

S. V. Burdina

THEORETICAL GRAMMAR

**Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sports of Ukraine
State Institution
“Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University”**

S. V. Burdina

THEORETICAL GRAMMAR

*Methodic Guides for Students of Higher
Educational Institutions*

**Luhansk
State Institution
Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University
2013**

UDK 811.111'36(076.6)

BBK 81.2Engl-9

B91

References :

- Kryshalo O. V.* – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Translation Studies of Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University.
- Saveleva N. O.* – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of English Philology Department of Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University.
- Novikova H. A.* – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor of English Philology Department of Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University.

Burdina S. V.

- B91 Theoretical Grammar : method. guides for students of higher educational institutions / Svitlana Vasylyvna Burdina ; State Institution Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University. – Luhansk : Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University, 2013. – 90 p.

The methodological recommendations to Grammar Theory of Modern English consist of 3 parts: 1. Introduction. 2. Module test 1 – Morphology and 3. Module test 2 – Syntax. The main purpose of the course is to develop linguistic thinking in students, scientific understanding of grammar and lexical categories in Modern English. A particular attention is paid to the problematic issues on grammar theory at the modern stage of the development of linguistics, the issues on system nature of language, dialect unities of form and content of all grammar phenomena, functional and semantic connections between units of different levels. These issues are discussed using systematic comparison with the Ukrainian language.

The methodological recommendations are designed for students in philological specialities in higher educational establishments.

UDK 811.111'36(076.6)

BBK 81.2Engl-9

*Recommended for printing by the council of methods of teaching
of Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University
(proceedings № 6, dated Jan. 16, 2013)*

© Burdina S. V., 2013

© State Institution Luhansk Taras Shevchenko
National University Press, 2013

Contents

Introduction 5

LECTURES

Module 1. Morphology. The Basics of Theoretical Grammar

Lecture 1. Theoretical Grammar in the Systemic Conception of Language..... 8

Lecture 2. Basic Grammatical Notions 19

Lecture 3. Basic Morphological Notions 32

Lecture 4. The Theory of the Grammatical Classes of Words 40

Lecture 5. The Verb as a Part of Speech 50

Module 2. Syntax

Lecture 6. Basic Syntactic Notions 55

Lecture 7. The Theory of the Word Group 60

Lecture 8. The Theory of the Sentence 63

SEMINARS

Module 1. Morphology. The Basics of Theoretical Grammar

Seminar 1. Theoretical Grammar and its Relationship to Other Branches of Linguistics. Basic Grammatical Notions 68

Seminar 2. The Morphological Level of the Language..... 70

Seminar 3. General Survey of Nouns and Their Categories ... 72

Seminar 4. The Verb and Verbal Categories	76
Seminar 5. The Category of Tense.....	78
Module 2. Syntax	
Seminar 6. Syntax. Its Subject and Methods	82
Seminar 7. Word-Group Theory	85
References	86

Introduction

This manual, containing a theoretical outline of English grammar, is intended for the departments of English in universities. Its purpose is to present an introduction to the problems of up-to-date grammatical study of English on a systemic basis, sustained by demonstrations of applying modern analytical techniques to various grammatical phenomena of living English speech.

The main purpose of the theoretical course on English grammar is to introduce students to many linguistic problems connected with grammatical structures and to the modern methods applied in dealing with them. As there are many outstanding problems in Modern linguistics, one of these concerns the relations between morphology and syntax [9, p. 3]. That is why the lecture and seminar hours of this course are divided into two modules.

Any linguistic description may have a practical or theoretical purpose. A practical description is aimed at providing the student with a manual of practical mastery of the corresponding part of language (within the limits determined by various factors of educational destination and scientific possibilities). As for theoretical linguistic descriptions, they pursue analytical aims and therefore present the studied parts of language in relative isolation, so as to gain insights into their inner structure and expose the intrinsic mechanisms of their functioning. Hence, 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. The rigid regulations for the correct ways of expression, for want of the profound understanding of the social nature of language, were often based on purely subjective and arbitrary judgements of individual

grammar compilers. The result of this "prescriptive" approach was, that alongside of quite essential and useful information, non-existent "rules" were formulated that stood in sheer contradiction with the existing language usage, i.e. lingual reality. Traces of this arbitrary prescriptive approach to the grammatical teaching may easily be found even in to-date's school practice [2, p. 7].

For the purpose of helping students to eradicate this malpractice throughout this course students focus on analyzing modern textbooks from the point of view of theoretical grammar, on which they report and actively engage in discussion in the classroom.

It is by actively mastering the essentials of these theoretical developments that the student will be enabled to cope with the grammatical aspects of their future linguistic work as teachers and learners of English. After all, every teacher is still a learner.

LECTURES

Module 1. Morphology. The Basics of Theoretical Grammar

Lecture 1. Theoretical Grammar in the Systemic Conception of Language

Issues Discussed:

1. *Basic approaches to language*
2. *Language as system and structure*
3. *Language and Speech*
4. *Paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations between language units*
5. *Theoretical Grammar and its relation to other branches of linguistics*

Basic approaches to language

There are two basic approaches to language as a complicated social phenomenon:

- 1) the internal approach;
- 2) the external approach.

Internally language is analyzed as a global macrosystem consisting of three micro systems: the **phonological** system, the **lexical** system, the **grammatical** system.

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 [2, p. 6].

Language is also regarded as a structure of interrelated and interdependent language units.

Externally language represents a functional system, which makes up language as a social phenomenon. The basic functions of language are:

- 1) the communicative;
- 2) the cognitive (thought-forming);
- 3) the emotive.

From the point of view of the *communicative* function “language is a means of forming and storing ideas as reflections of reality and exchanging them in the process of human intercourse. Language is social by nature; it is inseparably connected with the people who are its creators and users; it grows and develops together with the development of society” [2, p. 6].

The *cognitive* function is predetermined by the organic connection between language and thought. In this respect language is characterised as the immediate actuality of thought. Hence, comes that language is a means of forming, expressing and storing thoughts.

The emotional sphere of life also finds its reflection in language. An utterance comprises not only logical information (informative content) but also emotional aspect, which indicates emotions, attitudes, assessments of speakers. Hence, comes the *emotive* function of language.

As a functional system language may be studied not only by linguistics but by some other branches of sciences: systematology (a science of any system), semiotics (a science of sign systems), sociology, psychology, the theory of information. Due to this interdisciplinary cooperation new branches of linguistics have appeared of late: sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, computational linguistics, cognitive linguistics etc.

Language as system and structure

From the internal point of view language is qualified as **system** and **structure**. “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. Units of immediate interdependencies (such as classes and subclasses of words, various subtypes of syntactic constructions, etc.) form different microsystems (subsystems) within the framework of the global macrosystem (supersystem) of the whole of language.

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” [2, p. 11].

Language units are characterized by systemic value. It means that language units may be viewed and valued within a certain system. Let us take the word [kit] to illustrate how its meaning differs depending on the language: in English it means a set of equipment; in Russian – a big mammal living in the sea; in Ukrainian – a domestic animal fond of mice. Thus, we cannot state the meaning of the word until we know the language system to which it refers.

Language units 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. This hierarchy is of a kind that units of any higher level are analysable into (i.e. are formed of) units of the immediately lower level. Thus, morphemes are decomposed into phonemes, words are decomposed into morphemes, phrases are decomposed into words, etc.

But this hierarchical relation is by no means reduced to the mechanical composition of larger units from smaller ones; units of each level are characterised by their own, specific functional features which provide for the very recognition of the corresponding levels of language.

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 [-l]; 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.

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 Melrose.

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 unified 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 [2, p. 13-16].

It should be noted that one and the same language unit may have different status, e.g. [o:] may be a phoneme in "more"[mo:], a morpheme in "awful" [o:], a word "awe" [o:] and a sentence "Oh!"

The systemic nature of grammar is probably more evident than that of any other sphere of language, since grammar is responsible for the very organisation of the informative content of utterances [2, p. 11]. Due to this fact, even the earliest grammatical treatises, within the cognitive limits of their times, disclosed some systemic features of the described material. But the scientifically sustained and consistent principles of systemic approach to language and its

grammar were essentially developed in the linguistics of the twentieth century, namely, after the publication of 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.

On the basis of discriminating synchrony and diachrony, the difference between language proper and speech proper can be strictly defined, which is of crucial importance for the identification of the object of linguistic science.

Language and Speech

Language in the narrow sense of the word is a system of means of expression, while speech in the same narrow sense 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.

Thus, we have the broad philosophical concept of language which is analysed by linguistics in two different aspects – the system of signs (language proper) and the use of signs (speech proper). The generalising term "language" is also preserved in linguistics, showing the unity of these two aspects.

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", i.e. made situationally significant as part of the grammatically organised text [2, p. 11-12].

The comparison of language and speech will not be complete without emphasizing that language is general, social, and potential while speech is concrete, individual, and actual.

Thus, language and speech are two correlative planes of one dialectical unity. It goes from this that there is nothing in language, which is not actualized in speech and there is nothing in speech, which does not exist potentially in language.

Paradigmatic and Syntagmatic relations between language units

Lingual units stand to one another in two fundamental types of relations: *syntagmatic* and *paradigmatic*.

Syntagmatic relations are immediate linear relations between units in a segmental sequence (string); they are predetermined by the valency (potential combinability) of language units; they are based on logical relations of ***independence, dependence and interdependence*** (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 a 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 actually observed in utterances, they are described by the Latin formula as relations "in praesentia" ("in the presence").

There are three types of syntagmatic relations:

1st type – based on coordination, logical connection of independence, found at 3 levels (morphemic – e.g. *hop-hop*; lexemic – e.g. *men and women*; proposemic – e.g. *He is a brilliant singer and she is good at dancing*). Such relations are equal in rank, homogeneous in nature and structurally independent.

2nd type – based on subordination, logical connection of dependence, found at 3 levels (morphemic – e.g. *driv-er*; lexemic – e.g. *lovely weather*; proposemic – e.g. *I like summer because I can lie in the sun*). Such relations are not equal in rank, not homogeneous in nature and are structurally dependent.

3rd type – based on predication, logical connection of interdependence, found at 1 level (lexemic – e.g. *I like sweets*). Such relations are mutually dependent and are found between subject and predicate.

In real speech in one and the same utterance different types of syntagmatic relations are realized, depending on the speakers intention and communicative purpose.

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."

In the sphere of phonology such series are built up by the correlations of phonemes on the basis of vocality or consonantism, voicedness or devoicedness, the factor of nazalisation, the factor of length, etc. In the sphere of the vocabulary these series are founded on the correlations of synonymy and antonymy, on various topical connections, on different word-building dependencies. In the domain of grammar series of related forms realise grammatical

numbers and cases, persons and tenses, gradations of modalities, sets of sentence-patterns of various functional destination, etc.

Paradigmatic relations are interclass relations that are found between language units, which occur in the same context. These are associative relations, because they are based on a certain kind of similarity according to which 4 types of paradigmatic relations are distinguished:

1st type – based on semantic similarity, found between synonyms (e.g. terrible-horrible-awful), antonyms (e.g. kind-cruel), semantically organized groups (e.g. school-teacher-lesson).

2nd type – based on formal similarity and can be of two types: *category* paradigmatic relations and *word-building* paradigmatic relations. Correspondingly each of these types are divided into two groups. 1) *Categorical* paradigmatic relations represented by the *grammatical paradigm* – a set of grammatical forms of one and the same word, which express the grammatical categories of it (e.g. boy-boys-boy's-boys'). 2) *Categorical* paradigmatic relations based on similarity of *category form* and are found between lexical units having the same grammatical (categorical) meaning (e.g. boys-girls-oxen-feet). 1) *Word-building* paradigmatic relations based on similarity of word-building pattern and represent a morphological opposition (e.g. teacher-swimmer-driver). 2) *Word-building* paradigmatic relations are found between words within the same word-family or group (e.g. heart-hearty-heartless-heartiness).

3rd type – based on functional similarity, i.e. perform the same function, and are found between, e.g. noun determiners (a/the/some/his/John's girl).

4th type – based on functional-semantic similarity, i.e. occupy the same set of positions in free utterances and are found between parenthesis (e.g. The concert/He/Swimming/To swim/This is good).

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). In other words, with paradigms, the same as with any other systemically organised material, macro- and micro-series are to be discriminated [2, p. 11-14].

Theoretical Grammar and its relation to other branches of linguistics

Theoretical grammar is related to other branches of linguistics. First of all each of the three constituent parts of language is studied by a particular linguistic discipline. These disciplines, presenting a series of approaches to their particular objects of analysis, give the corresponding "descriptions" of language consisting in ordered expositions of the constituent parts in question. Thus, 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 [2, p. 6].

The connection of theoretical grammar to phonology can be proved by the fact that a word stress may change a part of speech. *Cf.* *to import (v) – import (n); to export (v) – export (n)*, etc. A change of intonation may change the communicative type of a sentence: *We surrender* (a declarative sentence) – *We surrender?!* (an interrogative-negative emotional sentence).

