sets of six elementary transformations**.

The **first** class includes ***"morphological arrangement"*** of the sentence.

John+start (the kernel base string) → *John starts. John will be starting. John would be starting. John has started. Etc.*

The **second** class includes ***functional expansion***.

He understood my request. → *He seemed to understand my request. Now they consider the suggestion.* → *Now they do consider*

the suggestion.

The **third** class of syntactic derivational transformations includes ***substitution.***

The pupils ran out of the classroom. → They ran out of the classroom. I want another pen, please. → I want another one, please.

The **fourth** class is formed by processes of ***deletion,*** i.e. elimination of some elements of the sentence in various contextual conditions. As a result of deletion the elliptical constructions are produced.*:*

Would you like a cup of tea? → A cup of tea? It's a pleasure! → Pleasure!

The **fifth** class includes processes of *positional arrangement* **permutations (changes of the word-order into the reverse patterns**). *:The man is here. → Is the man here? Jim ran in with an excited cry. —» In ran Jim with an excited cry.*

The **sixth** class of syntactic derivation is formed by the ***intonational arrangement,*** i.e. application of various tones and accents. *We must go. → We must go? We? Must go?? You care nothing about what I feel. → You care nothing about what I feel!*

THe kernel sentences can undergo derivational changes into **clauses and phrases**. *When they arrived I was relieved of my fears. → I**f they arrive,** I shall be relieved of my fears. → **Even though they arrive**, I shan't be relieved of my fears. Etc. → They arrived, **and** I was relieved of my fears. → They arrived, **but** I was not relieved of my fears.*

To recognise a kernal sentence in the text, one must use the criteria of elementary sentence-structure identification . I**t is an elementary sentence which is non-interrogative, non-imperative, non-negative, non-modal..**This is the "weakest"opposition in the predicative oppositions.

The **predicative functions** expressed by kernel sentence should be divided into the **two types**: first, ***lower* functions**; second, ***higher* functions**. The lower functions include the expression of such morphological categories **as tenses and aspects.** The **higher** functions are **"evaluative"** - they express thel semantics of relating the content of the sentence to reality.

The principal predicative functions are expressed by **12** syntactic oppositions:

1-question as opposed to statement.

2- inducement as opposed to statement.

3- **negation as opposed to affirmation.**

4- **unreality as opposed to reality**.

5- **probability as opposed to fact**

6- **modal identity as opposed to fact.**

7- **modal subject-action relation as opposed to fac**t (can do, may do, etc.).

8- specified actual subject-action relation as opposed to fact.

9- phase of action as opposed to fact.

10-, **passive action as opposed to active action.**

11- **specialised actual division (specialised perspective) as opposed to non-specialised actual division** (non-specialised perspective).

12-emphasis as opposed to **neutrality**.

The sentence always expresses predication. The sentence may be predicatively "**loaded" or "non-loaded"**. If the sentence is predicatively **"non-loaded",** it means that i**ts construction is kernel elementary .** If the sentence is **predicatively "loaded"**, it means that it renders at least one of the 12 oppositional meanings .

Prof.Bloh M.J. takes as a derivation sentence-base the sentence ***"The thing bothers me".*** This sentence is predicatively "**non-loaded**". The predicative structure of the sentence can be expanded by the expression of the modal subject-action relation → ***"The thing can bother me";*** This construction can be used as a derivation base for a sentence of a higher predicative complexity; - the feature of unreality can be added to it: → ***"The thing could bother me (now)".W***e may introduce in the sentence the feature of passivity: → ***"I could be bothered (by the thing now)***". Finally, we may introduce a negation in it: → "***I could not be bothered (by the thing now)"***. So as a result there is a construction that is **predicatively "loaded"-** in the contextual conditions of real speech, expresses an intricate set of meanings and stylistic connotations. :"...Wilmet and Henrietta Bentworth have agreed to differ already." — "What about?" — **"Well, I couldn't be bothered, but I think it was about the P.M., or was it Portulaca?** — they differ about everything" (J. Galsworthy).

The construction becomes semantically complicated; but all its complexity is linguistically resolved by the demonstrated semantico-syntactic oppositional analysis showing the growth of meaning of the sentence in the course of its **paradigmatic derivation.**

COMPOSITE SENTENCE: POLYPREDICATIVE CONSTRUCTION.

The composite sentence is formed by two or more predicative lines.

The use of the composite sentences is characteristic of literary written speech rather than colloquial oral speech.

Prof.Blokh writes that the written speech is more or less carefully composed in advace, being meant for a future use of the reader, often for his repeated use.The colloquial oral speech is uttered each time in the complete and final form. Logic and style are the limiters of the written sentence volume.

Prof M.J.Bloh transforms the following sentence from D. du Maurier

Once Mary waved her hand as she recognised her driver, but he took no notice of her, only whipping his horses the harder, and she realised with a rather helpless sense of futility that so far as other people were concerned she must be considered in the same light as her uncle, and that even if she tried to walk to Boduin or Launceston no one would receive her, and the door would be shut in her face (D. du Maurier)

into a plainer, more natural form.

