

Fənn: İngilis dilinin morfolojiyası ilə sintaksisin əlaqə tədrisinin elmi metodiki əsasları (mühazirələr)

Müəllim: dos. Z.Ç.Abbasova

Lecture I

GRAMMAR IN THE SYSTEMIC CONCEPTION OF LANGUAGE

1. How is the classification of words existing in English?
2. What does it mean that the language is social by nature?
3. How is the classification of words according to meaning?
4. To what characteristic features any linguistic description may have a practical or theoretical purpose?

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.

Language incorporates the three constituent parts ("sides"), each being inherent in it by virtue of its social nature. These parts are the phonological system, the lexical system, the grammatical system. Only the unity of these three elements forms a language; without any one of them there is no human language in the above sense.

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.

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.

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. Since the practice of lingual intercourse, however, can only be realised by employing language as a unity of all its constituent parts, practical linguistic manuals more often than not comprise the three types of description presented in a complex. 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.

The said traditional view of the purpose of grammar has lately been re-stated by some modern trends in linguistics. In particular, scholars belonging to these trends pay much attention to artificially constructing and analysing incorrect utterances with the aim of a better formulation of the rules for" the construction of correct ones. But their examples and deductions, too, are often at variance with real facts of lingual usage.

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

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

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

However, a couple of years later this assessment of the lingual value of the given utterances was disputed in an experimental investigation with informants — natural speakers of English, who could not come to a unanimous conclusion

about the correctness or incorrectness of both of them. In particular, some of the informants classed the second utterance as "sounding like poetry".

To understand the contradictions between the bluntly formulated "rules" and reality, as well as to evaluate properly the results of informant tests like the one mentioned above, we must bear in mind that the true grammatical rules or regularities cannot be separated from the expression of meanings; on the contrary, they are themselves meaningful. Namely, they are connected with the most general and abstract parts of content inherent in the elements of language. These parts of content, together with the formal means through which they are expressed, are treated by grammarians in terms of "grammatical categories". Such are, for instance, the categories of number or mood in morphology, the categories of communicative purpose or emphasis in syntax, etc. Since the grammatical forms and regularities are meaningful, it becomes clear that the rules of grammar must be stated semantically, or, more specifically, they must be worded functionally. For example, it would be

fallacious to state without any further comment that the inverted word order in the English declarative sentence is grammatically incorrect. Word order as an element of grammatical form is laden with its own meaningful functions. It can express, in particular, the difference between the central idea of the utterance and the marginal idea, between emotive and unemotive modes of speech, between different types of style. Thus, if the inverted word order in a given sentence does express these functions, then its use should be considered as quite correct. *E.g.*: In the centre of the room, under the chandelier, as became a host, stood *the head of the family, old Jolyon himself* (J. Galsworthy).

The word arrangement in the utterance expresses a narrative description, with the central informative element placed in the strongest semantic position in narration, i.e. at the end. **The nature of grammar as a constituent part of language is better understood in the light of explicitly discriminating the two planes of language, namely, the plane of content and the plane of expression.**

The plane of content comprises the purely semantic elements contained in language, while the plane of expression comprises the material (formal) units of language taken by themselves, apart from the meanings rendered by them. The two planes are inseparably connected, so that no meaning can be realised without some material means of expression. Grammatical elements of language present a unity of content and expression. In this the grammatical elements are similar to the lingual lexical elements, though the quality of grammatical meanings is different in principle from the quality of lexical meanings.

On the other hand, the correspondence between the planes of content and expression is very complex, and it is peculiar to each language. This complexity is clearly illustrated by the phenomena of polysemy, homonymy, and synonymy.

In cases of polysemy and homonymy, two or more units of the plane of content correspond to one unit of the plane of expression. For instance, the verbal form of the present indefinite (one unit in the plane of expression) polysemantically renders the grammatical meanings of habitual action, action at the present moment, action taken as a general truth (several units in the plane of content). The morphemic material element *-s/-es* (in pronunciation [-s, -z, -iz]), i.e. one unit in the plane of expression, homonymically renders the grammatical meanings of the third person singular of the verbal present tense, the plural of the noun, the possessive form of the noun, i.e. several units of the plane of content.

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

Taking into consideration the discrimination between the two planes, we may say that the purpose of grammar as a linguistic discipline is, in the long run, to disclose and formulate the regularities of the correspondence between the plane of content and the plane of expression in the formation of utterances out of the stocks of words as part of the process of speech production.

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.

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. 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 Beudoin 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 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 into 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.

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). *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").

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 nasalisation, 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.

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.

Units of language are divided into *segmental* and *suprasegmental*.

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 [-1]; a-fire [ə-]; come-s [-z].

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

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

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

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

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

This kind of nomination can be called "polynomination", as different from "monomination" effected by separate words.

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

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

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

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

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

We have surveyed six levels of language, each identified by its own functional type of segmental units. If now we carefully observe the functional status of the level-forming segments, we can distinguish between them more self-sufficient and less self-sufficient types, the latter being defined only in relation to the functions of other level units. Indeed, the phonemic, lexemic and proposemic levels are most strictly and exhaustively identified from the functional point of view: the function of the phoneme is differential, the function of the word is nominative, the function of the sentence is predicative. As different from these, morphemes are identified only as significative components of words, phrases present polynominative combinations of words, and supra-sentential constructions mark the transition from the sentence to the text.

Furthermore, bearing in mind that the phonemic level forms the subfoundation of language, i.e. the non-meaningful matter of meaningful expressive means, the two notions of grammatical description shall be pointed out as central even within the framework of the structural hierarchy of language: these are, first, the notion of the word and, second, the notion of the sentence. The first is analysed by morphology,

which is the grammatical teaching of the word; the second is analysed by syntax, which is the grammatical teaching of the sentence.

Lecture II

The morphological system of language

1. How many segmental units morphology as part of grammatical theory faces ?
2. What is defined as the minimal potential sentence, the minimal free linguistic form, the elementary component of the sentence, the articulate sound-symbol?
3. Is the function of words realised in their nominative correlation with one another?
4. Types of morphemes, how many are they?

The morphological system of language reveals its properties through the morphemic structure of words. It follows from this that morphology as part of grammatical theory faces the two segmental units: the morpheme and the word. But, as we have already pointed out, the morpheme is not identified otherwise than part of the word; the functions of the morpheme are effected only as the corresponding constituent functions of the word as a whole.

For instance, the form of the verbal past tense is built up by means of the dental grammatical suffix: train-*ed* [-d]; publish-*ed* [-t]; meditat-*ed* [-id].

However, the past tense as a definite type of grammatical meaning is expressed not by the dental morpheme in isolation, but by the verb (i.e. word) taken in the corresponding form (realised by its morphemic composition); the dental suffix is immediately related to the stem of the verb and together with the stem constitutes the temporal correlation in the paradigmatic system of verbal categories

Thus, in studying the morpheme we actually study the word in the necessary details of its composition and functions. Very difficult to give a rigorous (ciddi) 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. 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 (çəkındrmək) 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 to them to be divided by a third word. But this would-be rigorous criterion is quite irrelevant for analytical wordforms, 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.

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 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.

In traditional grammar the study of the morphemic structure of the word was conducted in the light of the two basic criteria: positional and semantic or functional. The combination of these two criteria in an integral description has led to the rational classification of morphemes that is widely used both in research linguistic work and in practical lingual tuition.

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

The roots of notional words are classical lexical morphemes.

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

The root, according to the positional content of the term is obligatory for any word, while affixes are not obligatory. Therefore one and the same morphemic segment of functional (i.e. non-notional) status, depending on various morphemic

environments, can in principle be used now as an affix (mostly, a prefix), now as a root. *Cf.*:

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

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

outing — a two-morpheme word, in which *out* is a root, and *-ing* is a suffix; *outlook, outline, outrage, out-talk, etc.* — words, in which *out-* serves as a prefix;

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

The morphemic composition of modern English words has a wide range of varieties; in the lexicon of everyday speech the preferable morphemic types of stems are root-stems (one-root stems or two-root stems) and one-affix stems. With grammatically changeable words, these stems take one grammatical suffix {two "open" grammatical suffixes are used only with some plural nouns in the possessive case, *cf.*: the children's toys, the oxen's yokes).

Thus, the abstract complete morphemic model of the common English word is the following: prefix + root + lexical suffix + grammatical suffix.

The distribution of a unit may be defined as the total of all its environments; in other words, the distribution of a unit is its environment in generalised terms of classes or categories.

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

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

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

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

Contrastive and non-contrastive distributions concern identical environments of different morphs. The morphs are said to be in contrastive distribution if their meanings (functions) are different. 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 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 a result of the application of distributional analysis to the morphemic level, different types of morphemes have been discriminated which can be called the "distributional morpheme types". It must be stressed that the distributional classification of morphemes cannot abolish or in any way depreciate the traditional morpheme types. Rather, it supplements the traditional classification, showing some essential features of morphemes on the principles of environmental study.

We shall survey the distributional morpheme types arranging them in pairs of immediate correlation.

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

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

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

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

2) the segments *-ing*: the gerund and present participle;

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

The auxiliary word-morphemes of various standings should be interpreted in this connection as "semi-bound" morphemes, since, being used as separate elements of speech strings, they form categorial unities with their notional stem-words.

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

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

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

The said elements of language, as we have stated elsewhere, should beyond dispute be considered signemic units of language, since they are functionally bound.

They form the secondary line of speech, accompanying its primary phonemic line (phonemic complexes). On the other hand, from what has been stated about the morpheme proper, it is not difficult to see that the morphemic interpretation of suprasegmental units can hardly stand to reason. Indeed, these units are functionally connected not with morphemes, but with larger elements of language: words, word-groups, sentences, supra-sentential constructions.

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

It should be remembered that the phonemic interchange is utterly unproductive in English as in all the Indo-European languages. If it were productive, it might rationally be interpreted as a sort of replacive "infixation" (correlated with "exfixation" of the additive type). As it stands, however, this type of grammatical means can be understood as a kind of suppletivity (i.e. partial suppletivity).

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

By the discontinuous morpheme, opposed to the common, i.e. uninterruptedly expressed, continuous morpheme, a two-element grammatical unit is meant which is identified in the analytical grammatical form comprising an auxiliary word and a grammatical suffix. These two elements, as it were, embed the notional stem; hence, they are symbolically represented as follows:

be ... ing — for the continuous verb forms (*e.g.* is going); have ... en — for the perfect verb forms (*e.g.* has gone); be ... en — for the passive verb forms (*e.g.* is taken)

It is easy to see that the notion of morpheme applied to the analytical form of the word violates the principle of the identification of morpheme as an elementary meaningful segment: the analytical "framing" consists of two meaningful segments, i.e. of two different morphemes. On the other hand, the general notion "discontinuous constituent", "discontinuous unit" is quite rational and can be helpfully used in linguistic description in its proper place.

Lecture III

CATEGORIAL STRUCTURE OF THE WORD

1. How is the classification of words existing in English?
2. What does it mean ---notional part of speech?
3. How is the classification of words according to meaning?
4. To what characteristic features words are grouped as a part of speech?

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

Grammatical meanings are very abstract, very general. Therefore the grammatical form is not confined to an individual word, but unites a whole class of words, so that each word of the class expresses the corresponding grammatical meaning together with its individual, concrete semantics.