Grammar is related to lexicology, as it is not indifferent to the meaning of words: the meaning of a word may change the type of the predicate in a sentence. Cf.: a) *He made a good report*, b) *He made a good reporter*. In the first sentence we observe a simple verbal predicate while in the second sentence we see a compound nominal predicate.

Theoretical grammar is definitely related to practical grammar, but their purposes are different: the purpose of practical (or prescriptive) grammar is to prescribe the rules of how to correctly build sentences, or the Past Indefinite forms, or the plural number forms, etc., while the main purpose of theoretical (scientific, descriptive) grammar is to give a scientific description and analysis of the structure of Modern English and its grammatical categories along with the purpose of giving students a deeper insight into the mechanism, processes and tendencies in the grammatical structure of English.

Grammar has at its disposal different methods of analysis: the traditional method of analysis, the immediate constituents (IC) method, the transformational method (T-method), etc.

Lecture 2. Basic Grammatical Notions

Issues Discussed:

1. *Grammatical meaning and its types*
2. *Grammatical form and its types*
3. *The notion of morphological opposition. Types of morphological opposition*
4. *The notion of grammatical category. Types of grammatical category.*

Grammatical Meaning and its Types

The grammatical meaning is the essential part of a grammatical category, which is defined as a unity of a grammatical meaning and a morphological way of its expression. The peculiarities of the grammatical meaning are especially evident in comparison with the lexical meaning.

Grammatical meanings are very abstract (expresses such abstract notions as plurality/singularity), very general (not confined to an individual word, but unite a whole class of words), formally expressed by means of inflexions or absence of inflexions. *Lexical meaning* is concrete (each lexical unit denotes a particular referent in reality), individual, expressed by root. Grammatical meaning correlates with the lexical meaning and they are connected. The realization of the grammatical meaning may be restricted or favoured by the lexical meaning (e.g. *to see* – no Continuous Aspect). But grammatical meaning may be expressed in the sentence irrespective of the lexical meaning (e.g. *Wogglis digged diggls.* – 1) substantivity, plurality, countability; 2) regularity, Past Tense).

Thus, grammatical meaning is an abstract, generalized meaning, typical of large groups of words and formally expressed by inflexions or zero inflexions in opposition.

According to *the way of expression* grammatical meaning can be explicit (formally expressed by a positive inflexion or by a zero morpheme, syntagmatically singled out) and implicit (not formally expressed, not syntagmatically singled out). Explicit

categorial grammatical meaning can be synthetically and analytically expressed (see below). Implicit grammatical meaning can be general (parts of speech meaning: substantivity for nouns, verbality – verbs, qualitiveness – adjectives) and dependent. The implicit dependent meaning 1) is not a real segment of a word; 2) has no constant morphological way of its expression; 3) is revealed through the interaction with a grammatical category, the realization of which it favours or restricts. For example, countability-uncountability of English nouns (not formally expressed in the word structure – implicit; correlate with the grammatical category of number and these meanings depend on the realization of this grammatical category - dependent), transitivity-intransitivity of English verbs (no morphological marker – implicit, revealed through the interaction with the grammatical category of Voice – dependent), terminativeness-nonterminativeness /непредельность/ of English verbs (implicit dependent – correlates with the category of Aspect, i.e. Continuous Aspect: I want to see you – You are seeing me right now!), qualitiveness-relativeness of English adjectives (implicit dependent – correlates with degrees of comparison), animateness-inanimateness (implicit dependent – correlates with the category of case).

The 2nd classification is based on the attitude of grammatical meaning to *objective reality* and can be **extralingual** and **introlingual**. *Extralingual* grammatical meaning is situationally conditioned, extralingually motivated, the choice of grammatical forms is free (e.g. Give me a book. Give me the book.). The meanings of definiteness-indefiniteness are extralingual because the choice of the article is grammatically free. This or that article is predetermined by the situation of communication and the speaker's communicative intention. *Introlingual* grammatical meaning is not situationally conditioned but conditioned by the language structure, introlingually motivated, the choice of grammatical forms is bound. Introlingual grammatical meanings are found in the following cases: 1) When there is only one grammatical form for expressing grammatical meaning (e.g. The news is so exciting). 2) When the

grammatical meaning is syntactically predetermined (e.g. I saw him. – the meaning of the objective case depends on the syntactical structure). 3) When the grammatical meaning correlates with the lexical element in the sentence. (e.g. Yesterday I saw him) In real speech one and the same grammatical meaning may be either intralingual or extralingual, e.g. the grammatical meaning of plurality is extralingual in class nouns).

Grammatical Form and its Types

The grammatical form is a means of expressing grammatical meanings; it is a combination of the stem and a word-changing morpheme. The grammatical forms are classed 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 (e.g. foot-feet), outer inflexion: zero morpheme (e.g. book), positive morpheme (e.g. books), monoinflexion (e.g. Tom and John's room – inflexion to more than one root), 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 (grammatical "infixation", see above) is used in English in irregular verbs (the bulk of them belong to the Germanic strong 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, half – to halve 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. In other words, it consists in the grammatical interchange of word roots, and this unites it in principle with inner inflexion (or, rather, makes the latter into a specific variety of the former). Thus, suppletivity is the occurrence of an unrelated form to fill a gap in a conjugation (e.g. went as the past tense of go)

Suppletivity is used in the forms of the verbs *be* and *go*, in the irregular forms of the degrees of comparison, in some forms of personal pronouns. Cf.: be – am – are – is – was – were; go – went; good – better; bad – worse; much – more; little – less; I – me; we – us; she – her.

In a broader morphological interpretation, suppletivity can be recognised in paradigmatic correlations of some modal verbs, some indefinite pronouns, as well as certain nouns of peculiar categorial properties (lexemic suppletivity). Cf.: 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).

Suffixes are used to build up the number and case forms of the noun; the person-number, tense, participial and gerundial forms of the verb; the comparison forms of the adjective and adverb. In the oppositional correlations of all these forms, the initial paradigmatic form of each opposition is distinguished by a zero suffix. Cf.: boy + \emptyset – boys; go + \emptyset – goes; work + \emptyset – worked; small + \emptyset – smaller; etc.

Taking this into account, and considering also the fact that each grammatical form paradigmatically correlates with at least one other

grammatical form on the basis of the category expressed (*e.g.* the form of the singular with the form of the plural), we come 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, they deserve some special comment on their substance.

The traditional view of the analytical morphological form recognises two lexemic parts in it, stating that it presents a combination of an auxiliary word with a basic word. However, there is a tendency with some linguists to recognise as analytical not all such grammatically significant combinations, but only those of them that are "grammatically idiomatic", i.e. whose relevant grammatical meaning is not immediately dependent on the meanings of their component elements taken apart. Considered in this light, the form of the verbal perfect where the auxiliary "have" has utterly lost its original meaning of possession, is interpreted as the most standard and indisputable analytical form in English morphology. Its opposite is seen in the analytical degrees of comparison which, according to the cited interpretation, come very near to free combinations of words by their lack of "idiomatism" in the above sense [21, p. 68; 1, p. 67.].

The scientific achievement of the study of "idiomatic" analytism in different languages is essential and indisputable. On the other hand, the demand that "grammatical idiomaticism" should be regarded as the basis of "grammatical analytism" seems, logically, too strong. The analytical means underlying the forms in question consist in the discontinuity of the corresponding lexemic constituents. Proceeding from this fundamental principle, it can hardly stand to reason to exclude "unidiomatic" grammatical combinations (i.e. combinations of oppositional-categorical significance) from the system of analytical

expression as such. Rather, they should be regarded as an integral part of this system, in which, the provision granted, a gradation of idiomatism is to be recognised. In this case, alongside of the classical analytical forms of verbal perfect or continuous, such analytical forms should also be discriminated as the analytical infinitive (*go – to go*), the analytical verbal person (verb plus personal pronoun), the analytical degrees of comparison of both positive and negative varieties (*more important – less important*), as well as some other, still more unconventional form-types.

Moreover, alongside of the standard analytical forms characterised by the unequal ranks of their components (auxiliary element–basic element), as a marginal analytical form-type grammatical repetition should be recognised, which is used to express specific categorial semantics of processual intensity with the verb, of indefinitely high degree of quality with the adjective and the adverb, of indefinitely large quantity with the noun. *Cf.*:

He *knocked* and *knocked* and *knocked* without reply (Gr. Greene). Oh, I feel I've got such *boundless, boundless* love to give to somebody (K. Mansfield). Two white-haired severe women were in charge of *shelves* and *shelves* of knitting materials of every description (A. Christie) [2, p. 32-35].

The problem of potential polysemy in grammar is one of the most important, the one which is very complex and seems to be relevant to a number of aspects.

All languages seem to have polysemy on several levels. Like words which are often signs not of one but of several things, a single grammatical form can also be made to express a whole variety of structural meanings. This appears to be natural and is a fairly common development in the structure of any language. The linguistic mechanism works naturally in many ways to prevent ambiguity in patterns of grammatical structure. Orientation towards the context will generally show which of all the possible meanings is to be attached to a polysemantic grammatical form.

It is sometimes maintained that in case of grammatical polysemy we observe various structural meanings inherent in the given form,

one of them being always invariable, i. e. found in any possible context of the use of the form. And then, if this invariable structural meaning cannot be traced in different uses of the given form, we have homonymy. In point of fact, this angle of view does not seem erroneous.

Functional re-evaluation of grammatical forms is a source of constant linguistic interest. We may say with little fear of exaggeration that whatever may be the other problems of grammar learning the polysemantic character of grammatical forms is always primary in importance.

The nature of grammar as a constituent part of language is better understood through two planes of language, namely, the **plane of content** (meaning) and the **plane of expression** (form) [24].

The Notion of Morphological Opposition. Types of Morphological Opposition

The paradigmatic correlations of grammatical forms in a category are exposed by the so-called "grammatical oppositions".

The opposition (in the linguistic sense) may be defined as a generalised correlation of lingual forms by means of which a certain grammatical category is expressed. The correlated elements (members) of the opposition must possess two types of features: *common* features and *differential* features. Common features serve as the basis of contrast, while differential features immediately express the function in question.

The oppositional theory was originally formulated as a phonological theory. Three main qualitative 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** (tertiary, quaternary, etc.).

The most important type of opposition is the binary privative opposition; the other types of oppositions are reducible to the binary privative opposition.

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".

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, since they are differentiated by the degree of their openness (their length, as is known, is also relevant, as well as some other individualising properties, but these factors do not spoil the gradual opposition as such).

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 nasalised, [b] being plosive.

We have noted above that any opposition can be reformulated in privative terms. Indeed, any positive feature distinguishing an oppositionally characterised lingual element is absent in the oppositionally correlated element, so that considered from the point of view of this feature alone, the opposition, by

definition, becomes privative. This reformulation is especially helpful on an advanced stage of oppositional study of a given microsystem, because it enables us to characterise the elements of the system by the corresponding strings ("bundles") of values of their oppositional featuring ("bundles of differential features"), each feature being represented by the values + or –.

For instance, [p] is distinguished from [b] as voiceless (voice –), from [t] as bilabial (labialisation +), from [m] as non-nazalised (nazalisation –), etc. The descriptive advantages of this kind of characterisation are self-evident.

Unlike phonemes which are monolateral lingual elements, 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 (marked) member and absent in its weak (unmarked) member. In another kind of wording, this differential feature may be said to mark one of the members of the opposition positively (the strong member), and the other one negatively (the weak member). The featuring in question serves as the immediate means of expressing a grammatical meaning.

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 differentiated by the oppositions of signemic units (signemic oppositions) are referred to as "semantic features", or "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 two forms constitute a privative

opposition in which the plural is the marked member. In order to stress the negative marking of the singular, it can be referred to as "non-plural".

It should be noted that the designation of the weak members of privative morphological oppositions by the "non-" terms is significant not only from the point of view of the plane of expression, but also from the point of view of the plane of content. It is connected with the fact that 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, respectively, more particular and concrete. Due to this difference in meaning, the weak member is used in a wider range of contexts than the strong member. For instance, the present tense form of the verb, as different from the past tense, is used to render meanings much broader than those directly implied by the corresponding time-plane as such. *Cf.:*

The sun *rises* in the East. To err *is* human. They *don't speak* French in this part of the country. Etc.

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*.

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. These forms are ordered in a paradigm in grammatical descriptions.

Both equipollent and gradual oppositions in morphology, the same as in phonology, can be reduced to privative oppositions within the framework of an oppositional presentation of some categorial system as a whole. Thus, a word-form, like a phoneme, can be represented by a bundle of values of differential features, graphically exposing its categorial structure. For instance, the verb-

form *listens* is marked negatively as the present tense (tense -), negatively as the indicative mood (mood -), negatively as the passive voice (voice-), positively as the third person (person +), etc. This principle of presentation, making a morphological description more compact, at the same time has the advantage of precision and helps penetrate deeper into the inner mechanisms of grammatical categories [2, p. 27-31].