Once Mary recognised her driver. She waved her hand to him. But he took no notice of her. He only whipped his horses the harder. And she realised that so far as other people were concerned she must be considered in the same light as her uncle. This gave her a rather helpless sense of futility. Even if she tried to walk to Boduin or Launceston no one would receive her. Quite the contrary, the door would be shut in her face.

One long composite sentence has been divided into 8 short sentences. The cited example of syntactic transformation of text helps to formulate the rule of good non-fiction (neutral) prose style: in neutral written speech each sentence construction should be as simple as can be permitted by the semantic context.

Composite sentences display two principal types of construction: *hypotaxis* (subordination) and *parataxis* (coordination). Both types are representative of colloquial speech. Hypotaxis and parataxis as forms of composite sentences can be traced back to the early stages of language development (the Old English epic "Beowulf" , dated from the VII c A. D.)

The two main types of the connection of clauses in a composite

sentence are subordination and coordination.

By coordination the clauses are arranged as units of syntactically equal rank, equipotently; by subordination, as units of unequal rank, one being categorially dominated by the other. In clauses the copulative conjunction *and* or the conjunction *but may be* used as the introducers:

That sort of game gave me horrors, so I never could play it. → That sort of game gave me horrors, and I never could play it. The excuse was plausible, only it was not good enough for us. → The excuse was plausible, but it was not good enough for us.

The means of combining clauses into a polypredicative sentence are divided into *syndetic,* - conjunctional, and *asyndetic*- non-conjunctional.

Compound sentences (coordinating their clauses) and complex sentences (subordinating their clauses), syndetic or asyndetic types of clause connection being specifically displayed with both classes.

Besides the classical types of coordination and subordination of clauses, there exists another kind of composite sentence, namely, when the connection between the clauses is expressly loose, placing the clause in a syntactically detached position.This kind of syntactic connection comes under the heading of cumulation. Its formal signs are a semicolon, a dash.

Cumulation forms a type of syntactic connection intermediary between clausal connection and sentential connection. Thus, the very composite sentence is a unit intermediary between one polypredicative sentence and a group of separate sentences making up a contextual sequence.

Parenthetical clauses are the specific cumulative constructions:*He was sent for very suddenly this morning, as I have told you already, and he only gave me the barest details before his horse was saddled and he was gone*

Prof. Bloh M.J. defines the cumulative phrase as a phrase whose elements are not equal in their rank (coordinative,consective phrase) .

He goes on writing that beside the"completely" composite sentences, there exist sentences with homogeneous predicates, as well as sentences with verbid complexes.

These utterances do not represent classical composite sentences.. At the same time, they contain not one, but more than one predicative lines. These predicative constructions should be analysed as semi-composite sentences.

The semi-composite sen- tences are directly opposed to

composite-cumulative sentences. The semi-composite constructions are of especial preference in colloquial speech.

Thus, composite sentences exist in the two types: first, composite sentences of complete composition; second, semi-composite sentences.

LECTURE 14.
COMPLEX AND COMPOUND SENTENCES

The **complex sentence** is a polypredicative construction built up on the principle of subordination.

The complex sentence of minimal composition includes two clauses — a principal one and a subordinate one. The principal clause dominates the subordinate clause positionally..

One of the problems the central one concerns **the principles of classification of subordinate clauses. T**wo different bases of classification are considered : the first is ***functional,*** the second is ***categorial.***

In accord with the *functional principle,* subordinate clauses are to be classed on the analogy of the positional parts of the simple sentence.

Now, in accord with the *categorial principle,* subordinate clauses are to be classed by their inherent nominative properties irrespective of their positions in the sentence. The nominative properties of notional words are reflected in their part-of-speech classification.

All the subordinate clauses can be divided into **three** categorial-semantic groups. The **first group** includes clauses that name an event as a certain fact. These pure fact-clauses may be terminologically defined as *"substantive-nominal".*

That his letters remained unanswered annoyed him very much.

The **second group** of clauses also name an event-fact and can be called *"qualification-nominal'".*

The man who came in in the morning left a notice.

The third group of clauses make their event-nomination into a dynamic relation. And are called *"adverbial".*

Describe the picture as you see it.

Subordinate clauses are introduced by **functional connective words.** Categorially these sentence subordinators (or subordinating **clausalisers)** fall into the t**wo basic types**: those that **occupy a notional position** and those that **do not occupy such a position**. The non-positional subordinators are referred to as ***pure conjunctions.*** Here belong such words as *since, before, until, if, in case, because, so that, in order that, though, however, than, as if,* etc. The positional subordinators are in fact *conjunctive substitutes.* The main positional subordinators are the pronominal words *who, what, whose, which, that, where, when, why, as.* Some of these words are double-

functional (bifunctional), entering also the first set of subordinators; such are the words *where, when, that, as,* used both as conjunctive substitutes and conjunctions. Together with these **the zero subordinator** should be named.