For instance, the meaning of the substantive plural is rendered by the regular plural suffix *-(e)s*, and in some cases by other, more specific means, such as phonemic interchange and a few lexeme-bound suffixes. Due to the generalised character of the plural, we say that different groups of nouns "take" this form with strictly defined variations in the mode of expression, the variations being of more systemic (phonological conditioning) and less systemic (etymological conditioning) nature. *Cf.*: faces, branches, matches, judges; books, rockets, boats, chiefs, proofs; dogs, beads, films, stones, hens; lives, wives, thieves, leaves; girls, stars, toys, heroes, pianos, cantos; oxen, children, brethren, kine; swine, sheep, deer; cod, trout, salmon; men, women, feet, teeth, geese, mice, lice; formulae, antennae; data, errata, strata, addenda, memoranda; radii, genii, nuclei, alumni; crises, bases, analyses, axes; phenomena, criteria.

As we see, **the grammatical form presents a division of the word on the principle of expressing a certain grammatical meaning.** 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 categorical 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 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 function 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 (ternary, 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 sent 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-nasalised (nasalisation —), 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.

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

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

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

Consider another example: Tonight we *start* for London.

The verb in this sentence takes the form of the present, while its meaning in the context is the future. It means that the opposition "present — future" has been reduced, the weak member (present) replacing the strong one (future). The oppositional reduction shown in the two cited cases is stylistically indifferent, the demonstrated use of the forms does not transgress the expressive conventions of ordinary speech. This kind of oppositional reduction is referred to as "neutralisation" of oppositions. The position of neutralisation is, as a rule, filled in by the weak member of the opposition due to its more general semantics.

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

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

This kind of oppositional reduction should be considered under the heading of "transposition". Transposition is based on the contrast between the members of the opposition, it may be defined as a contrastive use of the counter-member of the opposition. As a rule (but not exclusively) transpositionally employed is the strong member of the opposition, which is explained by its comparatively limited regular functions.

The means employed for building up member-forms of categorial oppositions are traditionally divided into *synthetical* and *analytical*; accordingly, the grammatical forms themselves are classed into *synthetical* and *analytical*, too.

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

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

Inner inflexion (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, 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, as we pointed out in the foregoing chapter, unites it in principle with inner inflexion (or, rather, makes the latter into a specific variety of the former).

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 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).

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

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 idiomaticism 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).

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. Categorial forms based on subordinative grammatical agreement (such as the verbal person, the verbal number) are reflective, while categorial forms stipulating grammatical agreement in lexemes of a contiguous word-class (such as the substantive-pronominal person, the substantive number) are immanent. Immanent 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.

In the light of the exposed characteristics of the categories, we may specify the

status of grammatical paradigms of changeable forms.

Grammatical change has been interpreted in traditional terms of declension and conjugation. By declension the nominal change is implied (first of all, the case system), while by conjugation the verbal change is implied (the verbal forms of person, number, tense, etc.). However, the division of categories into immanent and reflective invites a division of forms on a somewhat more consistent basis.

Since the immanent feature is expressed by essentially independent grammatical forms, and the reflective feature, correspondingly, by essentially dependent grammatical forms, all the forms of the first order (immanent) should be classed as "declensional", while all the forms of the second order (reflective) should be classed as "conjugational".

In accord with this principle, the noun in such synthetical languages as Russian or Latin is declined by the forms of gender, number, and case, while the adjective is conjugated by the same forms. As for the English verb, it is conjugated by the reflective forms of person and number, but declined by the immanent forms of tense, aspect, voice, and mood.

Lecture IV

GRAMMATICAL CLASSES OF WORDS

1. How the nouns classified according to number?
2. Why are the nouns classified according to number?
3. Is the category of number expressed by the opposition of the plural form of the noun to the singular form of the noun?
4. The absolute plural is characteristic of the uncountable nouns which denote objects consisting of two halves?

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 refer to parts of speech as "lexico-grammatical" series of words, or as "lexico-grammatical categories"

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. This name was introduced *in* the grammatical 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, consequently, no strict differentiation was drawn between the word as a vocabulary unit and the word as a functional element of the sentence.

In modern linguistics, parts of speech are discriminated on the basis of the three criteria: "semantic", "formal", and "functional". The *semantic* criterion presupposes the evaluation of the generalised meaning, which is characteristic of all the subsets of words constituting a given part of speech. This meaning is understood as the "categorial 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 said three factors of categorial characterisation of words are conventionally referred to as, respectively, "meaning", "form", and "function".

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

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

The *conjunction* expresses connections of phenomena.

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

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

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

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

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

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

man, scholar, leopard, butterfly — earth, field, rose, machine;
coin/coins, floor/floors, kind/kinds — news, growth, water, furniture;
stone, grain, mist, leaf — honesty, love, slavery, darkness.

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

walk, sail, prepare, shine, blow — can, may, shall, be, become;
take, put, speak, listen, see, give — live, float, stay, ache, ripen, rain; write, play, strike, boil, receive, ride — exist, sleep, rest, thrive, revel, suffer;
roll, tire, begin, ensnare, build, tremble — consider, approve, mind, desire, hate, incline.

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

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

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

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

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

We have drawn a general outline of the division of the lexicon into part of speech classes developed by modern linguists on the lines of traditional morphology.

It is known that the distribution of words between different parts of speech may to a certain extent differ with different authors. This fact gives cause to some linguists for calling in question the rational character of the part of speech classification as a whole, gives them cause for accusing it of being subjective or "prescientific" in essence. Such nihilistic criticism, however, should be rejected as utterly ungrounded. Indeed, considering the part of speech classification on its merits, one must clearly realise that what is above all important about it is the fundamental principles of word-class identification, and not occasional enlargements or diminutions of the established groups, or re-distributions of individual words due to re-considerations of their subcategorial features. The very idea of subcategorisation as the obligatory second stage of the undertaken classification testifies to the objective nature of this kind of analysis.

For instance, prepositions and conjunctions can be combined into one united series of "connectives", since the function of both is just to connect notional

components of the sentence. In this case, on the second stage of classification, the enlarged word-class of connectives will be subdivided into two main subclasses, namely, prepositional connectives and conjunctive connectives. Likewise, the articles can be included as a subset into the more general set of particles-specifiers. As is known, nouns and adjectives, as well as numerals, are treated in due contexts of description under one common class-term "names": originally, in the Ancient Greek grammatical teaching they were not differentiated because they had the same forms of morphological change (declension). On the other hand, in various descriptions of English grammar such narrow lexemic sets as the two words *yes* and *no*, the pronominal determiners of nouns, even the one anticipating pronoun *it* are given a separate class-item status — though in no way challenging or distorting the functional character of the treated units.

It should be remembered that modern principles of part of speech identification have been formulated as a result of painstaking research conducted on the vast materials of numerous languages; and it is in Soviet linguistics that the three-criteria characterisation of parts of speech has been developed and applied to practice with the utmost consistency. The three celebrated names are especially notable for the elaboration of these criteria, namely, V. V. Vinogradov in connection with his study of Russian grammar, A. I. Smirnitsky and B. A. Ilyish in connection with their study of English grammar.

Alongside of the three-criteria principle of dividing the words into grammatical (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.

Worthy of note is that in the original Ancient Greek grammatical teaching which put forward the first outline of the part of speech theory, the division of words into grammatical classes was also based on one determining criterion only, namely, on the formal-morphological featuring. It means that any given word under analysis was turned into a classified lexeme on the principle of its relation to grammatical change. In conditions of the primary acquisition of linguistic knowledge, and in connection with the study of a highly inflexional language this characteristic proved quite efficient.

Still, at the present stage of the development of linguistic science, syntactic characterisation of words that has been made possible after the exposition of their fundamental morphological properties, is far more important and universal from the point of view of the general classificational requirements.

This characterisation is more important, because it shows the distribution of words between different sets in accord with their functional destination. The role of morphology by this presentation is not underrated, rather it is further clarified from

the point of view of exposing connections between the categorial composition of the word and its sentence-forming relevance.

This characterisation is more universal, because it is not specially destined for the inflexional aspect of language and hence is equally applicable to languages of various morphological types.

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

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

For his materials he chooses tape-recorded spontaneous conversations comprising about 250,000 word entries (50 hours of talk). The words isolated from this corpus are tested on the three typical sentences (that are isolated from the records, too), and used as substitution test-frames:

Frame A. The concert was good (always).

Frame B. The clerk remembered the tax (suddenly).

Frame C. The team went there.

The parenthesised positions are optional from the point of view of the structural completion of sentences.

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

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

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

Class 3. (A) good, large, necessary, foreign, new, empty, etc. *Class 4.* (A) there, here, always, then, sometimes, etc.

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

(C) there, back, out, etc.; rapidly, eagerly, confidently, etc. All these words can fill in the positions of the frames

without affecting their general structural meaning (such as "thing and its quality at a given time" — the first frame; "actor — action — thing acted upon — characteristic of the action" — the second frame; "actor — action — direction of the action" — the third frame). Repeated interchanges in the substitutions of the primarily identified positional (i.e. notional) words in different collocations determine their morphological characteristics, i.e. characteristics referring them to various subclasses of the identified lexemic classes.

Functional words (function words) are exposed in the cited process of testing as being unable to fill in the positions of the frames without destroying their

structural meaning. These words form limited groups totalling 154 units.

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

Comparing the syntactico-distributional classification of words with the traditional part of speech division of words, one cannot but see the similarity of the general schemes of the two: the opposition of notional and functional words, the four absolutely cardinal classes of notional words (since numerals and pronouns have no positional functions of their own and serve as pro-nounal and pro-adjectival elements), the interpretation of functional words as syntactic mediators and their formal representation by the list.

However, under these unquestionable traits of similarity are distinctly revealed essential features of difference, the proper evaluation of which allows us to make some important generalisations about the structure of the lexemic system of language.

One of the major truths as regards the linguistic mechanism arising from the comparison of the two classifications is the explicit and unconditional division of the lexicon into the notional and functional parts. The open character of the notional part of the lexicon and the closed character of the functional part of it (not excluding the intermediary field between the two) receives the strict status of a formal grammatical feature.

The unity of notional lexemes finds its essential demonstration in an inter-class system of derivation that can be presented as a formal four-stage series permeating the lexicon and reflected in regular phrase correlations. *Cf.:*

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

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

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

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

the general paradigmatic scheme of nomination can prove a lexeme of any word-class, we are enabled to speak about the concrete "derivational perspective" of this or that series, i. e. to identify nomination paradigms with a nounal (N→), verbal (V→), adjectival (A→), and adverbial (D→) derivational perspectives. Cf.:

N→ power — to empower — powerful — powerfully
V→ to suppose — supposition — supposed — supposedly
A→ clear — clarity — to clarify — clearly
D→ out — outing — to out — outer

The nomination paradigm with the identical form of the stem for all the four stages is not represented on the whole of the lexicon; in this sense it is possible to speak of lexemes with a complete paradigm of nomination and lexemes with an incomplete paradigm of nomination. Some words may even stand apart from this paradigm, i.e. be nominatively isolated (here belong, for instance, some simple adverbs).