The Notion of Grammatical Category. Types of Grammatical Categories.

The most general notions reflecting the most general properties of phenomena are referred to in logic as "categorical notions", or "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 categorial meaning (*e.g.* the grammatical number) unites the individual meanings of the correlated paradigmatic forms (*e.g.* singular – plural) and is exposed through them; hence, the meaning of the grammatical category and the meaning of the grammatical form are related to each other on the principle of the logical relation between the categorial and generic notions.

As for the grammatical category itself, it presents, the same as the grammatical "form", a unity of form (*i.e.* material factor) and meaning (*i.e.* ideal factor) and constitutes a certain signemic system.

More specifically, 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 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. categories innate for a given lexemic class, and "reflective" categories, i.e. categories of a secondary, derivative semantic value. Categorical forms based on subordinative grammatical agreement (such as the verbal person, the verbal number) are reflective, while categorical forms stipulating grammatical agreement in lexemes of a contiguous word-class (such as the substantive-pronominal person, the substantive number) are immanent. Immanent are also such categories and their forms as are closed within a word-class, i.e. do not transgress its borders; to these belong the tense of the verb, the comparison of the adjective and adverb, etc.

Another essential division of grammatical categories is based on the changeability factor of the exposed feature. Namely, the feature of the referent expressed by the 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 (see further). *Cf.*:

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", or "lexicalised". *Cf.*: news, advice, progress; people, police; bellows, tongs; colours, letters; etc.

In distinction to these, the gender word-building pairs should be considered as a clear example of hybrid constant-variable formations, since their constant feature of gender has acquired some changeability properties, i.e. has become to a certain extent "grammaticalised". *Cf.*: actor – actress, author – authoress, lion – lioness, etc. [2, p. 35-37].

Lecture 3. Basic Morphological Notions

Issues Discussed:

1. *The notion of morph and its types.*
2. *The notion of morpheme and types of morphemes.*
3. *The notion of allo-morph, types of allo-morphs.*
4. *Grammatical homonymy.*
5. *The notion of word.*

The Notion of Morph and its Types

Morph is the minimal meaningful succession of phonemes, which cannot be divided into any other meaningful units, which regularly occur in different environments (e.g. clear, clears, cleared, clearly). The repeated succession of phonemes “clear” is a morph because: 1) it is meaningful as it has the lexical meaning of “transparency”; 2) it is minimal, because the components “cl” or “ear” are devoid of meaning; 3) this succession occurs in different environments: in the initial form, before the inflexions -s, -ed, before the adjective-building suffix -ly. The combination of phonemes -ly is also a morph as: 1) it is meaningful, though it renders a more general, abstract meaning of qualitiveness of actions; 2) it is minimal, as it cannot be divided into other meaningful units; 3) it regularly occurs in qualitative adverbs formed up from the corresponding qualitative adjectives.

It should be noted that the meaningful character of a morph is not an absolute property of it. It is necessary to bear in mind two conclusions: 1) a succession of phonemes must be a part of a morph; 2) of one part of a word is a morph, the other part should be a morph too.

There are the following types of morphs: **free** (has a full lexical meaning, can be used separately in speech, e.g. *house-wife*), **bound** (cannot be used separately in speech, may only be a part of a word, expresses derivational or pure categorial grammatical meaning, e.g. *tables*, *strongly*), **semi-bound** (of double nature: may stay separately in speech as a word but is regularly used for expressing grammatical

derivational meaning, e.g. *statesmen, everybody, yourself*), **replacive** (vowel-type: a root vowel change, by means of which a certain grammatical meaning is expressed, e.g. *blood – bleed, goose – geese*; consonant-type: a consonant change, which is grammatically relevant, e.g. *build-built*), **fused** (have a common phoneme in their structure, e.g. *discussion*), **amalgamated** (=fully fused – one and the same morphs express different grammatical meanings, e.g. *girls'*).

The Notion of Morpheme and Types of Morphemes

The morpheme can be treated externally and internally. From the *external* point of view the morpheme is the minimal meaningful language unit, which has its content side and expression side. It is built up by phonemes, so that the shortest morphemes include only one phoneme. *E.g.*: *ros-y* [-i]; *a-fire* [ə-]; *come-s* [-z]. The zero morpheme exists but the zero morph does not.

The morpheme expresses abstract, "significative" meanings which are used as constituents for the formation of more concrete, "nominative" meanings of words [2, p. 14].

Internally, morpheme is a set of morphs, having the same meaning and being in the state of complementary distribution. Distribution is the total of all the environments of the word as belonging to a certain class.

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. Such morphs constitute different morphemes. Cf. 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. Such morphs constitute "free alternants", or "free variants" of the same morpheme. Cf. the suffixes -(e)d and -t in the verb-forms *learned, learnt*.

As different from the above, 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 their form is explained by different environments, these morphs are said to be in complementary distribution and considered the allomorphs of the same morpheme. Cf. the allomorphs of the plural morpheme /-s/, /-z/, /-iz/ which stand in phonemic complementary distribution; the plural allomorph -en in oxen, children, which stands in morphemic complementary distribution with the other allomorphs of the plural morpheme.

As we see, for analytical purposes the notion of complementary distribution is the most important, because it helps establish the identity of outwardly altogether different elements of language, in particular, its grammatical elements [2, p. 23-25].

The Notion of Allo-morph, Types of Allo-morphs

Further insights into the correlation between the formal and functional aspects of morphemes within the composition of the word may be gained in the light of the so-called "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. A set of iso-functional allo-units identified in the text on the basis of their co-occurrence with other lingual units (distribution) is considered as the corresponding eme-unit with its fixed systemic status.

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, i.e. the adjoining elements in the text [2, p. 23-24].

Grammatical Homonymy

The problem arises, how to interpret these different subclass entries – as cases of grammatical or lexico-grammatical homonymy, or some kind of functional variation, or merely variation in usage. The problem is vexed, since each of the interpretations has its strong points.

To reach a convincing decision, one should take into consideration the actual differences between various cases of the "subclass migration" in question. Namely, one must carefully analyse the comparative characteristics of the corresponding subclasses as such, as well as the regularity factor for an individual lexeme subclass occurrence.

In the domain of notional subclasses proper, with regular inter-class occurrences of the analysed lexemes, probably 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 [Почепцов, (2), 87 и сл.]. In the light of this interpretation, the very formula of "lexemic subclass migration" will be vindicated and substantiated.

On the other hand, for more cardinally differing lexemic sets, as, for instance, functional versus notional, the syntactic variation principle is hardly acceptable. This kind of differentiation should be analysed as lexico-grammatical homonymy, since it underlies the expression of categorially different grammatical functions [2, p. 102].

The Notion of Word

It is very difficult to give a rigorous and at the same time universal definition to the word, i.e. such a definition as would unambiguously apply to all the different word-units of the lexicon. This difficulty is explained by the fact that the word is an extremely complex and many-sided phenomenon. Within the framework of

different linguistic trends and theories the word is 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. None of these definitions, which can be divided into formal, functional, and mixed, has the power to precisely cover all the lexical segments of language without a residue remaining outside the field of definition.

The said difficulties compel some linguists to refrain from accepting the word as the basic element of language. In particular, American scholars – representatives of Descriptive Linguistics founded by L. Bloomfield – recognised not the word and the sentence, 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: the 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.

In fact, if we take such notional words as, say, *water*, *pass*, *yellow* and the like, as well as their simple derivatives, e.g. *watery*, *passer*, *yellowness*, we shall easily see their definite nominative function and unambiguous segmental delimitation, making them beyond all doubt into "separate words of language". But if we compare with the given one-stem words the corresponding composite formations, such as *waterman*, *password*, *yellowback*, we shall immediately note that the identification of the latter as separate words is much complicated by the fact that they themselves are decomposable into separate words. One could point out that the peculiar property distinguishing composite words from phrases is their linear indivisibility, i.e. the impossibility for them to be divided

by a third word. But this would-be rigorous criterion is quite irrelevant for analytical word forms, *e.g.*: has met - has never met; is coming –is not by any means or under any circumstances coming.

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 the bulk of 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).

In spite of the shown difficulties, however, there remains the unquestionable fact that each speaker has at his disposal a ready stock of naming units (more precisely, units standing to one another in nominative correlation) by which he can build up an infinite number of utterances reflecting the ever changing situations of reality.

This circumstance urges us to seek the identification of the word as a lingual unit-type on other lines than the "strictly operational definition". In fact, we do find the clarification of the problem in taking into consideration the difference between the two sets of lingual phenomena: on the one hand, "polar" phenomena; on the other hand, "intermediary" phenomena.

Within a complex system of interrelated elements, polar phenomena are the most clearly identifiable, they stand to one another in an utterly unambiguous opposition. Intermediary phenomena are located in the system in between the polar phenomena, making up a gradation of transitions or the so-called "continuum". By some of their properties intermediary phenomena are similar or near to one of the corresponding poles, while by other properties they are similar to the other, opposing pole. The analysis of the intermediary phenomena from the point of view of their relation to the polar phenomena reveal their own status in the system. At the same time this kind of analysis helps evaluate the definitions of the polar phenomena between which a continuum is established.

In this connection, 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. In particular, the variability of their status is expressed in the fact that some of them can be used in an isolated response position (for instance, words of affirmation and negation, interrogative words, demonstrative words, etc.), while others cannot (such as prepositions or conjunctions).

The nature of the element of any system is revealed in the character of its function. The function of words is realised in their nominative correlation with one another. On the basis of this correlation a number of functional words are distinguished by the "negative delimitation" (i.e. delimitation as a residue after the identification of the co-positional textual elements),* *e.g.*- the/people; to/speak; by/way/of.

The "negative delimitation" immediately connects these functional words with the directly nominative, notional words in the system. Thus, the correlation in question (which is to be implied by the conventional term "nominative function") unites functional words with notional words, or "half-words" (word-morphemes) with "full words". On the other hand, nominative correlation reduces the morpheme as a type of segmental signeme to the role of an element in the composition of the word.

As we see, if the elementary character (indivisibility) of the morpheme (as a significative unit) is established in the structure of words, the elementary character of the word (as a nominative unit) is realised in the system of lexicon.

Summing up what has been said in this paragraph, we may point out some of the properties of the morpheme and the word which are fundamental from the point of view of their systemic status and therefore require detailed investigations and descriptions.

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 (i.e. a component indivisible into smaller segments as regards its nominative function); together with other nominative units the word is used for the formation of the sentence – a unit of information in the communication process [2, p. 19-21].

It should be noted that there is some confusion in the use of the terms "suffix" and "inflection" or "ending".

According to one view, the term "suffix" is taken in a wide sense, and applied to any morpheme coming after the root morpheme, whether it is derivative or inflectional. If this view is endorsed, an inflection is a special kind of suffix, since it falls under the general definition of a suffix just mentioned.

According to another view, the term "suffix" is taken in a narrow sense, and applied to derivational post-root morphemes only. In that case an inflection is not a special kind of suffix but a morpheme of a different kind, having no lexical meaning of any sort.

We will adhere to this latter view, as it seems better to have a clear distinction than to use the term "suffix" in a vague sense.

Lecture 4. The Theory of Grammatical Classes of Words

Issues Discussed:

1. *The Notion of Grammatical Classes of Words.*
2. *Criteria for Parts of Speech Classification.*
3. *Comprehensive Approach to the Discrimination of Parts of Speech.*
4. *The Notional and Functional Parts of Speech.*
5. *Subcategorisation of Parts of Speech.*

The Notion of Grammatical Classes of Words.

The words of language, depending on various formal and semantic features, are divided into grammatically relevant sets or classes. The traditional grammatical classes of words are called "parts of speech". Since the word is distinguished not only by grammatical, but also by semantico-lexemic properties, some scholars, for instance prof. Smirnitsky, refer to **parts of speech** as "lexico-grammatical" series of words, or as "**lexico-grammatical categories**" [21, p. 33]. Professor Blokh introduced the term "**grammatical classes**". He starts from the assumption that what is traditionally called a part of speech is a type of word, which grammatically differs from other types of words. Since the grammatical aspect is dominating in word discrimination, professor Blokh considers it adequate to call these classes grammatical.

The system of parts of speech is historically changeable, e.g. articles, modal verbs, statives were not recognized as separate parts of speech in Old English, though they are recognized as such in Modern English. As a matter of fact one should recognize that language vocabulary is not a chaotic mass of words, grammar organizes these words into grammatical classes of words and every new lexeme, appearing in the language, should join one of the existing classes and share the features of other lexemes of the same class. The theory of parts of speech is problematic and controversial,

since many aspects of it have not been agreed upon. The most disputable issues are: 1) the principles of word discrimination; 2) the number of parts of speech in a certain language; 3) the qualitative division of parts of speech.