That was the day when she was wearing her pink dress. Sally put on her pink dress when she decided to join the party downstairs.

The relative pronominal "when" in the first of the entences replaces the antecedent "the day",while the conjunction "when" in the second sentence has no relative pronominal status.

So the categorial classification of clauses is made by the semantic division of the subordinators which are distinguished as ***substantive-nominal*** clausalisers, ***qualification-nominal*** clausalisers and ***adverbial*** clausalisers. All the subordinate clauses are to be divided into **three groups:**

-first, **clauses of *primary nominal positions*** to which belong subject, predicative and object clauses;

-second, **clauses of *secondary nominal positions*** to which belong attributive clauses;

-third, **clauses of *adverbial positions***.

Clauses of primary nominal positions — subject, predicative, object — are interchangeable with one another in easy reshufflings of sentence constituents.*:*

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.

The ***subject clause****,* in accord with its functional position, regularly expresses **the theme** 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. .

Why he rejected the offer has never been accounted for.

The ***predicative clause*** performs the function of the nominal part of the predicate, i. e. the part adjoining the link-verb. The link-verb is mostly expressed by the pure link *be.*

The trouble is that I don't know Fanny personally.

The ***object clause*** denotes an object-situation of the process expressed by the verbal constituent of the principal clause.

The object clauses can be introduced not only non-prepositionally, but also, prepositionally: *They will accept with grace whatever he may offer.*

Subordinate clauses of secondary nominal positions include attributive clauses of various syntactic functions. They fall into **2 major classes: "descriptive" attributive clauses and "restrictive"** attributive clauses.

The **descriptive attributive clause** exposes some characteristic of the antecedent (i. e., its substantive referent) as such, while t**he restrictive attributive clause** performs a purely identifying role.

The system of adverbial clauses is to be divided into **4 groups.**

1. The first group includes clauses of *time* and clauses of *place.* Their common semantic basis is to be defined as "localisation" — respectively, temporal and spatial.

With subordinate clauses of time the particularising localisation is expressed by such conjunctions as *while, as, since, before, after, until, as soon as, now that, no sooner than,* etc.

2.The **second group of adverbial clause**s 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. *He spent the Saturday night as was his wanted*

Clauses of comparison are subdivided into those of **equality (**subordinators *as, as ... as, as if, as though)* and **those of inequality** (subordinators *not so ... as, than).* The discontinuous introducers mark, respectively, a more intense rendering of the comparison in question.*: For many years he hadn't taken so long a holiday as he was offered that summer.*

3.The **third** and most numerous **group** of adverbial clauses includes "classical" clauses of different *circumstantial semantics,* here belong clauses of *attendant event, condition, cause, reason, result (consequence), concession, purpose.* The whole group should be divided into**2 subgroups,** the first being composed by clauses of ***"attendant circumstance";*** **the second, by clauses of *"immediate circumstance".***

Clauses of attendant circumstance are not much varied in structure or semantics and come near to clauses of time. The event described by a clause of attendant circumstance is presented as some sort of background in relation to the event described by the principal clause. Clauses of attendant circumstance are introduced by the conjunctions *while* and as. *As (while) the reception was going on, Mr. Smiles was engaged in a lively conversation with the pretty niece of the hostess.*

Clauses of immediate circumstance present a vast and complicated system of constructions expressing different explanations of events, reasonings and speculations in connection with them.

4.The fourth group of adverbial clauses is formed by *parenthetical* or *insertive* construc- tions.

Jack has called here twice this morning, if I am not mistaken.
Parenthetical clauses distinguish

2 semantic subtypes.

Clauses of the **first subtype** are "introductory", they express different modal meanings. Clauses of the **second subtype** are "deviational", they express commenting insertions of various semantic character.

Prof. Bloh M.J. introduces the notions of **"monolythic" and "segregative**" sentence structures. Obligatory subordinative connections underlie monolythic complexes, while optional subordinative connections underlie segregative complexes.

Monolithic complex sentences fall into **four** basic types.

The **first** of them is formed by *merger* complex sentences, i.e. sentences with subject and predicative subordinate clauses. The subordinate clausal part of the merger monolythic complex is fused with its principal clause. The corresponding construction of syntactic anticipation should also be considered under this heading. *Cf.:* It was at this point *that Bill had come bustling into the room.*

The **second subtype** of complex sentences is formed by constructions whose subordinate clauses are dependent on the obligatory right-hand valency of the verb in the principal clause. *:*

I don't know *when I'm beaten.* Put the book *where you've taken it from.* → (*) Put the book —Her first shock was *when she came down.*

The **third subtype** of monolythic complex sentences is formed by constructions based on subordinative correlations — *"correlation" monolith* complexes.*:*

His nose was as unkindly short *as his upper lip was long.*

The **fourth subtype** of monolithic complex sentences is formed by constructions whose obligatory connection between the principal and subordinate clauses is determined only by the linear order of clausal positions. Cf.: *If he comes,* tell him to wait.