On the other hand, the universal character of the nomination paradigm is sustained by suppletive completion, both lexemic and phrasemic. Cf.:

an end — to end final — finally
good — goodness well — to better
evidence — evident — evidently to make evident
wise — wisely — wisdom to grow wise, etc.

role of suppletivity within the framework of the lexical paradigm of nomination (hence, within the lexicon as a whole) is extremely important, indeed. It is this type of suppletivity, i.e. lexemic suppletivity, that serves as an essential factor of the open character of the notional lexicon of language.

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

The essence of their paradigmatic status in the light of syntactic interpretation consists in the fact that the lists of functional words may be regarded as paradigmatic series themselves — which, in their turn, are grammatical constituents of higher paradigmatic series on the level of phrases and especially sentences.

As a matter of fact, functional words, considered by their role in the structure of the sentence, are proved to be exposers of various syntactic categories, i.e. they render structural meanings referring to phrases and sentences in constructional forms similar to derivational (word-building) and relational (grammatical) morphemes in the composition of separate words. Cf.:

The words were obscure, *but* she understood the uneasiness that produced them.→ The words were obscure, *weren't* they? *How then* could she understand the uneasiness that produced them?→ *Or* perhaps the words were *not too* obscure, after all? *Or*, conversely, she *didn't* understand the uneasiness that produced them?→ *But* the words were obscure. *How* obscure they were! *Still* she *did* understand the uneasiness that produced them. Etc.

This role of functional words which are identified not by their morphemic composition, but by their semantico-syntactic features in reference to the embedding constructions, is exposed on a broad linguistic basis within the framework of the theory of paradigmatic syntax .

Pronouns considered in the light of the syntactic principles receive a special systemic status that characteristically stamps the general presentation of the structure

of the lexicon as a whole.

Pronouns are traditionally recognised on the basis of indicatory (deictic) and substitutional semantic functions. The two types of meanings form a unity, in which the deictic semantics is primary. As a matter of fact, indication is the semantic foundation of substitution.

As for the syntactic principle of the word stock division, while recognising their deictic aspect, it lays a special stress on the substitutive features of pronouns. Indeed, it is the substitutional function that immediately isolates all the heterogeneous groups of pronouns into a special set of the lexicon.

The generalising substitutional function of pronouns makes them into syntactic representatives of all the notional classes of words, so that a pronominal positional part of the sentence serves as a categorial projection of the corresponding notional subclass identified as the filler set of the position in question. It should be clearly understood that even personal pronouns of the first and second persons play the cited representative role, which is unambiguously exposed by examples with direct addresses and appositions. *Cf.:*

I, Little Foot, go away making noises and tramlings. Are you happy, Lil?

Included into the system of pronouns are pronominal adverbs and verb-substitutes, in due accord with their substitutional functions. Besides, notional words of broad meaning are identified as forming an intermediary layer between the pronouns and notional words proper. Broad meaning words adjoin the pronouns by their substitutional function. *Cf.:*

I wish at her age she'd learn to sit quiet and not *do things*. Flora's suggestion is *making* sense. I will *therefore* briefly set down the circumstances which led to my being connected with the *affair*. Etc.

As a result of these generalisations, the lexical paradigm of nomination receives a complete substitutive representation. *Cf.:* one, it, they... — do, make, act... — such, similar, same... — thus, so, there...

As a result of the undertaken analysis we have obtained a foundation for dividing the whole of the lexicon on the upper level of classification into three unequal parts.

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

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

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

Substitutes of names (pro-names) and specifiers of names, while standing with the names in nominative correlation as elements of the lexicon, at the same time serve as connecting links between the names within the lexicon and their actual uses in the sentences of living speech.

Lecture V

NOTIONAL PARTS OF SPEECH

1. How is the classification of words existing in English?
2. What does it mean ---notional part of speech?
3. How is the classification of words according to meaning?
4. To what characteristic features words are grouped as a part of speech?

The noun as a part of speech has the categorial meaning of "substance" or "thingness". It follows from this that the noun is the main nominative part of speech, effecting nomination of the fullest value within the framework of the notional division of the lexicon.

The noun has the power, by way of nomination, to isolate different properties of substances (i.e. direct and oblique qualities, and also actions and states as processual characteristics of substantive phenomena) and present them as corresponding self-dependent substances. *E.g.:*

Her words were unexpectedly *bitter*.— We were struck by the unexpected *bitterness* of her words. At that time he was *down* in his career, but we knew well that very soon he would be *up* again.— His career had its *ups* and *downs*. The cable arrived when John was *preoccupied* with the arrangements for the party.— The arrival of the cable interrupted his *preoccupation* with the arrangements for the party.

This natural and practically unlimited substantivisation force establishes the noun as the central nominative lexemic unit of language.

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

The most characteristic substantive function of the noun is that of the subject in the sentence, since the referent of the subject is the person or thing immediately named. The function of the object in the sentence is also typical of the noun as the substance word. Other syntactic functions, i.e. attributive, adverbial, and even predicative, although performed by the noun with equal ease, are not immediately characteristic of its substantive quality as such. It should be noted that, while performing these non-substantive functions, the noun essentially differs from the other parts of speech used in similar sentence positions.

Apart from the cited sentence-part functions, the noun is characterised by some special types of combinability.

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

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

The corresponding compound nouns (formed from substantive stems), as a rule, cannot undergo the isolability test with an equal ease. The transformations with the nounal compounds are in fact reduced to sheer explanations of their etymological motivation. The comparatively closer connection between the stems

in compound nouns is reflected by the spelling (contact or hyphenated presentation). *E.g.*: fireplace → place where fire is made; starlight → light coming from stars; story-teller → teller (writer, composer) of stories; theatre-goer → a person who goes to (frequents) theatres.

As a part of speech, the noun is also characterised by a set of formal features determining its specific status in the lexical paradigm of nomination. It has its word-building distinctions, including typical suffixes, compound stem models, conversion patterns. It discriminates the grammatical categories of gender, number, case, article determination, which will be analysed below.

The cited formal features taken together are relevant for the division of nouns into several subclasses, which are identified by means of explicit classificational criteria. The most general and rigorously delimited subclasses of nouns are grouped into four oppositional pairs.

The first nounal subclass opposition differentiates *proper* and *common* nouns. The foundation of this division is "type of nomination". The second subclass opposition differentiates *animate* and *inanimate* nouns on the basis of "form of existence". The third subclass opposition differentiates *human* and *non-human* nouns on the basis of "personal quality". The fourth subclass opposition differentiates *countable* and *uncountable* nouns on the basis of "quantitative structure".

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

There is a peculiarly regular contradiction between the presentation of gender in English by theoretical treatises and practical manuals. Whereas theoretical treatises define the gender subcategorisation of English nouns as purely lexical or "semantic", practical manuals of English grammar do invariably include the description of the English gender in their subject matter of immediate instruction.

In particular, a whole ten pages of A. I. Smirnitsky's theoretical "Morphology of English" are devoted to proving the non-existence of gender in English either in the grammatical, or even in the strictly lexico-grammatical sense

That the gender division of nouns in English is expressed not as variable forms of words, but as nounal classification (which is not in the least different from the expression of substantive gender in other languages, including Russian), admits of no argument. However, the question remains, whether this classification has any serious grammatical relevance. Closer observation of the corresponding lingual data cannot but show that the English gender does have such a relevance.

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

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

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

As a result of the double oppositional correlation, a specific system of three genders arises, which is somewhat misleadingly represented by the traditional terminology: the *neuter* (i.e. non-person) gender, the *masculine* (i.e. masculine person) gender, the *feminine* (i.e. feminine person) gender.

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

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

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

On the surface of semantic relations, the meaning of the singular will be understood as simply "one", as opposed to the meaning of the plural as "many" in the sense of "more than one".

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

This category is expressed in English by the opposition of the form in *-s* [-z, -s, -iz], usually called the "possessive" case, or more traditionally, the "genitive" case (to which term we will stick in the following presentation*), to the unfeatured form of the noun, usually called the "common" case. The apostrophised *-s* serves to distinguish in writing the singular noun in the genitive case from the plural noun in the common case. One of the notional parts of speech is the verb

Grammatically the verb is the most complex part of speech. This is due to the central role it performs in the expression of the predicative functions of the sentence, i.e. the functions establishing the connection between the situation (situational event) named in the utterance and reality. The complexity of the verb is inherent not only in the intricate structure of its grammatical categories, but also in its various subclass divisions, as well as in its falling into two sets of forms profoundly different from each other: the finite set and the non-finite set. The complicated character of the grammatical and lexico-grammatical structure of the verb has given rise to much dispute and controversy. However, the application of the principles of systemic linguistic analysis to the study of this interesting sphere of language helps

overcome many essential-difficulties in its theoretical description, and also a number of terminological disagreements among the scholars. This refers in particular to the fundamental relations between the categories of tense and aspect, which have aroused of late very heated disputes. The general categorial meaning of the verb is process presented dynamically, i.e. developing in time. This general processual meaning is embedded in the semantics of all the verbs, including those that denote states, forms of existence, types of attitude, evaluations, etc., rather than actions

The finite forms of the verb express the processual relations of substances and phenomena making up the situation reflected in the sentence. These forms are associated with one another in an extremely complex and intricate system. The peculiar aspect of the complexity of this system lies in the fact that, as we have stated before, the finite verb is directly connected with the structure of the sentence as a whole. Indeed, the finite verb, through the working of its categories, is immediately related to such sentence-constitutive factors as morphological forms of predication, communication purposes, subjective modality, subject-object relation, gradation of probabilities, and quite a few other factors of no lesser importance..

As a matter of fact, it is the verb system that, of all the spheres of morphology, has come under the most intensive and fruitful analysis undertaken by contemporary linguistics. In the course of these studies the oppositional nature of the categorial structure of the verb was disclosed and explicitly formulated; the paradigmatic system of the expression of verbal functional semantics was described competently, though in varying technical terms, and the correlation of form and meaning in the composition of functionally relevant parts of this system was demonstrated explicitly on the copious material gathered.

Theoretical discussions have not ceased, nor subsided. On the contrary, they continue and develop, though on an ever more solid scientific foundation; and the cumulative descriptions of the English verb provide now an integral picture of its nature which the grammatical theory has never possessed before. Indeed, it is due to this advanced types of study that the structural and semantic patterning of verbal constructions successfully applied to teaching practices on all the stages of tuition has achieved so wide a scope.

The categorial spheres to be considered in this book are known from every topical description of English grammar. They include the systems of expressing verbal person, number, time, aspect, voice, and mood. But the identification and the distribution of the actual grammatical categories of the verb recognised in our survey will not necessarily coincide with the given enumeration, which will be exposed and defended with the presentation of each particular category that is to come under study.

The categories of person and number are closely connected with each other. Their immediate connection is conditioned by the two factors: first, by their situational semantics, referring the process denoted by the verb to the situation, i.e. to its central substance (which exists in inseparable unity of "quality" reflected in the personal denotation, and "quantity" reflected in the numerical denotation); second, by their direct and immediate relation to the syntactic unit expressing the subject as the functional part of the sentence.