Criteria for Parts of Speech Classification.

There are two basic approaches to parts of speech classification:

- 1) based on using one single criterion for class discrimination (mono-differential approach);
- 2) based on a complex of criteria (poli-differential or complex approach).

Within the framework of the 1st approach it is necessary to analyze the following classifications of the classes of words:

1. The **traditional classification** was introduced in the grammar teaching of ancient Greece, where the concept of the sentence was not yet explicitly identified in distinction to the general idea of speech, and where no strict differentiation was drawn between the word as a vocabulary unit and the word as a functional element of the sentence [2, p. 37]. This classification is based on semantic criterion only: e.g. nouns are classified as words expressing substances; verbs – words, reflecting actions, states, processes; adjectives – words, expressing qualitiveness. The logical nature of this classification is a strong point of it, because it reveals the general correlation between language and thought and establishes the connection between language notions of nouns, verbs, adjectives on the one hand and the logical notions of substances, verbiality and qualitiveness on the other. But in the language there are words, whose categorial meaning is difficult to define (e.g. *blackness*, *strength*, *dimness*). These words are more adjectives than nouns according to their meaning but if we compare these nouns with the corresponding adjectives (e.g. *blackness* - *black*, *strength* - *strong*, *dimness* - *dim*), we must admit that they correlate only in the semantic aspect, while formal grammatical properties are too different to refer them to the same class. It proves that meaning can not be an absolute criterion for assigning words to different classes.

Henry Sweet the author of the 1st scientific grammar of English worked out a **morphological classification** of the parts of speech, which is based on a pure property of a word to be able or not to take an inflexion. According to this criterion Henry Sweet divided words into **declinable** (noun-words, adjective-words, verb-words) and **indeclinable** (adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections). Thus, declinable words can change their form by adding inflexions while indeclinable words are static.

The 1st division of words into declinable and indeclinable is pure morphological but it is inconsistent for such highly analytical language as Modern English, because: 1) English is characterized by the scarcity of inflexions; 2) not all lexemes of declinable parts of speech are capable of taking inflexions (e.g. *boy* – singular common case, *boy's* – singular genitive case, *boys* – plural common case, *boys'* – plural genitive case; cf. *furniture*).

Words with the same morphological and semantic properties should refer to different classes (e.g. *information*). On the contrary words having different semantic and morphological properties refer to the same class. Another drawback of this classification is that the division of nouns, adjectives and verbs is not morphological but pure synthetical. Thus, we may say that H. Sweet employed two different criteria in his classification.

Otto Jespersen analyzed words from a point of view of the position or function of them in units larger than words (phrases, sentences). According to his opinion, words are divided into **primary** (functions as the fact of a phrase), **secondary** (serves as an agent to a primary word) and **tertiary** (modifies a secondary word, serves as an agent to it). This is the so-called **theory of ranks** as it is a consistent distinction between words according to their position in the sentence and a phrase but this is not the discrimination of classes of words. Since the position of primary, secondary and tertiary words may be occupied by words belonging to different classes and consequently having different morphological and semantic properties (e.g. *a very good thing*).

The **distributional classification** is based on combinability. Within this approach, the part of speech is a functioning pattern and a word belonging to the same class should be the same only in one aspect – occupy the same position and perform the same syntactic function in speech utterances. Charles Fries introduced this classification. He used the **method of frames** (подстановки) e.g.:

Frame A

The concert was good.

Frame B

The clerk remembered the tax.

Frame C

The team went there.

Words that can substitute the word “concert”, “clerk”, “team”, “the tax” (e.g. woman, food, coffee etc.) are Class 1 words. Class 2 words are “was”, “remembered” and “went”. Words that can take the position of “good” are Class 3 words. Words that can fill the position of “there” are called Class 4 words.

The drawback of this classification is that morphological and semantic properties are completely neglected, because words of different nature are treated as items of the same class and vice a versa.

It should be noted that the term "part of speech" is purely traditional and conventional, it can't be taken as in any way defining or explanatory.

In modern linguistics, parts of speech are discriminated on the basis of these 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. This meaning is understood as the "categorical meaning of the part of speech". The *formal* criterion provides for the exposition of the specific inflexional and derivational (word-building) features of all the lexemic subsets of a part of speech. The *functional* criterion concerns the syntactic role of words in the sentence typical of a part of speech. The three factors of

categorial characterisation of words are conventionally referred to as, respectively, "meaning", "form", and "function" [2, p. 37].

Comprehensive Approach to the Discrimination of Parts of Speech.

The complex approach to the problem of parts of speech classification was introduced by academician Lev Shcherba, who proposed to discriminate parts of speech on the basis of three criteria: **semantic, formal and functional**. By the *semantic* criterion he understood the generalized meaning or general grammatical meaning, which is characteristic of all the words, constituting a given part of speech, i.e. categorial meaning of parts of speech (e.g. the general grammatical meaning of nouns is substance; verbs – verbiality, i.e. the ability to express actions, processes or states; adverbs – adverbiality, i.e. the ability to express qualities or properties of actions, processes or states; adjectives – qualitativeness, i.e. the ability to express qualities or properties of substances).

Taken separately, the semantic criterion cannot be sufficient for word class discrimination, as there are lexemes of a part of speech, which acquire the general meaning of the other part of speech (e.g. *action* – a noun, which expresses verbiality, *sleep* – a noun, which expresses process, *blackness* – a noun, which expresses quality). Thus, the general grammatical categorial meaning is important for part of speech classification, it is the intrinsic quality of a part of speech, it predetermines some outward properties of its lexemes but it cannot play the role of an absolute criterion of word classification.

The *formal* criterion provides for the exposition of the specific inflexional and derivational (word-building) features of words of a part of speech and deals with the morphological properties of words, which include: 1) the system of inflexional morphemes of words, typical of a certain part of speech; 2) the system of derivational lexico-grammatical morphemes, characteristic of a part of speech. Each part of speech is characterized by its grammatical categories, manifested in the paradigms of its lexemes (e.g. nouns – have the categories of number and case; verbs – have the categories of mood,

tense, aspect, voice, person, number; adjectives – have the category of degrees of comparison). Thus, the paradigms of words, belonging to different parts of speech are different and these paradigms show to what part of speech the word belongs. But this criterion is not sufficient, not absolute because not all the words of a part of speech have the same paradigm, e.g. the number and case opposemes are neutralized in the noun “information”. Neutralization is the reduction of a grammatical opposition to one of its members under certain circumstances. The neutralization takes place in the domain of relative adjectives, which have only one opposeme of degrees of comparison – positive. We observe the same process of neutralization among terminative verbs, having no grammatical categories of aspect, intransitive verbs – having no voice opposemes.

As words of different classes are also characterized by a specific system of derivational morphemes, the presence of a certain lexico-grammatical morpheme in the word signals its part of speech reference. Many of these derivational morphemes are regularly used to form the words of a part of speech, other stem-building elements are of little significance as distinctive features of a part of speech because they are not systematic and may be found within separate lexemes of a class (e.g. food – feed; blood-bleed; full – fill). Thus, the morphological composition or stem-structure is one of the criteria employed for part of speech classification but it cannot function separately in order to classify words. Many English words of different classes consist only of roots and have no derivational morphemes in their structure.

The *functional* criterion concerns the syntactic properties of a part of speech, which are of two kinds: **combinability** and **syntactic functions in the sentence**. The *combinability* is the ability of words of a given part of speech to be in syntactic connection with other words in the sentence. A word has different syntactic connections. These connections are not equally significant for parts of speech reference (e.g. This difficult job/To proceed/Swimming/It/The first is very important.). But the connection of the noun with the verb is less significant than its connection with the adjective. Owing to the

lexico-grammatical meaning of nouns (substance) and prepositions (relation to substance) these two parts of speech often form up word combinations. The article is characterized by unilateral right-hand connections with different classes of words. Thus, the combinability of a word, its connections in speech help to show to what part of speech it belongs. Parts of speech perform certain syntactic functions in the sentence: nouns – of the subject and object, verbs – of predicates; adjectives – attributes) but the subject may be expressed not only by nouns and nouns can perform practically all syntactic functions. Thus, due to the little significance of the syntactic function of a word in identifying its class reference, this criterion is the least helpful.

None of the above mentioned criteria is sufficient to be an absolute principle of word discrimination. Only all of them taken together give a fully satisfactory basis for part of speech classification. Thus, a part of speech is a set of words characterized by identical properties: 1) general grammatical meaning; 2) lexico-grammatical morphemes (derivational or stem-building); 3) grammatical categories; 4) combinability; 5) functions in the sentence. As the dominant criteria in parts of speech classification are grammatical, it is reasonable to refer to word classes, traditionally called “parts of speech” as grammatical word classes

The Notional and Functional Parts of Speech.

In accord with the described criteria, words on the upper level of classification are divided into notional and functional, which reflects their division in the earlier grammatical tradition into changeable and unchangeable.

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

We have surveyed the identifying properties of the notional parts of speech that unite the words of complete nominative meaning characterised by self-dependent functions in the sentence.

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

On the principle of "generalised form" only unchangeable words are traditionally treated under the heading of functional parts of speech. As for their individual forms as such, they are simply presented by the list, since the number of these words is limited, so that they needn't be identified on any general, operational scheme.

To the basic functional series of words in English belong the article, the preposition, the conjunction, the particle, the modal word, the interjection [2, p. 38-39].

Subcategorisation of Parts of Speech.

Alongside of their individual concrete lexical meaning, 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 [2, p. 39-40].

The words of a certain class are characterized by identical properties. The parts of speech tend to be rather heterogeneous, each having small and fairly well-defined groups. Each part of speech is subdivided into subseries in accord with various particular semantico-functional and formal features of the constituent word. This subdivision is sometimes called subcategorization of parts of speech. The lexemes of a part of speech are subdivided with regard to some leading feature. From the grammatical point of view it is most essential to classify lexemes according to the grammatical categories of the part of speech they belong to. With regard to the category of number nouns are divided into countable/uncountables (i.e. nouns possessing number opposemes and those, having no number opposemes). According to the category of case, nouns fall into declinables (having case opposemes) and indclinables etc.

Different lexemes usually belong to different subclasses but often the dividing line passes within the word (e.g. beauty). These are variants of one lexeme, but not homonyms because the connection between those meaning is very close and obvious. The relations between these variants are those of conversion: 1) the variants belong to different lexico-grammatical subclasses; 2) they

have different paradigms; 3) there is some difference in their combinability. Thus, they are related by internal conversion (within the same part of speech).

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

The fact is, that the three-criteria principle faces a special difficulty in determining the part of speech status of such lexemes as have morphological characteristics of notional words, but are essentially distinguished from notional words by their playing the role of grammatical mediators in phrases and sentences. Here belong, for instance, modal verbs together with their equivalents – suppletive fillers, auxiliary verbs, aspective verbs, intensifying adverbs, determiner pronouns. This difficulty, consisting in the intersection of heterogeneous properties in the established word-classes, can evidently be overcome by recognising only one criterion of the three as decisive [2, p. 41].

Lecture 5. The Verb as a Part of Speech

Issues Discussed:

1. *General Survey of Verb as a Part of Speech.*
2. *Subclassifications of Verbs:*
 - a) *morphological types of verbs;*
 - b) *lexico-morphological groups of verbs;*
 - c) *lexico-synthetical groups of verbs.*

General Survey of Verb as a Part of Speech.

The verb is the richest part in English morphology. It occupies the unique position in it due to the following facts:

1. The verb has an intricate morphological system, which is based on different morphological categories.
2. The verb has a wide set of analytical categorial functions
3. The system of the verbs is represented by two sets of forms – **finite** and **non-finite**.
4. The verb performs the unique role in the sentence structure.

The traditional grammar defines the verb as a part of speech expressing verbiality (the ability to express actions, processes and states) but this definition of the verbal semantics is not quite adequate because these meanings can be rendered by other parts of speech (e.g. the meaning of state: *he is sleeping* – verbiality expressed with the help of the verb; *he is asleep* – verbiality expressed with the help of the stative; *his sleep was interrupted* – verbiality expressed with the help of the noun).

Not all verbs denote the idea of process, or state, or action (e.g. to find, to resemble, to consist, to own, to look after – are alien to the meaning of action or state). That is why it is much more reasonable to qualify the categorial meaning of the verb as the process presented dynamically (developing in time) [2]. This processual meaning is embedded in all verbs, including those denoting state, forms of existence, types of attitude, evaluation. Besides, the processual meaning is characteristic not only of finite verbs but of the verbals.

The **morphological properties** of the verb are of two kinds:

- 1) The system of verb derivational means;
- 2) The system of grammatical categories.