Complex sentences which have two or more subordinate clauses discriminate two basic types of subordination arrangement: ***parallel* and *consecutive.***

Subordinate clauses immediately referring to one and the same principal clause are said to be subordinated **"in parallel" or "co-subordinated".** Parallel subordination may be both homogeneous and heterogeneous. For instance, the two clauses of time in the following complex sentence, being embedded on the principle of parallel subordination, are **homogeneous** — they depend on the same element (the principal clause as a whole), are connected with each

other coordinatively and perform the same function: *When he agrees to hear me, and when we have spoken the matter over,* I'll tell you the result.

Homogeneous arrangement is very typical of object clauses expressing reported speech. Mrs. Lewin had warned her *that Cadover was an extraordinary place, and that one must never be astonished by anything* (A. Huxley).

THE COMPOUND SENTENCE

The compound sentence is a composite sentence built on the principle of coordination. Coordination, the same as subordination, can be expressed either syndetically (by means of coordinative connectors) or asyndetically.

Prof.Blokh writes that 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. As is known, this fact has given cause to some scholars to deny the existence of the compound sentence as a special, regular form of the composite sentence.

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.*

The compound sentence is derived from two or more base sentences which are connected on the principle of coordination either syndetically or asyndetically.

Th**e 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.*

The unmarked **coordinative connection** is realised by the coordinative conjunction *and* and also asyndetically.

Each semantic type of connection is inherent in the marking semantics of the connector. In particular, the connectors *but, yet, stilt, however,* etc. express different varieties of adversative relations of clauses; the discontinuous connectors *both ... and, neither ... nor* express, correspondingly, positive and negative (exclusive) copulative relations of events; the connectors *so, therefore, consequently* ex-

press various subtypes of clausal consequence, etc.

The coordinative conjunction can be used together with an functional particle-like or adverb-like word. :the conjunction *but* turns into the combinations ***but merely, but instead, but also*** ; the conjunction ***or*** forms the characteristic coordinative combinations ***or else, or rather, or even****:*

The workers were not prepared to accept the conditions of the administration, but instead they were considering a mass demonstration. She was frank with him, *or rather* she told him everything concerning the mere facts of the incident.

The coordinative specifiers combine also with the conjunction ***and,*** *so, yet, consequently* and some others*.: The two friends didn't dispute over the issue afterwards, and yet there seemed a hidden discord growing between them.*

The coordinative connections, as different from subordinative, are semantically less discriminatory. That is why the subordinative connection is regularly used as a diagnostic model for the coordinative connection, while the reverse is an exception rather than a *rule. .:*

Our host had rung the bell on our entrance and now a Chinese cook came in with more glasses and several bottles of soda. → On our entrance, as our host had rung the bell, a Chinese cook came in with more glasses and several bottles of soda. There was nothing else to do, so Alice soon began talking again. → Alice soon began talking again because there was nothing else to do.

The length of the compound sentence in terms of the number of its clausal parts is in principle unlimited. The commonest type of the compound sentence in this respect is a **two-clause construction**.

Longer sentences than two-clause ones are divided into **"open"** and **"closed"** constructions.Enumerative types of connection form **"open"** coordinations. These are used as **descriptive and narrative** means in a literary text*.:*

Sometimes they were too large and sometimes they were too small; sometimes they were too far from the center of things and sometimes they were too close; sometimes they were too expensive and sometimes they wanted too many repairs; sometimes they were too stuffy and sometimes they were too airy; sometimes they were too dark and sometimes they were too bleak. Roger always found a fault that made the house unsuitable (S. Maugham).

In the multi-clause compound sentence of a **closed** type the most typical closures are those by the conjunctions ***and*** and ***but*** *:His fingernails had been cleaned, his teeth brushed, his hair combed,*

his nostrils cleared and dried, and he had been dressed in formal black by somebody or other (W. Saroyan).

LECTURE 15.
SEMI-COMPLEX SENTENCE AND SEMI-COMPOUND SENTENCE

The semi-composite sentence is to be defined as a sentence with more than one predicative lines which are expressed in fusion. One of these lines can be identified as the dominant, the others making the semi-predicative expansion of the sentence. The expanding semi-predicative line in the minimal semi-composite sentence is either **wholly fused** with the dominant (complete) predicative line of the construction, or **partially fused** with it.

The semi-composite sentence displays an **intermediary syntactic character** between the composite sentence and the simple sentence. Its "surface" structure is analogous to that of an expanded simple sentence, since it possesses only one expressed predicative unit. Its "deep" structure, is that of a composite sentence, because it is derived from two or more completely predicative units — its base sentences.