Both categories are different in principle from the other categories of the finite verb, in so far as they do not convey any inherently "verbal" semantics, any constituents of meaning realised and confined strictly within the boundaries of the verbal lexeme. The nature of both of them is purely "reflective"

The verbal category of voice shows the direction of the process as regards the participants of the situation reflected in the syntactic construction.

The voice of the English verb is expressed by the opposition of the passive form of the verb to the active form of the verb. The sign marking the passive form is the combination of the auxiliary *be* with the past participle of the conjugated verb (in symbolic notation: *be ... en* —

The category of mood, undoubtedly, is the most controversial category of the verb. On the face of it, the principles of its analysis, the nomenclature, the relation to other categories, in particular, to tenses, all this has received and is receiving different presentations and appraisals with different authors.

The adjective expresses the categorial semantics of property of a substance. It means that each adjective used in the text presupposes relation to some noun the property of whose referent it denotes, such as its material, colour, dimensions, position, state, and other characteristics both permanent and temporary. It follows from this that, unlike nouns, adjectives do not possess a full nominative value. Indeed, words like *long*, *hospitable*, *fragrant* cannot effect any self-dependent nominations; as units of informative sequences they exist only in collocations showing what is long, who is hospitable, what is fragrant.

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

On the other hand, if the adjective is placed in a nominatively self-dependent position, this leads to its substantivisation. *E.g.*: Outside it was a beautiful day, and the sun tinged the snow with *red*. *Cf.*: The sun tinged the snow with the *red colour*.

Adjectives are distinguished by a specific combinability with nouns, which they modify, if not accompanied by adjuncts, usually in pre-position, and occasionally in postposition; by a combinability with link-verbs, both functional and notional; by a combinability with modifying adverbs.

In the sentence the adjective performs the functions of an attribute and a predicative. Of the two, the more specific function of the adjective is that of an attribute, since the function of a predicative can be performed by the noun as well. There is, though, a profound difference between the predicative uses of the adjective and the noun which is determined by their native categorial features

To the derivational features of adjectives, belong a number of suffixes and prefixes of which the most important are: *-ful* (hopeful), *-less* (flawless), *-ish* (bluish), *-ous* (famous), *-ive* (decorative), *-ic* (basic); *un-* (unprecedented), *in-* (inaccurate), *pre-* (premature). Among the adjectival affixes should also be named the prefix *a-*, constitutive for the stative subclass which is to be discussed below.

As for the variable (demutative) morphological features, the English adjective, having lost in the course of the history of English all its forms of grammatical agreement with the noun, is distinguished only by the hybrid category of comparison, which will form a special subject of our study.

All the adjectives are traditionally divided into two large subclasses:

qualitative and relative.

Relative adjectives express such properties of a substance as are determined by the direct relation of the substance to some other substance. *E.g.*: wood — a *wooden* hut; mathematics — *mathematical* precision; history — a *historical* event; table — *tabular* presentation; colour — *coloured* postcards; surgery — *surgical* treatment; the Middle Ages — *mediaeval* rites.

The nature of this "relationship" in adjectives is best revealed by definitional correlations. *Cf.*: a *wooden* hut — a hut made of wood; a *historical* event — an event referring to a certain period of history; *surgical* treatment — treatment consisting in the implementation of surgery; etc.

Qualitative adjectives, as different from relative ones, denote various qualities of substances which admit of a quantitative estimation, i.e. of establishing their correlative quantitative measure. The measure of a quality can be estimated as high or low, adequate or inadequate, sufficient or insufficient, optimal or excessive. *Cf.*: an *awkward* situation — a *very awkward* situation; a *difficult* task — *too difficult* a task; an *enthusiastic* reception — *rather* an *enthusiastic* reception; a *hearty* welcome — *not a very hearty* welcome; etc.

In this connection, the ability of an adjective to form degrees of comparison is usually taken as a formal sign of its qualitative character, in opposition to a relative adjective which is understood as incapable of forming degrees of comparison by definition

The adverb is usually defined as a word expressing either property of an action, or property of another property, or circumstances in which an action occurs. This definition, though certainly informative and instructive, fails to directly point out the relation between the adverb and the adjective as the primary qualifying part of speech.

The adverb denotes various circumstantial characteristics of processes or whole situations built around processes. The above definition, approaching the adverb as a word of the secondary qualifying order, presents the entire class of adverbial words as the least self-dependent of all the four notional parts of speech. Indeed, as has been repeatedly pointed out, the truly complete nominative value is inherent only in the noun, which is the name of substances. The verb comes next in its self-dependent nominative force, expressing processes as dynamic relations of substances, i.e. their dynamic relational properties in the broad sense. After that follow qualifying parts of speech —• first the adjective denoting qualifications of substances, and then the adverb denoting qualifications of non-substantive phenomena which find themselves within the range of notional signification.

As we see, the adverb is characterised by its own, specific nominative value, providing for its inalienable status in the system of the parts of speech.

In accord with their categorial meaning, adverbs are characterised by a combinability with verbs, adjectives and words of adverbial nature. The functions of adverbs in these combinations consist in expressing different adverbial modifiers.

In accord with their word-building structure adverbs may be *simple* and *derived*.

Simple adverbs are rather few, and nearly all of them display functional semantics, mostly of pronominal character: *here, there, now, then, so, quite, why,*

how, where, when.

The typical adverbial affixes in affixal derivation are, first and foremost, the basic and only productive adverbial suffix *-ly* (*slowly, tiredly, rightly, firstly*), and then a couple of others of limited distribution, such as *-ways* (*sideways, crossways*), *-wise* (*clockwise*), *-ward(s)* (*homewards, seawards, afterwards*). The characteristic adverbial prefix is *a-* (*away, ahead, apart, across*).

Among the adverbs there are also peculiar composite formations and phrasal formations of prepositional, conjunctive and other types: *sometimes, nowhere, anyhow; at least, at most, at last; to and fro; upside down*; etc.

Adverbs are commonly divided into qualitative, quantitative and circumstantial.

By qualitative such adverbs are meant as express immediate, inherently non-graded qualities of actions and other qualities. The typical adverbs of this kind are qualitative adverbs in *-ly*. E. g.:

The little boy was crying *bitterly* over his broken toy. The *plainly* embarrassed Department of Industry confirmed the fact of the controversial deal.

The adverbs interpreted as "quantitative" include words of degree. These are specific lexical units of semi-functional nature expressing quality measure, or gradational evaluation of qualities. They may be subdivided into several very clearly pronounced sets.

Thus, we will agree that the first general subclass of **adverbs is formed by qualitative adverbs which are subdivided into qualitative adverbs of full notional value and degree adverbs — specific functional words.**

Circumstantial adverbs are also divided into notional and functional.

The functional circumstantial adverbs are words of pronominal nature. Besides quantitative (numerical) adverbs mentioned above, they include adverbs of time, place, manner, cause, consequence. Many of these words are used as syntactic connectives and question-forming functionals. Here belong such words as *now, here, when, where, so, thus, how, why*, etc.

As for circumstantial adverbs of more self-dependent nature, they include two basic sets: first, adverbs of time; second, adverbs of place: *today, tomorrow, already, ever, never, shortly, recently, seldom, early, late; homeward, eastward, near, far, outside, ashore*, etc. Thus, the whole class of adverbs will be divided, first, into nominal and pronominal, and the nominal adverbs will be subdivided into qualitative and orientative, the former including genuine qualitative adverbs and degree adverbs, the latter falling into temporal and local adverbs, with further possible subdivisions of more detailed specifications.

Among the various types of adverbs, those formed from adjectives by means of the suffix *-ly* occupy the most representative place and pose a special problem.

The problem is introduced by the very regularity of their derivation, the rule of which can be formulated quite simply: each qualitative adjective has a parallel adverb in *-ly*.

The strong point of the adjectival interpretation of qualitative adverbs in *-ly* is the demonstration of the actual similarity between the two lexemic sets in their broader evaluative function, which fact provides for the near-identity of the adjectival and adverbial grammatical categories of comparison. On the whole,

however, the theory in question is hardly acceptable for the mere reason that derivative relations in general are not at all relations of lexico-grammatical identity; for that matter, they are rather relations of non-identity, since they actually constitute a system of production of one type of lexical units from another type of lexical units. As for the types of units belonging to the same or different lexemic classes, this is a question of their actual status in the system of lexicon, i. e. in the lexemic paradigm of nomination reflecting the fundamental correlations between the lexemic sets of

LECTURE VI

MORPHOLOGY, ITS INTERFACES WITH THE SYNTAX

1. Does the predicative connection of words, uniting the subject and the predicate, build up the basis of the sentence?
2. Combinations of a notional word with a functional word are equivalent to separate words by their nominative function, are they?
3. What member of the sentence unconditionally dominates over the predicate by its specific substantive categories in both agreed, and non-agreed forms of predicative connection?
4. Which connection unites a substance with its attribute expressed by an adjective or a noun?

Performing their semantic functions, words in an utterance form various syntagmatic connections with one another. One should distinguish between syntagmatic groupings of notional words alone, syntagmatic groupings of notional words with functional words, and syntagmatic groupings of functional words alone. Different combinations of notional words (notional phrases) have a clearly pronounced self-dependent nominative destination, they denote complex phenomena and their properties in their inter-connections, including dynamic interconnections (semi-predicative combinations). *Cf.*: a sudden trembling; a soul in pain; hurrying along the stream; to lead to a cross-road; strangely familiar; so sure of their aims. Combinations of a notional word with a functional word are equivalent to separate words by their nominative function. Since a functional word expresses some abstract relation, such combinations, as a rule, are quite obviously non-self-dependent; they are, as it were, stamped as artificially isolated from the context. *Cf.*: in a low voice; with difficulty; must finish; but a moment; and Jimmy; too cold; so unexpectedly.

We call these combinations "formative" ones. Their contextual dependence ("synsemantism") is quite natural; functionally they may be compared to separate notional words used in various marked grammatical forms (such as, for instance, indirect cases of nouns). *Cf.*: *Eng.* Mr. Snow's — of Mr. Snow; him — to him; *Russ.* ИВАНОВ — к ИВАНОВУ; лесом — через лес.

Expanding the cited formative phrases with the corresponding notional words one can obtain notional phrases of contextually self-dependent value ("autosemantic" on their level of functioning). *Cf.*: *Eng.* Mr. Snow's considerations — the considerations of Mr. Snow; gave it him — gave it to him; *Russ.* позвонили ИВАНОВУ — позвонили к ИВАНОВУ; шли лесом — шли через лес.

In this connection we should remember that among the notional word-classes only the noun has a full nominative force, for it directly names a substance. Similarly, we may assert that among various phrase-types it is the noun-phrase that has a full phrasal nominative force (see further).

As for syntagmatic groupings of functional words, they are essentially analogous to separate functional words and are used as connectors and specifiers of notional elements of various status. *Cf.*: from out of; up to; so that; such as; must be able; don't let's.

Functional phrases of such and like character constitute limited groups supplementing the corresponding subsets of regular one-item functional words, as different from notional phrases which, as free combinations, form essentially open subsets of various semantic destinations.

Groupings of notional words fall into two mutually opposite types by their grammatical and semantic properties.

Groupings of the first type are constituted by words related to one another on an equal rank, so that, for a case of a two-word combination, neither of them serves as a modifier of the other. Depending on this feature, these combinations can be called "equipotent".