As to the first point, the verb is characterized by the following means of verb derivation:

- **affixation** (prefixation, suffixation). As any notional part of speech, the verb has specific derivational affixes (-ize/organize, -ify/clarify, -en/broaden; -ate/cultivate, over-/overestimate, under-/undermine, dis-/dishearten, mis-/misunderstand, un-/undo, re-/remake, sub-/submerge, en-/enlarge, em-/embed, be-/befriend). Prefixation in verb-derivation is of greater relevance than of any other notional part of speech, since there is only one productive suffix in verbs *-ize*, while in nouns it is much wider.
- **conversion** (zero affixation) – a productive way of verb-building in modern English (e.g. *a doctor – to doctor, a towel – to towel*).
- **reversion** – consists in conversion plus reduction of a final element of a noun-stem (e.g. *proof-reader – to proof read, sea-basin – to sea base*).
- **compounding** is not typical of English verb-derivation and compound verb-stems correspond to the compound non-verb stems of the conversion type or of the reduction type (e.g. *blackmail – to blackmail*).
- **sound-replacive type** of derivation (e.g. *blood – to bleed*).
- **semantic stress** (e.g. *transport – to transport, object – to object, import – to import*).
- **composing** – combining verb-stems with different lexicogrammatical morphemes (e.g. *to look for/down/through; to be off/away/through*).
- **phrasal verb-derivation** – combining verbs like *have, give, take* with a nominal element, which presents one verbal unit from the semantic point of view (e.g. *to have a swim*). It is intermediate between analytical forms of the verb and syntactical word-combination.

Thus, the verb has a wide morphological system, represented by different categories of finitude, person, number, tense, mood, aspect, voice, phase (time-correlation). The combining power of verbs in relation to other words in syntactically subordinate groups is called the **syntactical valency** of verbs, which is of two types: **obligatory** and **optional**.

Obligatory valency must be necessarily realized for the sake of grammatical completion of syntactical constructions (e.g. *I saw the film*. Dropping off of the element *I* or *the film* results in ungrammatical organization of the structure).

Optional valency is not necessarily realized in grammatically complete syntactical constructions. They may or may not be present in the sentence structure depending on the information denoted by the sentence (e.g. *I saw an interesting film yesterday*).

The distinction between obligatory and optional valency is of great grammatical relevance, because one and the same verb may serve as the optional or obligatory element depending on speech environment. The verb is characterized by bilateral combinability: the typical left-hand combinability with a nominal element in the function of the subject; the typical right-hand combinability is with nominal element in the function of the object. Adjectives and nouns are combined occasionally with separate groups of adverbs, while the verb is combined with the whole class of adverbs. It is natural because the verb expresses a process, which can be viewed from different angles and these ideas are mostly rendered by adverbs.

The verb is characterized by the unique position in the sentence: it serves as the centre of predication, expressing such processual characteristics as *time, mood, number, voice*, through the corresponding grammatical categories. Being the centre of primary predication the verb is responsible for grammatical organization of the sentence. It is the type of the verb predicate that predetermines the number of syntactic positions that must be filled in for the sake of the sentence completion.

Subclassifications of Verbs:

The verb is characterized not only by the intricate morphological system, but also by a wide range of classes, having different semantic, morphological and syntactic properties. Hence, comes the variety of verb classifications.

Morphological types of verbs are predetermined by two formal criteria:

- 1) the type of verb stem (morphological composition);
- 2) the type of verb conjugation.

According to the 1st criterion English verbs are divided into: **simple** (consisting of mere roots), **derived** (root+affix), **compound, composite**.

According to the *type of verb conjugation* they fall into three subclasses: **weak** (regular), **strong** (irregular) and **verbs of mixed double nature**.

Lexico-syntactic classifications according to the following criteria employed:

- 1) the valency of the verbs;
- 2) the type of predication;
- 3) the semantic and the syntactic function in the sentence.

According to the 1st criterion English verbs are divided into: **avalent verbs** (no syntactic connection to any notional element in the sentence, e.g. *It rain, to snow*), **monovalent verbs** (one-sided connection to the subject, e.g. *She is smiling*), **bivalent** (two-sided connection: on the left – to the subject, on the right – to the direct object, e.g. *He has taken the book*) and **polyvalent verbs** (more than two connections).

The second classification is based on the type of predication and according to it verbs are divided into **verbs of complete predication** (realized by the subject-predicate relations) and **verbs of incomplete predication** (expressed by the subject-predicate complement relations, e.g. *He saw the film. She behaved decently*).

According to the meaning and syntactic function in the sentence verbs are divided into **notional** and **seminotional** (modal, auxiliary, semi-notional, link verbs).

Module 2. Syntax

Lecture 6. Basic Syntactic Notions

Issues Discussed:

- 2 *The subject matter of syntax.*
- 3 *Basic syntactic notions (syntactic units, relations, connections, functions, processes).*
- 4 *Types of syntactic theories.*

The subject matter of syntax

The grammatical structure of English consists of 2 parts:

1. the word classes;
2. the regularities of combining them to produce speech utterances.

Respectively grammar has two parts too:

Morphology – dealing with the study of grammatical classes of words.

Syntax – studying the rules of using words in speech. Thus syntax is the part of grammar, which investigates the act of producing speech utterances and utterances themselves. But in fact the definition of the subject matter of syntax is not an easy task. There are three basic approaches to the problem:

- a) **a word-centric approach** to syntax. Within this approach the word is recognized the main language unit and the syntactical units – word-groups and sentences are regarded as mere syntagmatics of words. The disadvantage of this approach lies in the fact that essential properties of syntactic units are neglected. Thus within this approach it is impossible to analyze the sentence not as a mere structure, but as a communicative unit as well as the word-group. It is not quite reasonable to reduce syntactic theory to the studying of syntagmatics of words.
- b) **A sentence-centric approach**. It is based on the assumption that the main language unit is the sentence and syntax should

be qualified as the theory of the sentence. This approach cannot be taken as a fully satisfactory, because word-groups and words are analyzed only as parts of the sentence and their essential properties are ignored.

- c) **A comprehensive approach** to the subject matter of syntax. It states that the domain of syntax is the study of all syntactic level units in the system of their paradigmatic and syntagmatic properties. Until recently it was considered that syntax is constituted by two language units: word-groups, which form up **minor syntax** and the sentence, which forms up **major syntax**.

Sentence is not the highest language unit, which crowns the hierarchy of language structure because the sentence itself cannot serve the purpose of communication. Only the combination of semantically connected sentences forms a language unit, which serves the purpose of communication. This highest communicative unit is called the text. Within the text sentence functions as a minimal communicative unit. Thus, it is reasonable to say that the theory of syntax consists of 3 basic parts:

- the theory of the word-group – minor syntax;
- the theory of the sentence – major syntax;
- the theory of the text – higher/super-syntax.

Basic syntactic notions (syntactic units, relations, connections, functions, processes).

Each branch of science operates its own set of basic notions. Syntax is not an exception in this respect. The basic syntactic notions are: syntactic units, relations, connections, functions, processes.

Syntactic units are language units, characterized by the following features: 1) they are level units, because they represent a separate level in the language structure – the proposemic level; 2) syntactic units are hierarchically organized, i.e. they are not equal in rank. There is the subdivision within the level. The logical structural scheme of the syntactic level is as follows: generally speaking there are two major parts of syntax: syntax and supersyntax.

Types of syntactic theories.

The investigation of language and each of its units implies first of all the construction of a certain model. **Model** is a theoretical construction, a certain abstract scheme, which is a more or less adequate approximation of real facts. Thus, theoretical study of sentence structure means the construction of sentence model, i.e. an abstract theoretical scheme, which more or less exactly reflects the real sentence structure. The traditional grammar has only one model – the parts-of-the-sentence model. The structural grammar worked out three models:

- the distributional model;
- the immediate model;
- the constructive model.

The generative grammar has the transformational model.

In Modern Linguistics there appeared one more model of sentence analysis – **the functional sentence perspective (FSP) or theme-rheme model**. This may be closely connected with the functional and semantic approach to language, typical of modern language science.

The **parts-of-the-sentence model**. In accord with this model there are two stages of sentence analysis:

- 1) the sentence is analyzed in terms of primary (subject and predicate) and secondary (object, attribute, adverb) parts of the sentence;
- 2) the morphological representation of each sentence part undergoes the analysis e.g. *The old man saw a black dog.*

The sentence is decomposed into: subject – *the man*; predicate – *saw*; object – *a dog*; attribute to the subject – *old*; attribute to the object – *black*.

This model has a long established tradition and possesses advantages that cannot be disputed. The strong points of the **parts-of-the-sentence model** are in its functional and logical nature. The functional principle of this model adequately reflects the essence of the sentence, in which every element performs a certain role (function), e.g. the *subject* is the nominal element; *predication*

expressing the doer of the action; the *object* is the thing affected by the action; the *attribute* is the bearer of additional information about the subject or the object (a quantifier of the subject or the object).

The logical principle of the model establishes correlation between the sentence and the proposition, between the parts of the sentence and the elements of thought. According to this correlation the sentence is regarded as the language reflection of a certain proposition, sentence parts – as representation of elements of this proposition, e.g. *The boy came in. The train stops. The dog barks.* All these sentences reflect the same proposition structure, i.e. something is stated about the doer of the action. Thus, Proposition=Subject (logical)+Predicate (logical).

In spite of these advantages, the parts-of-the-sentence model can be subjected to criticism:

- a) The term “part of the sentence” is not strictly defined. Due to this it is difficult sometimes to distinguish between different sentence parts, e.g. *I want to know. He likes to go.* The syntactic function of the underlined part is rather vague, i.e. it is impossible to define, whether it is a part of the predicate or the object.
- b) The criteria for secondary parts of speech differentiation are not yet stable and definite. That is why identical constructions undergo different interpretations, e.g. *a cup of tea.* There are two possible interpretations of the construction:
 - postpositive attribute;
 - prepositional object.

E.g. *From the spectators there came a muffled cry.* There are two possible interpretations of this construction as well:

- prepositional object.
- adverbial modifier of place.

The **Constructive Model** proceeds from the assumption that elements of the syntactical constructions are characterized by different structural value. In accord with this sentence parts are subdivided into obligatory and optional. Obligatory sentence parts

constitute a kernel of the sentence and cannot be omitted without destroying the grammatical structure of the sentence. Optional parts are not obligatory from the constructive point of view. They constitute the extension of the sentence and may be omitted without destroying the grammatical structure of the sentence.

According to the **Distributional Model** all words, which can occupy the same set of positions in the patterns of English free utterances must belong to the same part of speech.

The **Immediate Constituents Model** schemes the sentence structure not as a sequence of its elements but as a hierarchy of segmentation levels.

The **Transformational Model** establishes the definite relations between the derivation trees of such sentences, when one of them is derived from the other. The Transformational Model makes a fundamental distinction between two kinds of sentences: the *kernel* sentences and their *transforms*. *Kernel* sentences are the basic elementary sentences of the language from which all else is made. *Transforms* are the constructions, which are derived from the basic ones by certain grammatical rules.

Lecture 7. The Theory of the Word Group

Issues Discussed:

1. *The problem of the definition of the word group.*
2. *The word group as a separate language unit.*
3. *Types of word groups according to different criteria employed.*

The Problem of the Definition of the Word Group.

There are two sublevels in syntax: non-communicative and communicative. The main syntactic unit, representing the non-communicative sublevel is the word-group, while the sentence is the basic syntactic unit of the communicative design. Though the word-group is unanimously recognized as a separate syntactic level unit, the definition of it has not yet been agreed upon. The divergency of opinions on the definition of a word-group is caused by different interpretations of two basic problems in the theory of the word-group:

- 1– the morphological status of the constituents of the word-group;
- 2– the type of syntactic connection between the constituents of the word-group.

As for the 1st principle, the opinions of grammarians differ in the following way: some of them consider that the constituents of the word-group are only notional words. This point of view was steadily worked out by Barkhudarov [1].

The Word Group as a Separate Language Unit.

The word-group is a separate language unit that qualitatively differs from other language units (a word, a clause, a sentence). To better understand the phenomenon of the word-group, let us consider it in opposition to these language units.

A word-group versus a word. Though a word-group and a word belong to different language levels, they have common features in **functional** and **nominative** aspects. *Functionally* both word and word-group serve as the building material for a sentence and perform a certain function in its structure. In the *nominative* aspect

a word-group and a word perform the same naming function: they denote separate objects in reality but nevertheless a word-group quantitatively differs from the word in the above mentioned aspects. Thus, though a word-group and a word are of the same type of nomination (object nomination), a word-group is a more extended naming unit (e.g. *a red pen, to come here*) and names not only objects, but also their properties. Though, if the word-group consists of functional words only, its naming sphere is narrower. *Functionally* a word-group differs from a word qualitatively too, because if a word-group consists of 2 or more notional words, it performs not one syntactic function in the sentence structure but more than one (e.g. *Why are you writing with a red pen?*).