The main **cause** of the existence of the semi-composite sentence in language

is t**he tendency of speech to be economical.**

The sergeant gave a quick salute to me, and then he put his squad in motion. → ***Giving a quick salute to me,*** **the sergeant put his squad in motion.** → *With a quick salute to me,* the sergeant put his squad in motion.

The **second** sentence, of the semi-composite participial-expanded type, expresses a semantic ranking of the events in the situational blend, one of them standing out as a dominant event, the other as a by-event.The **third** construction of semi-composition (maximum degree of blending), the fusion of the events is shown as constituting a unity in which the attendant action (the sergeant's salute) forms simply a background detail in relation to the immediately reflected occurrence (the sergeant's putting the squad in motion).

Prof.Blokh writes that the semi-composite sentences should be divided into ***semi-complex*** **and** ***semi-compound*** ones. These constructions correspond to the complex and compound sentences of complete composition

The semi-complex sentence is a semi-composite sentence built up on the principle of subordination. It is derived from minimum two base sentences, one matrix and one insert.The insert sentence is transformed into a partially depredicated

construction.

The semi-complex sentences fall into a number of subtypes. The sentences based on **position-sharing** fall into those of ***subject-sharing*** **and those of** ***object-sharing***.

The sentences based on semi-predicative linear expansion fall into those of a***ttributive complication, adverbial complication,*** **and** ***nominal-phrase complication.***

Semi-complex sentences of subject-sharing are built up by means of the two base sentences overlapping round the common subject. *:*

The man stood silent. *The moon* rose. *The moon* rose red.

Sam returned from the polar expedition *a grown-up man.* They waited *breathless.* She stood *bending over the child's bed.* We stared at the picture *bewildered.*

The given constructions express two simultaneous events .

Semi-complex sentences of object-sharing are built up of two base sentences overlapping round the word performing different functions in them: in the matrix sentence it is the object, in the insert sentence it is the subject. The complicator expansion of such sentences is commonly called the **"complex object".***:*

We saw him approach us (approaching us).

As for the relations between the two connected events expressed by the object-sharing sentence, they are of the three basic types: first, **relations of *simultaneity*** in the same place; second, relations of *cause* and *result;*

third, relations of *mental attitude* towards the event (events thought of, spoken of, wished for, liked or disliked, etc.).

All these types of relations can be explicated by the corresponding transformations of the semi-complex sentences into pleni-complex sentences.

Simultaneity in the same place is expressed by constructions with dominant verbs of perceptions *(see, hear, feel, smell,* etc.)*.:*

He felt the morning breeze gently touching his face. → He felt the morning breeze as it was gently touching his lace.

Cause and result relations are rendered by constructions with dominant causative verbs taking three types of complex objects:

an unmarked infinitival complex object (the verbs *make, let, get, have, help);*

a nounal or adjectival complex object (the verbs *call, appoint, keep, paint,* etc.);

a participial complex object (the verbs *set, send, keep,* etc.). Cf.:

I helped Jo *find the photo.* → I helped Jo *so that he found the photo.* The cook beat the meat *soft.* —» The cook beat the meat *so that it was (became) soft.*

Different mental presentations of the complicator event are effected, respectively, by verbs of mental perceptions and thinking *(think, believe, expect, find,* etc.); verbs of speech

(tell, ask, report, announce, etc.); verbs of wish; verbs of liking and disliking. *.:*

You will find many things strange here. → You will find that many things are strange here.

Semi-complex sentences of attributive complication are derived from two base sentences having an identical element that occupies the position of the subject in the insert sentence and any notional position in the matrix sentence. The insert sentence is usually an expanded one.

The waves rolling over the dam sent out fine spray.

The attributive semi-clause may contain in its head position a present participle, a past participle and an adjective. We found dry ground at the base of a tree *looking toward the sun.* → We found dry ground at the base of a tree *that looked toward the sun.*

This specific semi-complex sentence is called the **"apo-koinou" construction** *(Greek* "with a common element"). *E:*

It was you *insisted on coming,* because you didn't like restaurants (S. O'Casey),

He's the one *makes the noise at night* (E. Hemingway).

And there's nothing more *can be done* (A. Christie).

The apo-koinou construction should be classed as a familiar colloquialism of occasional use.

Semi-complex sentences of adverbial complication are derived from two base sentences one of which, the insert sentence, is predicatively reduced and embedded in an adverbial position of the matrix sentence. *:*

The task was completed. + The task seemed a very easy one. → The task, *when completed,* seemed a very easy one.

The windows were closed.-|-*She* did not hear the noise in the street. —» ***The windows being closed,*** **she did not hear the noise in the street.**

The adverbial semi-clause of the first type the "conjoint" semi-clause. The adverbial complicator expansion of the second type (i.e. having its own subject) is known under the name of the **"absolute construction"** (**"absolutive"**).