Groupings of the second type are formed by words which are syntactically unequal in the sense that, for a case of a two-word combination, one of them plays the role of a modifier of the other. Due to this feature, combinations of the latter type can be called "dominational".

Equipotent connection in groupings of notional words is realised either with the help of conjunctions (syndetically), or without the help of conjunctions (asyndetically). *Cf.*: prose and poetry; came and went; on the beach or in the water; quick but not careless; — no sun, no moon; playing, chatting, laughing; silent, immovable, gloomy; Mary's, not John's.

In the cited examples, the constituents of the combinations form logically consecutive connections that are classed as coordinative. Alongside of these, there exist equipotent connections of a non-consecutive type, by which a sequential element, although equal to the foregoing element by its formal introduction (coordinative conjunction), is unequal to it as to the character of nomination. The latter type of equipotent connections is classed as "cumulative".

The term "cumulation" is commonly used to mean connections between separate sentences. By way of restrictive indications, we may speak about "inner cumulation", i. e. cumulation within the sentence, and, respectively, "outer cumulation".

Cumulative connection in writing is usually signalled by some intermediary punctuation stop, such as a comma or a hyphen.

Syndetic connection in a word-combination can alternate with asyndetic connection, as a result of which the whole combination can undergo a semantically motivated sub-grouping. *Cf.*: He is a little man *with irregular features, soft dark eyes and a soft voice, very shy, with a gift of mimicry and a love of music* (S. Maugham).

In enumerative combinations the last element, in distinction to the foregoing elements, can be introduced by a conjunction, which underlines the close of the syntagmatic series. *Cf.*: All about them happy persons were enjoying the good things of life, talking, laughing, *and* making merry (S. Maugham).

The same is true about combinations formed by repetition. *E. g.*: There were rows of books, books *and* books everywhere. Dominational connection, as different from equipotent connection, is effected in such a way that one of the constituents of the combination is principal (dominating) and the other is subordinate (dominated). The principal element is commonly called the "kernel", "kernel element", or "headword"; the subordinate element, respectively, the "adjunct", "adjunct-word", "expansion".

Dominational connection is achieved by different forms of the word (categorical

agreement, government), connective words (prepositions, i. e. prepositional government), word-order.

Dominational connection, like equipotent connection, can be both consecutive and cumulative. *Cf.*: a careful observer an observer, seemingly careful; definitely out of the

point — — out of the point, definitely; will be helpful in any case will be helpful — at least, in some cases.

The two basic types of dominational connection are bilateral (reciprocal, two-way) domination and monolateral (one-way) domination. Bilateral domination is realised in predicative connection of words, while monolateral domination is realised in completive connection of words. The predicative connection of words, uniting the subject and the predicate, builds up the basis of the sentence. The reciprocal nature of this connection consists in the fact that the subject dominates the predicate determining the person of predication, while the predicate dominates the subject, determining the event of predication, i. e. ascribing to the predicative person some action, or state, or quality. This difference in meaning between the elements of predication, underlying the mutually opposite directions of domination, explains the seeming paradox of the notion of reciprocal domination, exposing its dialectic essence. Both directions of domination in a predicative group can be demonstrated by a formal test.

The domination of the subject over the predicate is exposed by the reflective character of the verbal category of person and also the verbal category of number which is closely connected with the former.

The English grammatical forms of explicit subject-verb agreement (concord) are very scarce (the inflexion marking the Third person singular present, and some special forms of the verb *be*). Still, these scarce forms are dynamically correlated with the other, grammatically non-agreed forms. *Cf.*: he went — he goes I went — I go.

But apart from the grammatical forms of agreement, the predicative person is directly reflected upon the verb-predicate as such; the very semantics of the person determines the subject reference of the predicative event (action, state, quality). Thus, the subject unconditionally dominates over the predicate by its specific substantive categories in both agreed, and non-agreed forms of predicative connection.

As for the predicate dominating the subject in its own sphere of grammatical functions, this fact is clearly demonstrated by the correlation of the sentence and the corresponding noun-phrase. Namely, the transformation of the sentence into the noun-phrase places the predicate in the position of the head-word, and the subject, in the position of the adjunct. *Cf.*: The train arrived. → The arrival of the train.

Alongside of fully predicative groupings of the subject and the finite verb-predicate, there exist in language partially predicative groupings formed by a combination of a non-finite verbal form (verbid) with a substantive element. Such are infinitival, gerundial, and participial constructions.

The predicative person is expressed in the infinitival construction by the prepositional *for*-phrase, in the gerundial construction by the possessive or objective form of the substantive, in the participial construction by the nominative (common) form of the substantive. *Cf.*: *The pupil* understands his mistake —» *for the pupil* to

understand his mistake —» *the pupil('s)* understanding his mistake — *the pupil* understanding his mistake.

In the cited semi-predicative (or potentially-predicative) combinations the "event"-expressing element is devoid of the formal agreement with the "person"-expressing element, but the two directions of domination remain valid by virtue of the very predicative nature of the syntactic connection in question (although presented in an incomplete form).

Thus, among the syntagmatic connections of the reciprocal domination the two basic subtypes are distinguished: first, complete predicative connections, second, incomplete predicative connections

All the completive connections fall into two main divisions: objective connections and qualifying connections.

Objective connections reflect the relation of the object to the process and are characterised as, on the whole, very close. By their form these connections are subdivided into non-prepositional (word-order, the objective form of the adjunct substantive) and prepositional, while from the semantico-syntactic point of view they are classed as direct (the immediate transition of the action to the object) and indirect or oblique (the indirect relation of the object to the process). Direct objective connections are non-prepositional, the preposition serving as an intermediary of combining words by its functional nature. Indirect objective connections may be both prepositional and non-prepositional. Since, on the other hand, some prepositional objective connections, in spite of their being indirect, still come very near to direct ones in terms of closeness of the process-substance relation expressed, all the objective connections may be divided into "narrow" and "broader". Semantically, narrow prepositional objective connections are then to be classed together with direct objective connections, the two types forming the corresponding subclasses of non-prepositional (direct) and prepositional (indirect) narrow objective connections of words.

Further subdivision of objective connections is realised on the basis of subcategorising the elements of objective combinations, and first of all the verbs; thus, we recognise objects of immediate action, of perception, of speaking, etc.

Objective connection may also combine an adjunct substance word with a kernel word of non-verbal semantics (such as a state or a property word), but the meaning of some processual relation is still implied in the deep semantic base of such combinations all the same. *Cf.:* *aware* of John's presence → *am aware*; *crazy* about her → *got crazy* about her; *full* of spite → *is full* of spite; etc.

Qualifying completive connections are divided into attributive and adverbial. Both are expressed in English by word-order and prepositions.

Attributive connection unites a substance with its attribute expressed by an adjective or a noun..

Adverbial connection is subdivided into primary and secondary.

The primary adverbial connection is established between the verb and its adverbial modifiers of various standings. The secondary adverbial connection is established between the non-verbal kernel expressing a quality and its adverbial modifiers of various standings. *E.g.:* *marvellously* becoming; *very much* at ease; *strikingly* alike; *no longer* oppressive; *unpleasantly* querulous; etc.

Different completive noun combinations are distinguished by a feature that

makes them into quite special units on the phrasemic level of language. Namely, in distinction to all the other combinations' of words they are directly related to whole sentences, i. e. predicative combinations of words. This fact was illustrated above when we described the verbal domination over the subject in a predicative grouping of words

LECTURE VII

SYNTAGMATIC CONNECTIONS OF WORDS .

1. What is the main object of syntax as part of the grammatical theory?
2. Is the word a component element of the word-stock and as such is a nominative unit of language, the sentence, linguistically, is a predicative utterance-unit?
3. How intonation separates one sentence from another in the continual flow of uttered segments and, together with various segmental means of expression?

The sentence is the immediate integral unit of speech built up of words according to a definite syntactic pattern and distinguished by a contextually relevant communicative purpose. Any coherent connection of words having an informative destination is effected within the framework of the sentence. Therefore the sentence is the main object of syntax as part of the grammatical theory.

The sentence, being composed of words, may in certain cases include only one word of various lexico-grammatical standing. *Cf.*: Night. Congratulations. Away! Why? Certainly.

The actual existence of one-word sentences, however, does not contradict the general idea of the sentence as a special syntactic combination of words, the same as the notion of one-element set in mathematics does not contradict the general idea of the set as a combination of certain elements. Moreover, this fact cannot lead even to the inference that under some circumstances the sentence and the word may wholly coincide: a word-sentence as a unit of the text is radically different from a word-lexeme as a unit of lexicon, the differentiation being inherent in the respective places occupied by the sentence and the word in the hierarchy of language levels. While the word is a component element of the word-stock and as such is a nominative unit of language, the sentence, linguistically, is a predicative utterance-unit. It means that the sentence not only names some referents with the help of its word-constituents, but also, first, presents these referents as making up a certain situation, or, more specifically, a situational event, and second, reflects the connection between the nominal denotation of the event on the one hand, and objective reality on the other, showing the time of the event, its being real or unreal, desirable or undesirable, necessary or unnecessary.

Thus, even one uninflected word making up a sentence is thereby turned into an utterance-unit expressing the said semantic complex through its concrete contextual and consituational connections. By way of example, compare the different connections of the word-sentence "night" in the following passages:

1) Night. Night and the boundless sea, under the eternal star-eyes shining with promise. Was it a dream of freedom coining true? 2) Night? Oh no. No night for me until I have worked through the case. 3) Night. It pays all the day's debts. No cause for worry now, I tell you.

Whereas the utterance "night" in the first of the given passages refers the event to the plane of reminiscences, the "night" of the second passage presents a question

in argument connected with the situation wherein the interlocutors are immediately involved, while the latter passage features its "night" in the form of a proposition of reason in the flow of admonitions.

It follows from this that there is another difference between the sentence and the word. Namely, unlike the word, the sentence does not exist in the system of language as a ready-made unit; with the exception of a limited number of utterances of phraseological citation, it is created by the speaker in the course of communication. Stressing this fact, linguists point out that the sentence, as different from the word, is not a unit of language proper; it is a chunk of text built up as a result of speech-making process, out of different units of language, first of all words, which are immediate means for making up contextually bound sentences, i. e. complete units of speech.

It should be noted that this approach to the sentence, very consistently exposed in the works of the prominent Soviet scholar A. I. Smirnitsky, corresponds to the spirit of traditional grammar from the early epoch of its development. Traditional grammar has never regarded the sentence as part of the system of means of expression; it has always interpreted the sentence not as an implement for constructing speech, but as speech itself, i. e. a portion of coherent flow of words of one speaker containing a complete thought.

Being a unit of speech, the sentence is intonationally delimited. Intonation separates one sentence from another in the continual flow of uttered segments and, together with various segmental means of expression, participates in rendering essential communicative-predicative meanings (such as, for instance, the syntactic meaning of interrogation in distinction to the meaning of declaration). The role of intonation as a delimiting factor is especially important for sentences which have more than one predicative centre, in particular more than one finite verb. Cf.:

1) The class *was over*, the noisy children *fitted* the corridors. 2) The class *was over*. The noisy children *filled* the corridors.