A word-group versus a clause. Both units are syntactical in nature. Another feature in common is their being non-communicative. In case of predicative word-groups, one should speak of one more common feature, i. e. the same type of syntactical connection – predication. But at the same time there is a very sufficient difference between them: predicative word-groups are based on secondary non-finite predication, while a clause is based on finite primary predication, e.g. *John's coming* – a predicative word-group based on secondary predication, which lacks the grammatical category of tense, mood, person and number. While in the sentence *I know that John is coming* – the underlined clause represents subject-predicate relations, which reveal the category of mood (indicative), tense (present), person (the 3rd), number (singular). But nevertheless, the clause can not stand separately in speech; it may only be a part of a speech utterance, the same as a word-group.

A word-group versus a sentence. Though both units refer to the same level in the language structure, the difference between them is crucial.

1) They refer to different types of nomination. As it has already been stated a word-group is a unit of object nomination, while a sentence is a unit of propositional nomination. Thus, unlike word-

groups sentences denote the whole propositions (situations of objective reality).

2) A word-group and a sentence refer to different sublevels within syntax. A word-group is non-communicative, may only be a part of an utterance, while the sentence is the basic communicative unit, stands separately in speech in the form of an utterance.

3) A word-group and a sentence differ greatly in the formal aspect. Within a word-group it is quite possible to change the paradigmatic form of the constituents, without destroying the identity of the word-group (e.g. *to read a book* – *to be reading a book*, *to have read a book*, *to read books*). Things are different with reference to a sentence (e.g. *The book was read*). The change of the paradigmatic form of the constituents is sure to result in destroying the structure of the sentence and will lead to unmarkedness of the structure. A word-group does not have an intonation of its own, while the intonation contour is one of the essential properties of a sentence.

Types of Word Groups According to Different Criteria Employed

A word-group is a highly organized syntactical unit that can be viewed from different angles, respectively there are different principles:

1) According to the type of syntactic connection and relations between the components of a word-group they are divided into: *subordinate*, *coordinate* and *predicative*. **Subordinate** word-groups are based on syntagmatic relations of dependence, hypothetical syntactic relations, subordination as a type of connection (e.g. *fine weather*, *to run quickly*, *very dark*, *four of the students*). **Coordinate** word-groups are based on syntagmatic relations of independence, **paratactic** syntactic relations, coordination as a type of connection (e.g. *either he or his brother*, *not only he but also his brother*). **Predicative** word-groups are based on syntagmatic relations of interdependence, predicative syntactic relations, predication as a type of connection (e.g. *him/his coming*, *for him to come*).

Lecture 8. The Theory of the Sentence

Issues Discussed:

1. *The problem of the definition of the sentence.*
2. *Sentence versus proposition, communication, utterance.*
3. *Essential features of the sentence.*
4. *Classifications of sentences with different criteria employed.*

The problem of the definition of the sentence.

Though there are more than 300 definitions of the sentence, a fully satisfactory answer to the question what a sentence is, is yet to be formulated. The existent definitions of the sentence may be divided into two groups: *notional* (logically grounded) and *formal* (structural).

Sentence versus proposition, communication, utterance.

A sentence as a language unit should be differentiated from other language units: a clause, a word, a word-group, a text.

A sentence versus a clause. Both are units of primary predication but a clause is a unit of dependant primary predication, which is distinguishable only within a composite sentence and a sentence is a unit of independent primary predication, which enables it to stand separately in speech as an utterance. Thus, a sentence and a clause coincide in the structure of the predication, but they differ in the nature of it.

A sentence versus a word. Both units are considered to be the basic language units, but a word is the basic nominative language unit. It is a component element of a word stock, while a sentence is the basic predicative unit of language with communicative force.

A sentence versus a text. Both elements are communicative ones, but the sentence is the elementary minimal speech unit, which serves to build up a text as a highest supercommunicative unit of which the sentence is only a component.

Essential features of the sentence.

The sentence is a structural unit. One of the essential internal properties of the sentence is the nucleus-headed structure, which

represents a primary predication of the sentence. Predication reflects the structural proposition. Thus, predication is the structural centre of the sentence. There are two types of predication:

- 1) single-headed predication;
- 2) double-headed predication.

Classifications of sentences with different criteria employed.

The sentence is a complex language unit, which incorporates in its structure units of all other lower levels with the variety of semantic and syntactic relations between them. Thus, the sentence can be viewed from different angles, which are called aspects (essential features).

1. Predicativity – e.g. 1) *The doctor's arrival*. 2) *The doctor has arrived*. Both examples consist of the same lexemes and render the information about one and the same person and his action. Nevertheless, there is a fundamental difference between them. The 1st example does not express an event, which refers to a particular time. The 2nd example expresses an actual fact, which refers to the past. Grammatically the 2nd example is characterized by the categories of tense and mood, by means of which this structure refers to objective reality. Thus, the 1st example is a non-predicative word-group and the 2nd example – a sentence. The sentence differs from the word-group by its relatedness to objective reality – predicativity. There are three approaches to the interpretation of predicativity:

- semantic approach interprets predicativity as a reference to a certain situation of objective reality;
- logical – interprets predicativity as reference to a proposition, which is the main form of thought;
- formal-syntactical approach rests on the interpretation of predicativity as subject-predicate relations. There is no contradiction between the suggested interpretations of predication. Each of them deals with a separate side of one and the same phenomenon.

As one of the basic functions of language is cognitive (see lecture 1), respectively the sentence may be analyzed as the immediate actuality of proposition. Predicativity and predication correlate as meaning and form. Thus, predicativity is a bilateral unit, as it has its content side (proposition) and expression side (predication).

2. Modality. The following sentences differ in the speaker's attitude to the presented information.

E.g. 1) *I asked him the question.* The speaker states a real fact in the past.

2) *Ask him the question.* The speaker expresses an order or command to perform an action.

3) *If only I asked him the question!* The speaker renders the unreal desirable act.

4) *It's necessary that you should ask him the question.* The speaker renders a hypothetical action

5) *You'll certainly ask him the question.* The speaker states a real fact and the speaker's assurance.

Modality is constituted by many-modal aspect, that can be grouped into a hierarchy of sentence modality, which consists of two modal planes: **objective modality** and **subjective modality**. *Objective modality* expresses the attitude of the speaker to objective reality. It is obligatory as it is an essential feature of each sentence and it is morphologically expressed by the category of mood. *Subjective modality* expresses the speakers' attitude to the information of the sentence. Subjective modality is optional, as it may or may not be expressed in the sentence. Its realization depends on the speaker's communicative intention. Subjective reality is expressed lexically – by means of modal words, lexico-grammatically – by means of modal verbs, lexico-semanticly – by means of word-groups with modal meaning (e.g. *to be willing, to be bound*). Sometimes the expression of subjective modality is embedded in the predicate (e.g. *He is sure to come*).

3 Communicative force. Unlike words, sentences are not ready-made utterances. It is created in the process of speech communication to answer the speaker's intention. Thus, the

sentence as a speech unit is characterized by the communicative force. According to the type of proposition realized in a particular sentence, sentences can be **interrogative, declarative, imperative**.

SEMINARS

Module 1. Morphology. The Basics of Theoretical Grammar

Seminar 1. Theoretical Grammar and its Relationship to Other Branches of Linguistics. Basic Grammatical Notions.

Issues Discussed:

1. Human language as a semiotic system of conventional signs.
2. The hierarchy of linguistic levels and their basic units.
3. Interrelation of different branches of linguistics.
4. Grammatical meaning and its types.
5. The notion of grammatical form. Types of forms.
6. The notion of grammatical opposition. Types of opposition.
7. The notion of grammatical category. Types of grammatical category.
8. Paradigmatics and syntagmatics.

Recommended literature

1. Blokh M. Y. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. / Марк Яковлевич Блох. – М. Высшая школа, 2000. – 381 p. . pp. 26-39.
2. Ilyish B. A. The Structure of Modern English. – L., 1971. pp. 5-7; 15-18; 21-28.
3. Morokhovska E. J. Fundamentals of English Grammar (Theory and Practice) - K., 1993. pp. 32-35.
4. Rayevska N. M. Modern English Grammar. – Kyiv, 1976. pp. 37-42; 67-71.

Practical assignments:

Exercise 1. *Read the definitions of language cited below. Think over the principles they are based upon:*

a) Language is the expression of thought by means of words, that is, by means of signs of a particular sort made with the vocal organs. (James B. Greenbough)

b) Language is a system of arbitrary vocal symbols by means of which a social group cooperates. (B. Blokh)

c) Language is not an assemblage of unconnected patterns but a

system which is integrated in a high degree. (H. leason) Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of a system of voluntary produced symbols. (E. Sapir)

d) Language is first and foremost a means of transmitting information, and its study is a branch of the study of the signs and objects that they symbolize. /.../ Language is also a form of social behaviour. (J. Whatmough)

Exercise 2. *Define on what types of opposition the categories of tense, voice, mood, number, case and degrees of comparison are based in Modern English and Ukrainian.*

Exercise 3. *Provide examples from your Practical English Course book to illustrate different kinds of paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations.*

Seminar 2. The Morphological Level of the Language

Issues Discussed:

1. *The notion of morph, morpheme and allo-morph.*
2. *Variations of morphemes.*
3. *Synonymy and homonymy of morphemes.*
4. *The word. Morphological structure of the word. Types of word stems. Lexical and grammatical aspects of the word.*

Recommended literature

1. Blokh M. Y. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. / Марк Яковлевич Блох. – М. Высшая школа, 2000. – 381 p. . pp. 26-39.
2. Ilyish B. A. The Structure of Modern English. – L., 1971. pp. 5-7; 15-18; 21-28.
3. Morokhovska E. J. Fundamentals of English Grammar (Theory and Practice) - K., 1993. pp. 23-25.
4. Rayevska N. M. Modern English Grammar. – Kyiv, 1976. pp. 37-42; 67-71.

Practical assignments:

Exercise 1. *Analyse the morphemic structure of the following words: to criticise, to reconstruct, removable, sweetish, removed, paralinguistic, immaterial, imperious, irrepressible, irresponsible, restlessness, irretrievable, prehistorical.*

Exercise 2. *Pick out a composite sentence from your home reading material, write out all the morphemes from it and define their type.*

Exercise 3. *Give five synthetic and five analytic grammatical forms in Modern English, Ukrainian and Russian.*

Exercise 4. *Give two or three illustrative examples of monosemantic morphemes and three examples of polysemantic morphemes in Modern English and Ukrainian.*

Exercise 5. *Give three examples of homonymous morphemes in Modern English and, if possible, also in the present-day Ukrainian.*

Exercise 6. *Analyze the following words from the morphological point of view:* richest, families, different, beautiful, departure, unattractive, better, reproductiveness, irregularities, unexpectedly, pretenders, ship, exclusive, temporality, acceptability, bring up, give up, downstairs.

Seminar 3. General Survey of Nouns and Their Categories

Issues Discussed:

1. *The definition and semantic, formal and functional properties. The classification of English nouns and criteria for these classifications. The morphological structure of English nouns, their combinability and functions.*
2. *The problem of gender in English. Sex and Gender. Linguistic ways of expressing sex distinctions.*
3. *The category of number in English, the opposition “plural-singular”, singular tantum, pluralia tantum, collective nouns, nouns of multitude.*
4. *The category of case. Different approaches to the category of case. The two-case system of English nouns. The opposition “Common Case – Genitive Case”.*
5. *Noun-determiners, noun-building means. Morphological categories of nouns and factors influencing their realization (implicit meanings, contextual conditions). Syntactic properties of nouns: functions and combinability. Substantivisation and nominalization in English.*

Recommended literature

5. Blokh M. Y. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. / Марк Яковлевич Блох. – М. Высшая школа, 2000. – 381 p. . pp. 26-39.
6. Ilyish B. A. The Structure of Modern English. – L., 1971. pp. 36-48.
7. Morokhovska E. J. Fundamentals of English Grammar (Theory and Practice) – K., 1993. pp. 53-65.
8. Rayevska N. M. Modern English Grammar. – Kyiv, 1976. pp. 37-42; 67-71.

Practical assignments:

Exercise 1. Translate into Ukrainian:

The Moscow Region state farm horse exhibition; Kyiv street traffic regulation rules; space shuttle trajectory optimization problems; offshore tanker unloading operations; Dallas county district attorney's office.

Exercise 2. Pick out from a newspaper or your home reading material sentences with the 's-phrases, identify the meaning of the '-s in them.