The given classification may be formulated for practical

purposes as the "rule of the subject", which will run as follows: **by adverbialising scmi-complexing the subject of the insert sentence is deleted if it is identical with the subject of the matrix sentence.**

Thus, t**he adverbial semi-clauses** are divided into **participial and non-participial**. *.:*

One day Kitty had an accident. + She *was swinging in the garden.* → One day Kitty had an accident while *swinging in the garden.* (The participle i**s not to be deleted**, being of an actional character.)

He *is very young.+ He* is quite competent in this field. —» Though *being very young,* he is quite competent in this field. → Though *very young,* he is quite competent in this field. (The participle **can be deleted**, being of a linking nature.)

She spoke as if *being in a dream.* → She spoke as if *in a dream.* (The predicate **can be deleted,** since It is expressed by the existential *be.)*

The two predicate types of adverbial semi-clauses, similar to the two subject types, can be briefly presented by the **"rule of the predicate" as follows: by adverbialising semi-complexing the verb-predicate of the insert sentence is participialised, and may be deleted if it is expressed by *be.***

Semi-complex sentences of nominal phrase complication are derived from two base sentences one of which, the insert sentence, is partially norninalised (changed into a verbid phrase of infinitival or gerundial type) and embedded in one of the nominal and prepositional adverbial positions of the other sentence serving as the matrix. The nominal verbid constructions meet the demands both of economy and expressiveness, and they are widely used in all the functional orders of speech.

Tom's coming late annoyed his mother. → *The fact that Tom came late* annoyed his mother. *For him to come so late* was unusual. → It was unusual that he came so late.

In contrast with nominal uses of infinitive phrases, **gerundial phrases** are widely employed as adverbial semi-clauses introduced by prepositions.*:*

In writing the letter he dated it wrong. → *White he was writing the letter* he dated it wrong.

SEMI-COMPOUND SENTENCE

The sentence possessing coordinated notional parts of immediately sentential reference (directly related to its predicative line) is to be treated as semi-compound. But different structural types of syntactic coordination even of direct sentential reference (coordinated subjects, predicates, objects, adverbial modifiers) display very different implications as regards semi-compounding composition of sentences.

There was nothing else, only her face in front of me. → There was nothing else in front of me.+There was only her face in front of me.

The entrance door stood open, and also the door of the living-room. —» The entrance door stood open.+ The door of the living-room stood also open.

The semi-compound sentence of predicate coordination is derived from minimum two base sentences having identical subjects. By the act of semi-compounding, one of the base sentences in most cases of textual occurrence becomes the leading clause of complete structure, while the other one is transformed into the sequential coordinate semi-clause (expansion) referring to the same subject.*:*

The soldier *was badly wounded.* +The soldier *stayed in the ranks.* → The soldier *was badly wounded,* but *stayed in the ranks.*

By the number of bases joined, (and predicate phrases representing them) semi-compound sentences may be two-base (minimal) or multi-base (more than minimal two-base). The coordinated expansion is connected with the leading part either syndetically or asyndetically.

The conjunctions used for semi-compounding, besides the copulative *and,* are monoconjunctions *but, or, nor,* and double conjunctions *both ... and, not only ... but also, either ... or, neither ... nor.* The conjunctive adverbials are *then, so, just, only.*

Here are some examples of double-conjunctional formations expressing, respectively, disjunction, simple copulative relation, copulative antithesis, copulative exclusion:

They *either* went for long walks over the fields, *or* joined in a quiet game of chess on the veranda.- disjunction

That great man was *both* a soldier *and* a born diplomat. - simple copulative relation,

Mary *not only* put up with his presence, *but* tried to be hospitable.-copulative antithesis

I am *neither* for the proposal, *nor* against the proposal; *nor* participating in that sham discussion of theirs at all.-copulative exclusion:

Of all the means of connecting base sentences into a semi-compound construction the most important and the most broadly used is the conjunction *and.*

The officer parked the car at the end of the terrace *and* went into the Mission. → The officer parked the car ..., *then* went into the Mission. (Succession of events, inviting a coordinative exposition).

Suddenly the door burst open *and* Tommy rushed in panting for breath.→ As the door burst open, Tommy rushed in ...("Successive simultaneity" of actions, inviting a subordinative exposition)

LECTURE 16.
SENTENCE IN THE TEXT

Sentences in speech are not used in isolation; they are interconnected both semantically-topically and syntactically.

Prof. Blokh M.J. writes that any sequence of sentences forms a syntactic unity. So sentences in a stretch of talk may or may not build up a coherent sequence.