Special intonation contours, including pauses, represent the given speech sequence in the first case as one compound sentence, in the second case as two different sentences (though, certainly, connected both logically and syntactically).

On the other hand, as we have stated elsewhere, the system of language proper taken separately, and the immediate functioning of this system in the process of intercourse, i.e. speech proper, present an actual unity and should be looked upon as the two sides of one dialectically complicated substance — the human language in the broad sense of the term. Within the framework of this unity the sentence itself, as a unit of communication, also presents the two different sides, inseparably connected with each other. Namely, within each sentence as an immediate speech element of the communication process, definite standard syntactic-semantic features are revealed which make up a typical model, a generalised pattern repeated in an indefinite number of actual utterances.

Thus, the sentence is characterised by its specific category of predication which establishes the relation of the named phenomena to actual life. The general semantic category of modality is also defined by linguists as exposing the connection between the named objects and surrounding reality. However, modality, as different from predication, is not specifically confined to the sentence; this is a broader category revealed both in the grammatical elements of language and its

lexical, purely nominative elements. In this sense, every word expressing a definite correlation between the named substance and objective reality should be recognised as modal. Here belong such lexemes of full notional standing as "probability", "desirability", "necessity" and the like, together with all the derivationally relevant words making up the corresponding series of the lexical paradigm of nomination; here belong semi-functional words and phrases of probability and existential evaluation, such as *perhaps, may be, by all means*, etc.; here belong further, word-particles of specifying modal semantics, such as *just, even, would-be*, etc.; here belong, finally, modal verbs expressing a broad range of modal meanings which are actually turned into elements of predicative semantics in concrete, contextually-bound utterances.

As for predication proper, it embodies not any kind of modality, but only syntactic modality as the fundamental distinguishing feature of the sentence. It is the feature of predication, fully and explicitly expressed by a contextually relevant grammatical complex, that identifies the sentence in distinction to any other combination of words having a situational referent.

The centre of predication in a sentence of verbal type (which is the predominant type of sentence-structure in English) is a finite verb. The finite verb expresses essential predicative meanings by its categorial forms, first of all, the categories of tense and mood (the category of person, as we have seen before, reflects the corresponding category of the subject). However, proceeding from the principles of sentence analysis worked out in the Russian school of theoretical syntax, in particular, in the classical treatises of V.V. Vinogradov, we insist that predication is effected not only by the forms of the finite verb connecting it with the subject, but also by all the other forms and elements of the sentence establishing the connection between the named objects and reality, including such means of expression as intonation, word order, different functional words. Besides the purely verbal categories, in the predicative semantics are included such syntactic sentence meanings as purposes of communication (declaration — interrogation — inducement), modal probability, affirmation and negation, and others, which, taken together, provide for the sentence to be identified on its own, proposemic level of lingual hierarchy.

From what has been said about the category of predication, we see quite clearly that the general semantic content of the sentence is not at all reduced to predicative meanings only. Indeed, in order to establish the connection between some substance and reality, it is first necessary to name the substance itself. This latter task is effected in the sentence with the help of its nominative means. **Hence, the sentence as a lingual unit performs not one, but two essential signemic (meaningful) functions: first, substance-naming, or nominative function; second, reality-evaluating, or predicative function.**

The terminological definition of the sentence as a predicative unit gives prominence to the main feature distinguishing the sentence from the word among the meaningful lingual units (signemes). However, since every predication is effected upon a certain nomination as its material semantic base, we gain a more profound insight into the difference between the sentence and the word by pointing out the two-aspective meaningful nature of the sentence. The semantics of the sentence presents a unity of its nominative and predicative aspects, while the

semantics of the word, in this sense, is monoaspective.

On the other hand, we must also note a profound difference between the nominative function of the sentence and the nominative function of the word. The nominative meaning of the syntagmatically complete average sentence (an ordinary proposemic nomination) reflects a processual situation or event that includes a certain process (actional or statal) as its dynamic centre, the agent of the process, the objects of the process, and also the various conditions and circumstances of the realisation of the process. This content of the proposemic event, as is known from school grammar, forms the basis of the traditional syntactic division of the sentence into its functional parts. In other words, the identification of traditional syntactic parts of the sentence is nothing else than the nominative division of the sentence.

Cf.:

The pilot was steering the ship out of the harbour.

The old pilot was carefully steering the heavily loaded ship through the narrow straits out of the harbour.

As is easily seen, no separate word, be it composed of so many stems, can express the described situation-nominative semantics of the proposition. Even hyperbolically complicated artificial words such as are sometimes coined for various expressive purposes by authors of fiction cannot have means of organising their root components analogous to the means of arranging the nominative elements of the sentence.

Quite different in this respect is a nominal phrase — a compound signemic unit made up of words and denoting a complex phenomenon of reality analysable into its component elements together with various relations between them. Comparative observations of predicative and non-predicative combinations of words have unmistakably shown that among the latter there are quite definite constructions which are actually capable of realising nominations of proposemic situations. These are word-combinations of full nominative value represented by expanded substantive phrases. It is these combinations that, by their nominative potential, directly correspond to sentences expressing typical proposemic situations.

In other words, between the sentence and the substantive word-combination of the said full nominative type, direct transformational relations are established: the sentence, interpreted as an element of paradigmatics, is transformed into the substantive phrase, or "nominalised", losing its processual-predicative character. Thus, syntactic nominalisation, while depriving the sentence of its predicative aspect preserves its nominative aspect intact.

The identification of nominative aspect of the sentence effected on the lines of studying the paradigmatic relations in syntax makes it possible to define more accurately the very notion of predication as the specific function of the sentence.

The functional essence of predication has hitherto been understood in linguistics as the expression of the relation of the utterance (sentence) to reality, or, in more explicit presentation, as the expression of the relation between the content of the sentence and reality.

The essential principles of this interpretation of predication can be expressed even without the term "predication" as such. The latter approach to the exposition of the predicative meaning of the sentence can be seen, for instance, in the course of English grammar by M. A. Ganshina and N. M. Vasilevskaya, who write: "**Every**

sentence shows the relation of the statement to reality from the point of view of the speaker.

Taking into consideration the two-aspective character of the sentence as a signemic unit of language, predication should now be interpreted not simply as referring the content of the sentence to reality, but as referring the nominative content of the sentence to reality. It is this interpretation of the semantic-functional nature of predication that discloses, in one and the same generalised presentation, both the unity of the two identified aspects of the sentence, and also their different, though mutually complementary meaningful roles.

LECTURE VIII

SYNTAX , ITS BASIC UNIT-- THE SENTENCE.

1. What expresses the starting point of the communication, i.e. it denotes an object or a phenomenon about which something is reported?
2. What expresses the basic informative part of the communication, its contextually relevant centre
3. Where does the actual division of the sentence find its full expression ?
4. Is it sometimes referred to as the "contextual" division of the sentence ?

The notional parts of the sentence referring to the basic elements of the reflected situation form, taken together, the nominative meaning of the sentence. For the sake of terminological consistency, the division of the sentence into notional parts can be just so called — the "nominative division" (its existing names are the "grammatical division" and the "syntactic division"). The discrimination of the nominative division of the sentence is traditional; it is this type of division that can conveniently be shown by a syntagmatic model, in particular, by a model of immediate constituents based on the traditional syntactic analysis .

Alongside of the nominative division of the sentence, the idea of the so-called "actual division" of the sentence has been put forward in theoretical linguistics. The purpose of the actual division of the sentence, called also the "functional sentence perspective", is to reveal the correlative significance of the sentence parts from the point of view of their actual informative role in an utterance, i.e. from the point of view of the immediate semantic contribution they make to the total information conveyed by the sentence in the context of connected speech. In other words, the actual division of the sentence in fact exposes its informative perspective.

The main components of the actual division of the sentence are the *theme* and the *rheme*(*the part of a clause that gives information about the theme*). The theme expresses the starting point of the communication, i.e. it denotes an object or a phenomenon about which something is reported. The rheme expresses the basic informative part of the communication, its contextually relevant centre. Between the theme and the rheme are positioned intermediary, transitional parts of the actual division of various degrees of informative value (these parts are sometimes called "transition").

The theme of the actual division of the sentence may or may not coincide with the subject of the sentence. The rheme of the actual division, in its turn, may or may not coincide with the predicate of the sentence — either with the whole predicate

group or its part, such as the predicative, the object, the adverbial.

Historically the theory of **actual division of the sentence is connected with the logical analysis of the proposition**. The principal parts of the proposition, as is known, are the logical subject and the logical predicate. These, like the theme and the rheme, may or may not coincide, respectively, with the subject and the predicate of the sentence. The logical categories of subject and predicate are prototypes of the linguistic categories of theme and rheme. However, if logic analyses its categories of subject and predicate as the meaningful components of certain forms of thinking, linguistics analyses the categories of theme and rheme as the corresponding means of expression used by the speaker for the sake of rendering the informative content of his communications.

The actual division of the sentence finds its full expression only in a concrete context of speech, therefore it is sometimes referred to as the "contextual" division of the sentence. The close connection of the actual division of the sentence with the context in the conditions of which it is possible to divide the informative parts of the communication

One will agree that the actual division of the sentence will really lose all connection with syntax if its components are to be identified solely on the principle of their being "known" or "unknown" to the listener. However, we must bear in mind that the informative value of developing speech consists not only in introducing new words that denote things and phenomena not mentioned before; the informative value of communications lies also in their disclosing various new relations between the elements of reflected events, though the elements themselves may be quite familiar to the listener. The expression of a certain aspect of these relations, namely, the correlation of the said elements from the point of view of their immediate significance in a given utterance produced as a predicative item of a continual speech, does enter the structural plane of language. This expression becomes part and parcel of the structural system of language by the mere fact that the correlative informative significance of utterance components are rendered by quite definite, generalised and standardised lingual constructions. The functional purpose of such constructions is to reveal the meaningful centre of the utterance (i.e. its rheme) in distinction to the starting point of its content .

These constructions do not present any "absolutely formal", "purely differential" objects of language which are filled with semantic content only in the act of speech communication. On the contrary, they are bilateral signemic units in exactly the same sense as other meaningful constructions of language, i.e. they are distinguished both by their material form and their semantics. It follows from this that the constructional, or immediately systemic side of the phenomenon which is called the "actual division of the sentence" belongs to no other sphere of language than syntax. And the crucial syntactic destination of the whole aspect of the actual division is its rheme-identifying function, since an utterance is produced just for the sake of conveying the meaningful content expressed by its central informative part, i.e. by the rheme.

Among the formal means of expressing the distinction between the theme and the rheme investigators name such structural elements of language as word-order patterns, intonation contours, constructions with introducers, syntactic patterns of contrastive complexes, constructions with articles and other determiners,

constructions with intensifying particles.

them. She had just escaped *something simply awful*. ~* It was something simply awful that she had just escaped. At that moment *Laura* joined them. → It was Laura who joined them at that moment.

Syntactic patterns of contrastive complexes are used to expose the rheme of the utterance in cases when special accuracy of distinction is needed. This is explained by the fact that the actual division as such is always based on some sort of antithesis or "contraposition" (see further), which in an ordinary speech remains implicit (gizli). Thus, a syntactic contrastive complex is employed to make explicative the inner contrast inherent in the actual division by virtue of its functional nature.