Exercise 3. Think of the meaning the "s" morpheme signifies in a particular case. Tell whether the 's-morpheme denotes plurality or whether it is a word-building morpheme. Set up arguments.

air – airs

ice – ices

ash – ashes

art – arts

custom – customs

colour – colours

spectacle – spectacles

work – works

appoint – appointments

spade – spades

Exercise 4. Analyse the meaning of the "of-phrase" in the following sentences. Comment on the possible substitution of the "of-phrase" for the 's-in-flexion in each case:

1. In James love of his children was now the prime motive of his existence. (J. Galsworthy) 2. And here was a man of experience and culture, one who knew every rope of business life and polite society. (J. Galsworthy) 3. I'm not prepared to run the risks of concealment. (J. Galsworthy) 4. Alone suddenly like that, Fleur felt the first shocks of reality. (J. Galsworthy) 5. ... the Captain took the desperate determination of running away. (Ch. Dickens) 6. And in those days he was most simple, a very Spartan of a boy. (Th. Dreiser) 7. The eye of Alexander MacStinger, who had been his favourite, was insupportable to the Captain; the voice of Juliana MacStinger, who was the picture of her mother, made a coward of him. (Ch. Dickens) 8. You could hear their clear, rich voices over the singing of everyone else. (D. Carter) 9. Asherst never had much sense of time. (J. Galsworthy) 10. The latter nodded and looked at Butler shrewdly, recognizing him at once as a man of force and probably of position. (Th. Dreiser) 11. He wasn't much of a businessman – too emotional. (M. Quin) 12. But she did not hear him for the beating of her heart. (E. Hemingway) 13. She has a perfect devil of a brother.

(J. Galsworthy) 14. It was the face of a man who studied his play, warily. (Ch. Dickens).

Exercise 5. Replace the "of-phrases" by nouns in the genitive case: 1. Doctor Manson kept his eyes fixed on the face of Miss Barlow, putting a question now and then. 2. The cheeks of Miss Barlow continued to brighten. 3. A faint smile played round the lips of Miss Barlow. 4. The voice of a girl was heard in the distance. 5. The books of A.J.Cronin are very popular in our country. 6. Jon slipped his hand through the arm of his mother.

Exercise 6. Use the absolute possessive in the following sentences: A 1. Andrew raised his eyes and kept them on the eyes of Miss Barlow. 2. It was her job, not the job of old lady Winnie. 3. He put out his left hand and took the hand of Kate. 4. She had an unexpectedly pleasant voice, a little deeper than the voice of most women. 5. His face is long and white like the face of a clown.

B 1. The middle wall had precisely the same books as used to be in the library at the house of his own father, in Park Lane. 2. After breakfast he went off to the house of Fleur. 3. I'd like you to come to the place of my sister. 4. I'm not going to the house of Karoline Kent at all. 5. "They tell me at the house of Tymothy," said Nicholas lowering his voice, "that Dartie has gone off at last."

Exercise 7. Translate into Ukrainian the following word combinations with the so-called "double genitive", supply examples of your own.

Tom's sister's room

Jane's father's bag

John's friend's book

My neighbour's wife's car

My wife's sister's husband

My sister's boyfriend's jacket

Dallas county's district attorney's office. (N.Rosenberg) (also: A friend of my brother's; a bag of his mother's; the Nightingale's heart's blood.)

Exercise 8. As you know, in Modern English one and the same word in different contexts (distributions) may belong to different traditional parts of speech. Supply examples where the following words belong to different parts of speech:

a) fancy – noun

fancy – adjective

b) blue (or: black) – noun

blue – adjective

fancy – verb
c) since – adverb
since – preposition
since – conjunction
back – adverb

blue – verb
d) back – noun
back – adjective
back – verb

Seminar 4. The Verb and Verbal Categories

Issues Discussed:

1. *General characteristics of the verb as a part of speech (semantical, morphological, syntactic).*
2. *The classification of the English verb. Different principles used to distinguish verb cases as to:*
 - a) *stem types (morphological classification);*
 - b) *verb-form derivation (morphological classification);*
 - c) *implicit dependent meaning (two lexico-morphological classifications);*
 - d) *nature of predication (functional classification);*
 - e) *valent properties;*
 - f) *functional significance (functional-semantic classification);*
 - g) *combinability (syntagmatic classification).*
3. *Verb-building devices and their grammatical relevance.*
4. *The problem of the category of mood.*

Recommended literature

1. Blokh M. Y. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. / Марк Яковлевич Блох. – М. Высшая школа, 2000. – 381 p. . pp. 85-102, 185-203.
2. Ilyish B. A. The Structure of Modern English. – L., 1971. pp. 99-113.
3. Morokhovska E. J. Fundamentals of English Grammar (Theory and Practice) – K., 1993. pp. 69-71.
4. Rayevska N. M. Modern English Grammar. – Kyiv, 1976. pp. 37-42; 67-71.

Practical assignments:

Exercise 1. Give 7 examples of the use of tenses in transposition (non-temporal use offenses) in Modern English.

Exercise 2. For each example below give a derived passive construction. Experiment possible variants. Comment on the way the same ideas are rendered into Ukrainian:

1. Jin hired a taxi for her aunt. 2. Only yesterday I received a copy of *MORNING STAR* for my group. 3. He wrote a letter to the place called *HERMITAGE*. 4. Nobody spoke about this accident. 5. They just saw you climb into a rherry tree. 6. They should have finished this experiment by Monday. 7. She knotted her hair. 8. They looked at her with admiration. 9. Theyspoke much about this incident on the town. 10. Evidently, nobody had slept in I lie bed that night.

Exercise 3. Give 4 examples of the use of moods in transposition in Modern English (and, if possible, in Ukrainian).

Exercise 4. Examine the following sentences and point out the verb-forms which are characterized by neutralization of the opposition "common/continuous":

1. It is evening again. The sea runs very high. It frets, sweeps up and over, hugs, leaps upon the rocks. Every moment the light changes. Even as I write it is no longer hard. Some small white clouds top the mountain like tossed-up smoke. And now a purple colour, very menacing and awful, is pulling over the sky. (K. Mansfield) 2. The clock is striking five and the last rays of the sun pour under the swinging blind. (K. Mansfield) 3. I was lolling Robinson at the bank today, I've been getting pains, and I'm sleeping badly. (G. Greene) 4. I am in the sitting room downstairs. The wind howls outside, but here it is so warm and pleasant. (K. Mansfield) 5. It is i dark, reluctant day. The fire makes a noise like a flag. (K. Mansfield) 6. Mrs Giott scolded and exclaimed at the men for being in such a hurry. (K. Prichard) 7. While he looked at it she watched his face as though her life depended upon its expression. (E. Voinich)

Seminar 5. The Category of Tense

Issues Discussed:

1. *Time and Tense. Time signals and verb form indicators. The realization of tense in English. Tense oppositions and tense markers. Different views on the system of tenses in English (2 and 3 dimensional models). The problem of relative verb forms. Sequence of tenses.*
2. *The category of aspect. Aspect and manner of action. Aspect and aspective character of the verb in English. The realization of aspect in English. Aspect oppositions and aspect markers. Aspect and tense in relation. Different approaches to the number and kinds of aspects in English. English and Ukrainian aspects compared.*
3. *The problem of perfect in Modern English.*

Recommended literature

1. Blokh M. Y. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. / Марк Яковлевич Блох. – М. Высшая школа, 2000. – 381 p. . pp. 137-166, 166-176.
2. Ilyish B. A. The Structure of Modern English. – L., 1971. pp. 76-98.
3. Morokhovska E. J. Fundamentals of English Grammar (Theory and Practice) – K., 1993. pp. 71-72.
4. Rayevska N. M. Modern English Grammar. – Kyiv, 1976. pp. 37-42; 67-71.

Practical assignments:

Exercise 1. Comment upon the aspective character of the action expressed by the verb-forms in transposition. Discuss the shade of subjective modality as expressed in each case (blame, irritation, impatience, reproach, pleasure):

1. It was a habit. She was always sighing. (K. Mansfield)
2. It isn't true I hat all people will do things for money. I'm always being surprised about ii. (J. Priestley)
3. He says Charley's no good because

he's always loafing around the bar and drinks a lot. (K. Prichard) 4. You're always mopin' and moonin' over something now. (A. Cronin) 5. The experience of life shows that people are constantly doing things which must lead to disaster. (S. Maugham) 6. It's Miss le Roy, Doctor Manson. One of our customers. Not mine, thank goodness. She's always giving trouble. (A. Cronin) 7. Serious conversation is of course impossible on account of the paper pirates who are always hovering about to snatch up an idea. (J. Aldridge)

Exercise 2. Account for the indication of aspect distinction in the following sentences. Point out the devices which express:

- a) *the ingressive character of the action;*
- b) *the durative character of the action;*
- c) *the terminative character of the action;*
- d) *actions of single occurrence;*
- e) *frequentative character of the action.*

If possible, make a tabulated survey of these devices.

1. Harry Fisher had always had an affection for his more quiet and eccentric brother and was now coming to have a respect for him. (G. Chesterton) 2. I kept glancing at the files of Kopjes which ... seemed to change with every step. (D. Lessing) 3. «I told'em about you and they're dying to have a look at you", said Lutkins joyfully. (S. Lewis) 4. Stung by that retort, Soames moved towards the piano and back to the hearth, to and fro, as he had been wont in the old days in their drawing room. (J. Galsworthy) 5. Little by little I came to know why he was so dignified and had no need to complain about anything. (W. Saroyan) 6. I don't want to be a boy. I want to get to work. (Th. Dreiser) 7. He fell to thinking, and Ste-ger got up and strolled about leisurely. He was thinking too. (Th. Dreiser) 8. ... he had been in the habit of borrowing money from the city treasury at a low rate of interest. (Th. Dreiser) 9. The quartermaster nodded to him as he passed. (S. Maugham) 10. They smoked while they stared at the corpse. (S. Maugham) 11. All the next day Kitty thought of the Convent. (S. Maugham) 12. I mean she took to disliking me before I took to disliking her. (E. Caldwell) 13. He soon got to know the wisdom of being patient. (J. London) 14. When these women get

to talking they go on for hours. (A. Hornby) 15. And Jolyon would wonder what she would look like with such age. (J. Galsworthy) 16. He then set to work and lovingly composed a lobster salad. (A. Cronin) 17. You usen't to talk that way last year, Andrew. (A. Cronin) 18. ... one of the men gave a choked cry and stumbled back into the wall. (W. Faulkner) 19. The sun commenced to set behind the clouds. (B. Charleston) 20. Oh, don't go on and on about it! (J. Priestley)

Exercise 3. Give a few examples of the use of continuous verb-forms in transposition in sentences expressing repeated processes:

Model: "What are you getting?" – "Fifteen pounds a week" (A. Cronin).

Exercise 4. Translate into Ukrainian paying special attention to the aspective character of the predicate.

1. Just then an enormous wolf came prowling into the park to see if he could catch a fat little pig for his supper. (H. Munro) 2. He came stump -ing across the drawing room and stood beside her chair holding out various packages. (E. Webster) 3. At the same time the little ones, ... came tearing ilirough the kitchen. (M. Harris) 4. At the sound of his voice Willie came i pping from the woods on the east fringe of the clearing. (R. Caudill) 5. At I his a whole pack (of cards) rose up into the air and came flying down upon her. (L. Caroll) 6. ... the Venables came traipsing into the clearing, Stephanie crowding close behind her papy. (R. Caudill) 7. No code (of our society) mattered for her before she broke it but it came crashing down on her afterwards. (H. Lee) 8. "How – how are you? What are you doing here? Did Selina send you?" The questions came tumbling out. (E. Webster). 9. But presently a particularly noisy pair of geese came swimming close to t he water edge and shouted into Jan's ear. (E. Webster) 10. At that time nil old man came riding on a horse. 11. ... and the butter came pouring from under Seth's hat. (M. Twain) 12. Hopkins suddenly came barreling into the court room and slammed his brief on the table. (N. T. Rosenberg) 13. When Ann came rushing out of the courtroom, she ran right into Tommy Reed. (N. T. Rosenberg) 14. Any minute either Glen would come back or the police would come screaming up and arresting her. (N. T.

Rosen-he rg) 15. I work hard in the field and you only go walking at home from one corner to another.

Exercise 5. Follow the instructions of exercise 8:

1. I hope I shall come to know them through knowing him. (Ch. Dickens, 2. May I ask you how he came to fall into the desponding state which causes your uneasiness? (Ch. Dickens) 3. The rain came rushing on the bushes. (Ch. Dickens) 4. The stone went rumbling on the roofs. 5. He had come to attach to Little Dorrit an interest so peculiar that he found it disappointing, disagreeable to suppose her in love (Ch. Dickens). 6. Many women in business have come to learn how to protect themselves (Cf.: "I have come here to learn English" and explain the difference). 7. Fanny fell to tying her bonnet. (Ch. Dickens) 8. The birds came flying. (Cf.: She caime in crying).