The idea of a sequence of sentences forming a text includes two notions. On the one hand, it presupposes a succession of spoken or written utterances. On the other hand, it implies a topical stretch of talk. The text can be interpreted as a lingual element with its two distinguishing features: first, *semantic (topical) unity,* second, *semantico-syntactic cohesion.*

In a monologue, sentences connected in a continual sequence are directed from one speaker to his one or several listeners It is a **one-direction sequence.**

The first scholars who identified a succession of such sentences as a special syntactic unit were the Russian linguists **N. S. Pospelov and L. A. Bulakhovsky.** The former called the unit in question **a "complex syntactic unity**", the latter, a **"super-phrasal unity"**. Prof. Blokh M.J. writes English term used in his book is the "supra-sentential construction"

Sentences in a dialogue are uttered by the speakers-interlocutors in turn, so that they must meet one another.

It should be characterised as a two-direction sequence. "Annette, what have you done?" — "I've done what I had to do" (S. Maugham).

Prof.Blokh writes that the supra-sentential construction of one-**direction communicative type can be called a cumulative sequence, or a "cumuleme"**. He proposes to call this type of sentence-connection by the term **"occursive"**, and the supra-sentential construction based on occursive connection, by the term **"occurseme"**.

The occurseme as an element of the system occupies a place **above** the cumuleme. Indeed, if the cumuleme is constructed by two or more sentences joined by cumulation, **the occurseme can be constructed by two or more cumulemes*:***

"Damn you, stop talking about my wife. If you mention her name again I swear I'll knock you down." — "Oh no, you won't.

You're too great a gentleman to hit a feller smaller than yourself" (S. Maugham).

The cumuleme and occurseme can simply be referred to as topical elements (correspondingly, topical and exchange-topical).

Sentences in a cumulative sequence can be connected either "prospectively" or "retrospectively".

Prospective ("epiphoric", "cataphoric") cumulation is effected by connective elements that relate a given sentence to one that is to follow it - the sentence containing it is **semantically incomplete**. Very often **prospective connectors are notional words.**

I tell you, *one of two things* must happen. *Either* out of that darkness some new creation will come to supplant us as we have supplanted the animals, *or* the heavens will fall in thunder and destroy us (B. Shaw).

The prospective connection is especially characteristic of the **texts of scientific and technical works.**

Retrospective (or "anaphoric") cumulation is effected by connective elements that relate a given sentence to the one that precedes it and is semantically complete by itself - it is the basic type of cumulation in ordinary speech.

What curious "class" sensation was *this?* Or was *it* fellow-feeling with the huntedt? (J. Galsworthy).

Cumulation is divided into **two fundamental types: *conjunctive*** cumulation and ***correlative*** cumulation.

Conjunctive cumulation is effected by conjunction-like connectors.(both coordinative and subordinative;)-

- **adverbial and parenthetical sentence-connectors** *(then, yet, however, consequently, hence, besides, moreover, nevertheless,* etc.). Adverbial and parenthetical sentence-connectors may be both specialised, i.e. functional and semi-functional words, and non-specialised units performing the connective functions for the nonce.

There was an indescribable agony in his voice. *And* as if his own words of pain overcame the last barrier of his self-control, he broke down (S. Maugham). There was no train till nearly eleven, and she had to bear her impatience as best she could. *At last* it was time to start, and she put on her gloves (S. Maugham).

Correlative cumulation is effected by a pair of elements one of which, the "succeedent", refers to the other, the"antecedent", used in the foregoing sentence.

Correlative cumulation is divided into **substitutional connection and representative connection.** Substitutional cu-

mulation is based on the use of substitutes.

A cumuleme (cumulative supra-sentential construction) is formed by **two or more independent sentences making up a topical syntactic unity.** The first of the sentences in a cumuleme is its **"leading" sentence**, the succeeding sentences are "**sequential".**

The cumuleme, like a sentence, is **a universal unit of language** in so far as it is used in all the functional varieties of speech.

The basic **semantic types of cumulemes are "factual**" (narrative and descriptive), **"modal"** (reasoning, perceptive, etc.), **and mixed.** Here is an example of a narrative cumuleme:

Three years later, when Jane was an Army driver, she was sent one night to pick up a party of officers who had been testing defences on the cliff. She found the place where the road ran between a cleft almost to the beach, switched off her engine and waited, hunched in her great-coat, half asleep, in the cold black silence. She waited for an hour and woke in a fright to a furious voice coming out of the night (M. Dickens).

The introduction of the notion of cumuleme in linguistics helps specify and explain the two peculiar and rather important border-line phenomena between **the sentence and the sentential sequence.**

The second of the border-line phenomena in question is the opposite **of parcellation -**forcing two different sentences into one, i.e. in **transposing a cumuleme into a sentence**. The cumuleme-sentence construction is characteristic of uncareful and familiar speech; in a literary text it is used for the sake of giving a vivid verbal characteristic to a personage. I'm not going to disturb her *and that's flat, miss* (A. Christie). One of the means of transposing a cumuleme into a sentence in literary speech is the use of half-finality punctuation marks (here, a semicolon).

Paragraph groupings. Prof.Blokh writes that the **supra-cumulation** should be discriminated as connection of cumulemes and paragraphs into larger textual unities of the correspondingly higher subtopical status.