Determiners, among them the articles, used as means of forming certain patterns of actual division, divide their functions so that the definite determiners serve as identifiers of the theme while the indefinite determiners serve as identifiers of the rheme. As for intonation as a means of realising the actual division, it might appear that its sphere is relatively limited, being confined to oral speech only. On closer consideration, however, this view of rheme-identifying role of intonation proves inadequate. To appreciate the true status of intonation in the actual division of the sentence, one should abstract oneself from "paper syntax" (description of written texts) and remember that it is phonetical speech, i.e. articulately pronounced utterances that form the basis of human language as a whole. As soon as the phonetical nature of language is duly taken account of, intonation with its accent-patterns presents itself not as a limited, but as a universal and indisputable means of expressing the actual division in all types and varieties of lingual contexts. This universal rheme-identifying function of intonation has been described in treatises on logic, as well as in traditional philological literature, in terms of "logical accent. While recognising the logical accent as a means of effecting the actual division, we must strictly distinguish between the elements immediately placed under the phonetical, "technical" stress, and the sentence segments which are identified as the informative centre of communication in the true sense of the term.

Technically, not only notional, but functional units as well can be phrasally stressed in an utterance, which in modern printed texts is shown by special graphical ways of identification, such as italics, bold type.

However, it would be utterly incorrect to think that in such instances only those word-units are logically, i.e. rhematically, marked out as are stressed phonetically. As a matter of fact, functional elements cannot express any self-dependent nomination; they do not exist by themselves, but make up units of nomination together with the notional elements of utterances whose meanings they specify. Thus, the phrasal phonetical stress, technically making prominent some functional element, thereby identifies as rhematic the corresponding notional part ("knot") of the utterance as a whole. It is such notional parts that are real members of the opposition "theme — rheme", not their functional constituents taken separately. As for the said functional constituents themselves, these only set up specific semantic bases on which the relevant rhematic antitheses are built up.

The actual division, since it is effected upon the already produced nominative sentence base providing for its contextually relevant manifestation, enters the predicative aspect of the sentence. It makes up part of syntactic predication, because it strictly meets the functional purpose of predication as such, which is to relate the

nominative content of the sentence to reality . This predicative role of the actual division shows that its contextual relevance is not reduced to that of a passive, concomitant factor of expression. On the contrary, the actual division is an active means of expressing functional meanings, and, being organically connected with the context, it is not so much context-governed as it is |context-governing: in fact, it does build up concrete contexts out of constructional sentence-models chosen to reflect different situations and events.

One of the most important manifestations of the immediate contextual relevance of the actual division is the regular deletion (ellipsis) of the thematic parts of utterances in dialogue speech. By this syntactic process, the rheme of the utterance or its most informative part (peak of informative perspective) is placed in isolation, thereby being very graphically presented to the listener. Cf.:

"You've got the letters?" — "In *my bag*" (G. W. Target). "How did you receive him?" — "*Coldly*" (J. Galsworthy).

In other words, the thematic reduction of sentences in the context, resulting in a constructional economy of speech, performs an informative function in parallel with the logical accent: it serves to accurately identify the rheme of the utterance.

LECTURE IX

COMMUNICATIVE TYPES OF SENTENCES

1. In accord with the purpose of communication how many cardinal sentence-types have long been recognised in linguistic tradition?
2. What kind of sentence expresses a statement, either affirmative or negative, and as such stands in systemic syntagmatic correlation with the listener's responding signals of attention?
3. What kind of sentence expresses a question, i.e. a request for information wanted by the speaker from the listener?
4. What kind of sentence inducement, either affirmative or negative?

The sentence is a communicative unit, therefore the primary classification of sentences must be based on the communicative principle. This principle is formulated in traditional grammar as the "purpose of communication".

The purpose of communication, by definition, refers to the sentence as a whole, and the structural features connected with the expression of this sentential function belong to the fundamental, constitutive qualities of the sentence as a lingual unit.

In accord with the purpose of communication three cardinal sentence-types have long been recognised in linguistic tradition: first, the *declarative sentence*; second, the *imperative (inducive) sentence*; third, the *interrogative sentence*. These communicative sentence-types stand in strict opposition to one another, and their inner properties of form and meaning are immediately correlated with the corresponding features of the listener's responses.

Thus, the declarative sentence expresses a statement, either affirmative or negative, and as such stands in systemic syntagmatic correlation with the listener's responding signals of attention, of appraisal (including agreement or disagreement), of fellow-feeling.

The imperative sentence expresses inducement, either affirmative or negative. That is, it urges the listener, in the form of request or command, to perform or not to perform a certain action. As such, the imperative sentence is situationally connected with the corresponding "action response" (Ch. Fries), and lingually is systemically correlated with a verbal response showing that the inducement is either complied with, or else rejected. Since the communicative purpose of the imperative sentence is to make the listener act as requested, silence on the part of the latter (when the request is fulfilled), strictly speaking, is also linguistically relevant.

The interrogative sentence expresses a question, i.e. a request for

information wanted by the speaker from the listener. By virtue of this communicative purpose, the interrogative sentence is naturally connected with an answer, forming together with it a question-answer dialogue unity.

Naturally, in the process of actual communication the interrogative communicative purpose, like any other communicative task, may sporadically not be fulfilled. In case it is not fulfilled, the question-answer unity proves to be broken; instead of a needed answer the speaker is faced by silence on the part of the listener, or else he receives the latter's verbal rejection to answer

Evidently, such and like reactions to interrogative sentences are not immediately relevant in terms of environmental syntactic featuring.

An attempt to revise the traditional communicative classification of sentences was made by the American scholar Ch. Fries who classed them, as a deliberate challenge to the "accepted routine", not in accord with the purposes of communication, but according to the responses they elicit .

In Fries's system, as a universal speech unit subjected to communicative analysis was chosen not immediately a sentence, but an utterance unit . The sentence was then defined as a minimum free utterance.

Utterances collected from the tape-recorded corpus of dialogues were first classed into "situation utterances" (eliciting a response), and "response utterances". Situation single free utterances (i.e. sentences) were further divided into three groups:

1) **Utterances that are regularly followed by oral responses only. These are greetings, calls, questions.** *E.g.:*

Hello! Good-bye! See you soon! ... Dad! Say, dear! Colonel Howard! ... Have you got moved in? What are you going to do for the summer? ...

2) **Utterances regularly eliciting action responses. These are requests or commands.** *E.g.:*

Read that again, will you? Oh, wait a minute! Please have him call Operator Six when he comes in! Will you see just exactly what his status is?

3) **Utterances regularly eliciting conventional signals of attention to continuous discourse.** These are statements. *E.g.:*

I've been talking with Mr. D — in the purchasing department about our typewriter. (—Yes?). That order went in March seventh. However it seems that we are about eighth on the list. (— I see). Etc.

Alongside of the described "communicative" utterances, i.e. utterances directed to a definite listener, another, minor type of utterances were recognised as not directed to any listener but, as Ch. Fries puts it, "characteristic of situations such as surprise, sudden pain, disgust, anger, laughter, sorrow" . *E.g.:* Oh, oh! Goodness! My God! Darn! Gosh! Etc.

Such and like interjectional units were classed by Ch. Fries as "noncommunicative" utterances.

Alongside of the three cardinal communicative sentence-types, another type of sentences is recognised in the theory of syntax, namely, the **so-called exclamatory sentence**. In modern linguistics it has been demonstrated that exclamatory sentences do not possess any complete set of qualities that could place them on one and the same level with the three cardinal communicative types of sentences. The property of exclamation should be considered as an accompanying feature which is effected

within the system of the three cardinal communicative types of sentences.* In other words, each of the cardinal communicative sentence types can be represented in the two variants, viz. non-exclamatory and exclamatory.

Imperative sentences, naturally, are characterised by a higher general degree of emotive intensity than the other two cardinal communicative sentence-types. Still, they form analogous pairs, whose constituent units are distinguished from each other by no other feature than the presence or absence of exclamation as such

The communicative properties of sentences can further be exposed in the light of the theory of actual division of the sentence.

The actual division provides for the informative content of the utterance to be expressed with the due gradation of its parts according to the significance of their respective role in the context. But any utterance is formed within the framework of the system of communicative types of sentences. And as soon as we compare the communication-purpose aspect of the utterance with its actual division aspect we shall find that each communicative sentence type is distinguished by its specific actual division features, which are revealed first and foremost in the nature of the rheme as the meaningful nucleus of the utterance.

The strictly declarative sentence immediately expresses a certain proposition.

Thus, the rheme of the imperative utterance expresses the informative nucleus not of an explicit proposition, but of an inducement — a wanted (or unwanted) action together with its referential attending elements (objects, qualities, circumstances).

Due to the communicative nature of the inducement addressed to the listener, its thematic subject is usually zeroed, though it can be represented in the form of direct address.

As far as the strictly interrogative sentence is concerned, its actual division is uniquely different from the actual division of both the declarative and the imperative sentence-types.

The unique quality of the interrogative actual division is determined by the fact that the interrogative sentence, instead of conveying some relatively self-dependent content, expresses an inquiry about information which the speaker does not possess. Therefore the rheme of the interrogative sentence, as the nucleus of the inquiry, is informationally open (gaping); its function consists only in marking the rhematic position in the response sentence and programming the content of its filler in accord with the nature of the inquiry.

Different types of questions present different types of open rhemes.

In the pronominal ("special") question, the nucleus of inquiry is expressed by an interrogative pronoun. The pronoun is immediately connected with the part of the sentence denoting the object or phenomenon about which the inquiry ("condensed" in the pronoun) is made. The gaping pronominal meaning is to be replaced in the answer by the wanted actual information. Thus, the rheme of the answer is the reverse substitute of the interrogative pronoun: the two make up a rhematic unity in the broader question-answer construction. As for the thematic part of the answer, it is already expressed in the question, therefore in common speech it is usually zeroed.

The rheme of non-pronominal questions is quite different from the one described. It is also open, but its openness consists in at least two semantic

suggestions **presented for choice to the listener**. The choice is effected in the response; in other words, the answer closes the suggested alternative according to the interrogative-rhematic program inherent in it. This is clearly seen in the structure of ordinary, explicit alternative questions. *E.g.*: Will you take it away or open it here? (Th. Dreiser)

The superposition of the utterance may be presented as follows: → You in relation to it — will take (it) away, will open (it) here?

The alternative question may have a pronominal introduction, emphasising the open character of its rheme.

Thus, in terms of rhematic reverse substitution, the pronominal question is a question of unlimited substitution choice, while the alternative question is a question of a limited substitution choice, the substitution of the latter kind being, as a rule, expressed implicitly. This can be demonstrated by a transformation applied to the first of the two cited examples of alternative questions.

The non-pronominal question requiring either confirmation or negation ("general" question of *yes-no* response type) is thereby implicitly alternative, though the inquiry inherent in it concerns not the choice between some suggested facts, but the choice between the existence or non-existence of an indicated fact. The implicit alternative question can be made into an explicit one, which as a rule is very emphatic, i.e. stylistically "forced". The negation in the implied alternative part is usually referred to the verb. *Cf.*: → Are they going to stay long, or are they not going to stay long?

The cited relation of this kind of question to interrogative reverse substitution is best demonstrated by the corresponding pronominal transformation: → How long are they going to stay — long (or not long)?