Module 2. Syntax

Seminar 6. Syntax. Its Subject and Methods

Issues Discussed:

1. *Syntax as a part of grammar. The problem of the definition of the subject matter of syntax.*
2. *Basic syntactical notions (units, functions, relations, connections, processes, forms, positions, constructions).*
3. *Kinds of syntactical theories:*
 - a) *paradigmatic syntax;*
 - b) *structural syntax;*
 - c) *constructive syntax;*
 - d) *immediate constituents;*
 - e) *transformational syntax;*
 - f) *distributional syntax;*
 - g) *communicative syntax;*
 - h) *pragmatic syntax;*
 - i) *semantic syntax.*

Recommended literature

1. Blokh M. Y. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. / Марк Яковлевич Блох. – М. Высшая школа, 2000. – 381 p. . pp. 229-272, 282-342.
2. Ilyish B. A. The Structure of Modern English. – L., 1971. pp. 76-98.
3. Morokhovska E. J. Fundamentals of English Grammar (Theory and Practice) – K., 1993. pp. 71-72.
4. Rayevska N. M. Modern English Grammar. – Kyiv, 1976. pp. 37-42; 67-71.

Practical assignments:

Exercise 1. Write out from your home reading book at least five simple complicated sentences of different types.

Exercise 2. Define the type of the following sentences and divide them into clauses (if possible):

1. Having the power to manipulate the system must have played in to his madness and the more he got away with, the bolder he became. (N. T. Rosenberg). 2. But Mr. Sawyer's own statements make it clear that he violated the terms of his probation by continuing to distribute narcotics. (N. T. Rosenberg). 3. Once David got in the passenger seat, Ann turned to him and took his hands in her own. (Rosenberg). 4. The courtroom was even more crowded and noisy than before the break. (Rosenberg). 5. When finished with the formalities, he looked out at Jimmy Sawyer. (Rosenberg) 6. Waiting until most of the courtroom had cleared, Ann walked over and stood there until Jimmy saw her. (Rosenberg) 7. If you didn't have something good inside, you would have never been near me at that moment. (Rosenberg) 8. He must be sixty, if a day. (A. Sillitoe) 9. If youth knew, if age could! (a saying) 10. She is always diligent, which you seldom are. 11. I have to go home now, for I feel tired. 12. Jane is more diligent than you. 13. We heard Alice sing in the garden.

Exercise 3. Identify the infinitival one-member sentences and different kinds of modality as expressed in each case: indicative, imperative, oblique (wish, unreal condition, hypothesis, etc.). Comment on the shades of subjective modality:

1. Soames had a moment of sheer weakness. To part with his secret?! (J. Galsworthy) 2. What was to be done? Tell Dan he must come home? Confide in June? (J. Galsworthy) 3. To love everybody and bring them happiness! Was it not possible for her? (J. Galsworthy) 4. His thoughts were pleasant, slightly sensual, rather puzzled. Take steps! (J. Galsworthy) 5. To think that he should be a full cousin to this wealthy and influential family! (Th. Dreiser) 6. Please to remember that. (B. Shaw) 7. To know what was in her mind! (J. Galsworthy) 8. To think that any one should write such a thing of me! How dare they?! (Th. Dreiser) 9. Well, what to do? (J. Galsworthy). 10. Marriage! The mere thought of such a thing! Impossible! His father! His hitherto free roving life! His future! (Th. Dreiser). 11. She

had been betrayed. That was it. Devils! Devils! ... And after all he had said to her! And all his and his wife's care for her! And now the neighbours! His business! The police! A public trial! Possibly a sentence – a death sentence! God in heaven! His own daughter, too! (Th. Dreiser)

Exercise 4. Give comments on the adverbial use of nouns in the following patterns (point out the adverbial relations of comparison, the adverbial relations of time, different degree of a quality):

A shade darker, a bit louder, sky blue (cf. blue sky), snow white, life long, ankle deep, stone deaf, lots better, heaps better, a bit longer, iron hard, ash blond, paper white.

Exercise 5. Analyse the structures with parcellings (extreme isolation). Comment on the grammatical status and stylistic value of these structures:

1. Again the Captain laid his hand upon his chest. After drawing another deep breath, he conjured himself to «stand by». But in a whisper. (Ch. Dickens) 2. She was interrupted at that point. By me. (D. Salinger) 3. «It's easy,» the priest said, «to worry too much about that. Especially here». (G. Greene) 4. People who collect china – they cannot carry it around with them. Or books. (G. Greene) 5. There are daisies on the table and a red flower, like a poppy, shines through. Of daisies I will write. Of the dark, Of the wind – and the sun and the mists. Of the shadows. Ah! of all that you loved and that I too love and feel. (K. Mansfield) 6. Certainly I read it, George. And the correspondence which followed. (G. Gordon) 7. They flew out today. Disappointed. (G. Greene) 8. It's going to be most difficult. And dangerous. (G. Gordon) 9. Send me the School Secretary! And the Professor of medicine. (G. Gordon) 10. There's a lot of firing on the other side of the international road. Wild, firing. (G. Greene) 11. "I want some hot water", I said sternly. "Lots of hot water. Fill basins with it. Or anything you like." (G. Gordon)

Seminar 7. Word-Group Theory

Issues Discussed:

1. *General characteristics of the word-group. Confrontation of word-groups to words, clauses and sentences.*
2. *Types and kinds of word-groups, different criteria employed: Subordinate-coordinate-predicative; Endocentric – exocentric, Elementary – expanded; Simple – compound; Free – grammatically fixed; Syndatic – asyndetic; Notional – structural; Progressive – regressive; Continuous – discontinuous.*
3. *The problem of coordinate word-groups.*
4. *the problem of predicative word-groups.*

Recommended literature

1. Blokh M. Y. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. / Марк Яковлевич Блох. – М. Высшая школа, 2000. – 381 p. . pp. 229-272, 282-342.
2. Ilyish B. A. The Structure of Modern English. – L., 1971. pp. 171-181.
3. Morokhovska E. J. Fundamentals of English Grammar (Theory and Practice) – K., 1993. pp. 115-119.
4. Rayevska N. M. Modern English Grammar. – Kyiv, 1976. pp. 37-42; 67-71.

References

1. Бархударов Л. С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка / Леонид Степанович Бархударов. – М. – 1966. – 200 с.
2. Blokh M. Y. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar / Марк Яковлевич Блох. – М. : Высш. школа. – 2000. – 381 с.
3. Blokh M. Y., Lebedeva A. Y., Denisova V. S. A English Grammar Exercises / Марк Яковлевич Блох, Анастасия Яковлевна Лебедева, Валентина Серафимовна Денисова. – М. : Высш. школа. – 1985. – 174 с.
4. Burlakova V. V. Contribution of English and American Linguists to the Theory of Phrase / V. V. Burlakova. – М., – 1971. – 167 p.
5. Carstairs-McCarthy A. An Introduction to English Morphology: Words and Their Structure / Andrew Carstairs-McCarthy. – Edingburg University Press. – 2002. – 151 p.
6. Carstairs-McCarthy A. Current Morphology / Andrew Carstairs-McCarthy. – Routledge: London & New York. – 2002. – 289 p.
7. Ganshina M. A., Vasilevskaya N.M. English Grammar / M. A. Ganshina, N. M. Vasilevskaya. – М. – 1964. – 204 p.
8. Иванова И. П., Бурлакова В. В., Почепцов Г. Г. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка: Учебник / Ирина Петровна Иванова, Варвара Васильевна Бурлакова, Георгий Георгиевич Почепцов. – М.: Высш. школа. – 1981. – 285 с.
9. Ilyish V. A. The Structure of Modern English / Борис Александрович Ильиш. – Л. – 1971. – 365 p.

10. Khaimovich B. S., Rogovskaya B. I. A Course in English Grammar / B. S. Khaimovich, B. I. Rogivskaya. – М. – 1967. – 298 p.
11. Kharytonov I. K. Theoretical English Grammar / Іван Кирилович Харитонов. – Тернопіль : Навчальна книга – Богдан. – 2007. – 157 с.
12. Kobrina N. A., Korneyeva E. A. An Outline of Modern English Syntax / N. A. Kobrina, E. A. Korneyeva. – М. – 1965. – 161 p.
13. Kobrina N. A., Korneyeva E. A., Ossovskaya M. I., Guzeyeva K. A. An English Grammar (Syntax) / N. A. Kobrina, E. A. Korneyeva, M. I. Ossovskaya. – М. – 1986. – 160 p.
14. Korsakov A. K. The Use of Tenses in English. / A. K. Korsakov. – Lviv. – 1969. – 137 p.
15. Korunets I. V. Contrastive Typology of Modern English and Ukrainian / Ілько Вакулович Корунець. – Вінниця: Нова Книга. – 2003. – 464 p.
16. Koshevaya L. G. The Theory of English Grammar / Инна Гергиевна Кошечая. – М. – 1982. – 335 p.
17. Крылова И. П., Гордон Е. М. Грамматика современного английского языка / И. П. Крылова, Е. М. Гордон: Учебник для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. – 9-е изд. – М.: Книжный дом «Университет»: Высшая школа. – 2003. – 448 с.
18. Levitsky A. E., Slavova L. L., Borisenko N. D. Linguistics / A. E. Levitsky, L. L. Slavova, N. D. Borisenko. – К., 2006. – 236.
19. Morokhovska E. J. Fundamentals of English Grammar (Theory and Practice) / Эмилия Яковлевна Мороховская. – К. – 1993. – 287 p.
20. Rayevska N. M. Modern English Grammar / N. M. Rayevska. – К. – 1976. – 304 p.
21. Смирницкий А. И. Синтаксис английского языка / А. И. Смирницкий. – М. – 1957. – 286 с.

22. Starikova E. N., Alova N. P. Seminars in Theoretical Grammar / E. N. Starikova, N. P. Alova. – K., 1984. – 86 p.
23. Sweet H. A New English Grammar. Part 1 / H. A. Sweet. – 1982. – 247 p.
24. Volkova L. M. Lectures in Theoretical Grammar / L. M. Volkova. – K. : KNLU. – 2004. – 30 p.
25. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language / Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik. – Longman: London & New York. – 1985. – 1776 p.

Бурдіна С. В. Теоретична граматики. – Методичні рекомендації для студентів вищих навчальних закладів.

Методичне видання надає студентам можливість навчитися аналізувати та зіставляти основні теоретичні положення та проблеми теоретичної граматики англійської мови, сформулювати уявлення про граматику як підсистему мови, її компонентах, структурі і місці у загальній системі мови; розвинути навички використання термінології з теоретичної граматики та самостійно підбирати та аналізувати практичний матеріал для ілюстрування основних положень теоретичної граматики.

Бурдина С. В. Теоретическая грамматика. – Методические рекомендации для студентов высших учебных заведений.

Данное методическое пособие дает студентам возможность научиться анализировать и сопоставлять основные теоретические положения и проблемы теоретической грамматики английского языка, сформировать представление о грамматике как подсистеме языка, ее компонентах, структуре и месте в общей системе языка; развить умение пользоваться терминологией по теоретической грамматике и самостоятельно подбирать и анализировать практический материал для иллюстрации основных положений теоретической грамматики.

Burdina S. V. Theoretical Grammar. – Methodological Guidelines for Students of Higher Educational Institutions.

These guidelines enable students to learn to analyze and juxtapose the main theoretical concepts and problems of theoretical grammar of English, to shape their views about grammar as a subsystem, its components, structure and place in the overall system of the language; the develop their skills to use terminology of theoretical grammar, independently select and analyze practical exercises to illustrate the main concepts of theoretical grammar.

Навчально-методичне видання

БУРДІНА Світлана Василівна

ТЕОРЕТИЧНА ГРАМАТИКА

*Методичні рекомендації
для студентів вищих навчальних закладів*

Англійською мовою

Методичні рекомендації з теоретичної граматики сучасної англійської мови складаються з трьох розділів: I. Вступ, II. Модуль 1 - Морфологія і III. Модуль 2 - Синтаксис. Основне завдання курсу — розвиток лінгвістичного мислення студентів, наукового розуміння граматичних і лексико-граматичних категорій сучасної англійської мови. В центрі уваги проблемні питання теорії граматики на сучасному етапі розвитку мовознавства, питання системного характеру мови, діалектичної єдності форми і змісту всіх граматичних явищ, функціонально-семантичних зв'язків між одиницями різного рівня. Ці питання висвітлюються в плані систематичних зіставлень з українською мовою.

Адресовано студентам філологічних спеціальностей вищих навчальних закладів.

За редакцією автора
Комп'ютерне макетування, коректор – С. В. Бурдіна

Здано до склад. 17.12.2012 р. Підп. до друку 16.01.2013 р.
Формат 60x84 1/16. Папір офсет. Гарнітура Times New Roman.
Друк ризографічний. Ум. друк. арк. 5,35. Наклад 200 прим. Зам. № 9.

Видавець і виготовлювач
Видавництво Державного закладу
“Луганський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка”
вул. Оборонна, 2, м. Луганськ, 91011. т/ф: (0642) 58-03-20.
e-mail: alma-mater@list.ru
Свідоцтво суб'єкта видавничої справи ДК № 3459 від 09.04.2009 р.