... That first slip with my surname was just like him; and afterwards, particularly when he was annoyed, apprehensive, or guilty because of me, he frequently called me Ellis.

So, in the smell of Getliffe's tobacco, I listened to him , sometimes incomprehensibly, because of his allusive slang, often inaccurately. He loved the law (C. P. Snow).

In the given example, the sentence beginning the second paragraph is cumulated (i.e. supra-cumulated) to the previous paragraph, thus making the two of them into a paragraph grouping.

The sentence remains the central structural-syntactic element in all the formations of topical significance. Thus, even in the course of a detailed study of various types of supra-sentential constructions, the linguist comes to the confirmation of the classical truth that the two basic units of language are the word and the sentence: the word as a unit of nomination, the sentence as a unit of predication. **And it is through combining different sentence-predications that topical reflections of reality are achieved in all the numerous forms of lingual intercourse.**

A LIST OF SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Ахманова О. С.*, *Микаэлян Г. Б.* Современные синтаксические теории. М., 1963.
2. *Бархударов Л. С. Штелинг Д. А.* Грамматика английского языка. М., 1973.
3. *Блумфилд Л.* Язык. М., 1968.
4. *Бурлакова В. В.* Основы структуры словосочетания в современном английском языке. Л., 1975.
5. *Воронцова Г.* Я. Очерки по грамматике английского языка. М., 1960.
6. *Гальперин И. Р.* Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. М., 1981.
7. *Есперсен О.* Философия грамматики. М., 1958.
8. *Жигадло В.* Я., *Иванова И.* Я., *Иофик Л. Л.* Современный английский язык. М., 1956.
9. *Иванова И.* Я., *Бурлакова В. В., Почепцов Г. Г.* Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. М., 1981.
10. *Иртеньева* Я. *Ф.* Грамматика современного английского языка (теоретический курс). М., 1956.
11. *Корнеева Е. А., Кобрина* Я. *А., Гузеева К. А., Оссовская М. И.* Пособие по морфологии современного английского языка. М. 1974.
12. *Кошевая И. Г.* Грамматический строй современного английского языка. М., 1978.
13. *Лайонз Дж.* Введение в теоретическую лингвистику. М., 1978.
14. *Мухин А.М.* (1) Структура предложений и их модели. Л., 1968; (2) Синтаксемный анализ и проблема уровней языка. Л., 1980.
15. *Почепцов Г. Г.* (1) Конструктивный анализ структуры предложения. Киев, 1971; (2) Синтагматика английского слова. Киев, 1976.
16. *Слюсарева* Я. *А.* Проблемы функционального синтаксиса современного английского языка. М., 1981.
17. *Смирницкий А. И.* (1) Синтаксис английского языка. М., 1957; (2) Морфология английского языка. М., 1959.
18. *Тер-Минасова С.* Г. Словосочетание в научно-лингвистическом и дидактическом аспектах. М., 1981.
19. *Чейф У. Л.* Значение и структура языка. М., 1975.

20. *Уфимцева А. А.* Слово в лексико-семантической системе языка. М., 1968.

21. *Хлебникова И. Б.* Оппозиции в морфологии. М., 1969.

22. *Ярцева В. Н.* (1) Историческая морфология английского языка. М.-Л., I960; (2) Исторический синтаксис английского языка. М.-Л., 1961.

23. *Akhmanova O.* et. al. Syntax: Theory and Method. Moscow, 1972.

24. *Bryant M. A.* Functional English Grammar. N.Y., 1945.

25. *Close R. A.* A Reference Grammar for Students of English. Ldn., 1977.

26. *Curme G.O. A* Grammar of the English Language. Boston — N.Y., 1935.

27. *Fries Ch.C.* The Structure of English. N.Y., 1952.

28. *Ganshina M. A. Vasilevskaya N. M.* English Grammar. Moscow, 1964.

29. *Hill A. A.* Introduction to Linguistic Structures. N.Y. — Burlingame, 1958.

30. *Hockett Ch.* A Course in Modern Linguistics. N.Y., 1958.

31. *Iofik L. L., Chakhoyan L. P.* Readings in the Theory of English Grammar. Leningrad, 1972.

32. *Ilyish B. A.* The Structure of Modern English. M.-L., 1971.

33. *Irtenyeva N. F., Barsova O. M., Blokh M. Y., Shapkin A. P.* A Theoretical English Grammar. Moscow, 1969.

34. *Khaimovich B. S., Rogovskaya B. I.* A Course in English Grammar. Moscow, 1967.

35. *Nida E.* Morphology. Ann Arbor, 1965.

36. *Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A* Grammar of Contemporary English. Ldn., 1972.

37. *Strang B.* Modern English Structure. Ldn., 1974.

38. *Sweet H. A* New English Grammar Logical and Historical. Pt. 1. Oxf., 1891;. Pt. 2. Oxf., 1898.