As we see, the essential difference between the two types of alternative questions, the explicit one and the implicit one, remains valid even if the latter is changed into an explicit alternative question. This difference is determined by the difference in the informative composition of the interrogative constructions compared.

In general terms of meaning, the question of the first type should be classed as the alternative question of fact, since a choice between two or more facts is required by it; the question of the second type (the implicit alternative question) should be classed as the alternative question of truth, since it requires the statement of truth or non-truth of the indicated fact. In terms of actual division, the question of the first type should be classed as the polyperspective alternative question (biperspective, triperspective, etc.), because it presents more than one informative perspectives (more than one actual divisions) for the listener's choice; the question of the second type, as opposed to the polyperspective, should be classed as the monoperspective alternative question, because its both varieties (implicit and explicit) express only one informative perspective, which is presented to the listener for the existential *yes-no* appraisal.

The exposition of the fundamental role of actual division in the formation of the communicative sentence types involves, among other things, the unequivocal refutation of recognising by some linguists the would-be "purely exclamatory sentence" that cannot be reduced to any of the three demonstrated cardinal communicative types indeed, by "purely exclamatory sentences" are meant no other

things than interjectional exclamations of ready-made order such as "Great Heavens!", "Good Lord!", "For God's sake!" "Fiddle-dee-dee!", "Oh, I say!" and the like, which, due to various situational conditions, find themselves in self-dependent, proposemically isolated positions in the text

As is seen from the examples, the isolated positions of the interjectional utterances do not make them into any meaningfully articulate, grammatically predicated sentences with their own informative perspective (either explicit, or implicit). They remain not signals of proposemically complete thoughts, not "communicative utterances" (see above), but mere symptoms of emotions, consciously or unconsciously produced shouts of strong feelings. Therefore the highest rank that they deserve in any relevant linguistic classification of "single free units of speech" is "non-sentential utterances" (which is just another name for Ch. Fries's "noncommunicative utterances").

The vast set of constructional sentence models possessed by language is formed not only by cardinal, mono-functional communicative types; besides these, it includes also intermediary predicative constructions distinguished by mixed communicative features. The true nature of such intermediary constructions can be disclosed in the light of the

actual division theory combined with the general theory of paradigmatic oppositions.

Observations conducted on the said principles show that intermediary communicative sentence models may be identified between all the three cardinal communicative correlations (viz., statement — question, statement — inducement, inducement — question); they have grown and are sustained in language as a result of the transference of certain characteristic features from one communicative type of sentences to another.

As is seen from the examples, utterances intermediary between statements and questions convey meanings and connotations that supplement the direct programming of the answer effected by strictly monofunctional, cardinal interrogative constructions. Namely, they render the connotation of insistency in asking for information, they express a more definite or less definite supposition of the nature of information possessed by the listener, they present a suggestion to the listener to perform a certain action or imply a request for permission to perform an action, etc.

On the other hand, in the structural framework of the interrogative sentence one can express a statement. This type of utterance is classed as the "rhetorical question" — an expressive construction that has been attracting the closest attention of linguistic observers since ancient times.

A high intensity of declarative functional meaning expressed by rhetorical questions is best seen in various proverbs and maxims based on this specifically emphatic predicative unit.

It should be noted that in living speech responses to rhetorical questions exactly correspond to responses elicited by declarative sentences: they include signals of attention, appraisals, expressions of fellow feeling, etc.

A rhetorical question in principle can be followed by a direct answer, too. However, such an answer does not fill up the rheme of the rhetorical question (which, as different from the rheme of a genuine question, is not at all open), but

emphatically accentuates its intensely declarative semantic nature. An answer to a rhetorical question also emphasises its affirmative or negative implication which is opposite to the formal expression of affirmation or negation in the outer structure of the question.

The declarative nature of the rhetorical question is revealed also in the fact that it is not infrequently used as an answer to a genuine question — namely, in cases when an expressive, emphatic answer is needed

Rhetorical questions as constructions of intermediary communicative nature should be distinguished from such genuine questions as are addressed by the speaker to himself in the process of deliberation and reasoning.

The cited string of questions belongs to the inner speech of a literary personage presented in the form of non-personal direct speech. The rhemes of the questions are definitely open, i.e. they are typical of ordinary questions in a dialogue produced by the speaker with an aim to obtain information from his interlocutor. This is clearly seen from the fact that the second question presents an alternative in relation to the first question; as regards the third question, it is not a self-dependent utterance, but a specification, cumulatively attached to the foregoing construction.

Genuine questions to oneself as part of monologue deliberations can quite naturally be followed by corresponding responses, forming various kinds of dialogue within monologue. The next pair of correlated communicative sentence types between which are identified predicative constructions of intermediary nature are declarative and imperative sentences.

Inducive constructions, according to the described general tendency, can be used to express a declarative meaning complicated by corresponding connotations. Such utterances are distinguished by especially high expressiveness and intensity.

Due to its expressiveness this kind of declarative inducement, similar to rhetorical questions, is used in maxims and proverbs

Imperative and interrogative sentences make up the third pair of opposed cardinal communicative sentence types serving as a frame for intermediary communicative patterns.

Imperative sentences performing the essential function of interrogative sentences are such as induce the listener not to action, but to speech. They may contain indirect questions The reverse intermediary construction, i.e. inducement effected in the form of question, is employed in order to convey such additional shades of meaning as request, invitation, suggestion, softening of a command, etc

The undertaken survey of lingual facts shows that the combination of opposite cardinal communicative features displayed by communicatively intermediary sentence patterns is structurally systemic and functionally justified. It is justified because it meets quite definite expressive requirements. And it is symmetrical in so far as each cardinal communicative sentence type is characterised by the same tendency of functional transposition in relation to the two other communicative types opposing it.

LECTURE X

THE CONSTITUENT STRUCTURE OF THE SENTENCES

1. What does it mean one predicative line in other word sentences may be, respectively, "monopredicative"?
2. 1. What does it mean several (more than one) predicative lines in other word sentences may be, respectively, "polypredicative"?
3. What kind of sentence can be considered as a simple sentence?

The basic predicative meanings of the typical English sentence, as has already been pointed out, are expressed by the finite verb which is immediately connected with the subject of the sentence. This predicative connection is commonly referred to as the "predicative line" of the sentence. Depending on their predicative complexity, sentences can feature one predicative line or several (more than one) predicative lines; in other words, sentences may be, respectively, "monopredicative" and "polypredicative". Using this distinction, we must say that the simple sentence is a sentence in which only one predicative line is expressed. *E.g.:*

Bob has never *left* the stadium. Opinions *differ*. This *may happen* any time. The offer *might have been* quite fair. Etc.

According to this definition, sentences with several predicates referring to one and the same subject cannot be considered as simple. *E.g.:* I *took* the child in my arms and *held* him.

It is quite evident that the cited sentence, although it includes only one subject, expresses two different predicative lines, since its two predicates are separately connected with the subject. The content of the sentence reflects two closely connected events that happened in immediate succession: the first — "my taking the child in my arms"; the second — "my holding him".

Sentences having one verb-predicate and more than one subject to it, if the subjects form actually separate (though interdependent) predicative connections, cannot be considered as simple, either. Thus, the syntactic feature of strict monopredication should serve as the basic diagnostic criterion for identifying the simple sentence in distinction to sentences of composite structures of various systemic standings.

The simple sentence, as any sentence in general, is organised as a system of function-expressing positions, the content of the functions being the reflection of a situational event. The nominative parts of the simple sentence, each occupying a notional position in it, are subject, predicate, object, adverbial, attribute, parenthetical enclosure, addressing enclosure; a special, semi-notional position is

occupied by an interjectional enclosure. The parts are arranged in a hierarchy, wherein all of them perform some modifying role. The ultimate and highest object of this integral modification is the sentence as a whole, and through the sentence, the reflection of the situation (situational event).

Thus, the subject is a person-modifier of the predicate. The predicate is a process-modifier of the subject-person. The object is a substance-modifier of a processual part (actional or statal). The adverbial is a quality-modifier (in a broad sense) of a processual part or the whole of the sentence (as expressing an integral process inherent in the reflected event). The attribute is a quality-modifier of a substantive part. The parenthetical enclosure is a detached speaker-bound modifier of any sentence-part or the whole of the sentence. The addressing enclosure (address) is a substantive modifier of the destination of the sentence and hence, from its angle, a modifier of the sentence as a whole. The interjectional enclosure is a speaker-bound emotional modifier of the sentence.

All the said modifiers may be expressed either singly (single modifiers) or collectively, i.e. in a coordinative combination

When analysing sentences in terms of syntagmatic connections of their parts, two types of subordinative relations are exposed: on the one hand, *obligatory* relations, i.e. such as are indispensable for the existence of the syntactic unit as such; on

the other hand, *optional* relations, i.e. such as may or may not be actually represented in the syntactic unit. These relations, as we have pointed out elsewhere, are at present interpreted in terms of syntactic valency and are of especial importance for the characteristic of the verb as the central predicative organiser of the notional stock of sentence constituents thus, the idea of verbal valency, answering the principle of dividing all the notional sentence-parts into obligatory and optional, proves helpful in gaining a further insight into the structure of the simple sentence; moreover, it is of crucial importance for the modern definition of the simple sentence.

In terms of valencies and obligatory positions first of all the category of "elementary sentence" is to be recognised; this is a sentence all the positions of which are obligatory. In other words, this is a sentence which, besides the principal parts, includes only complementive modifiers; as for supplementive modifiers, they find no place in this type of predicative construction.

Finally, bearing in mind that the general identification of obligatory syntactic position affects not only the principal parts of the sentence but is extended to the complementive secondary parts, we define **the unexpanded simple sentence** as a monopredicative sentence formed only by obligatory notional parts. **The expanded simple sentence will**, accordingly, be defined as a monopredicative sentence which includes, besides the obligatory parts, also some optional parts, i.e. some supplementive modifiers which do not constitute a predicative enlargement of the sentence.

Proceeding from the given description of the elementary sentence, it must be stressed that the pattern of this construction presents a workable means of semantico-syntactic analysis of sentences in general.

As we see, the notions "elementary sentence" and "sentence model" do not exclude each other, but, on the contrary, supplement each other: a model is always

an abstraction, whereas an elementary sentence can and should be taken both as an abstract category and as an actual utterance of real speech.

The subject-group and the predicate-group of the sentence are its two constitutive "members", or, to choose a somewhat more specific term, its "axes". **According as both members are present in the composition of the sentence or only one of them, sentences are classed into "two-member" and "one-member" ones.**

Scholars point out that "genuine" one-member sentences are characterised not only as expressing one member in their outer structure; in addition, as an essential feature, they do not imply the other member on the contextual lines. In other words, in accord with this view, elliptical sentences in which the subject or the predicate is contextually omitted, are analysed as "two-member" sentences. The semantic classification of simple sentences should be effected at least on the three bases: first, on the basis of the *subject categorial meanings*; second, on the basis of the *predicate categorial meanings*; third, on the basis of the *subject-object relation*.

Reflecting the categories of the subject, **simple sentences are divided into personal and impersonal**. The further division of the personal sentences is into *human and non-human*; human — **into definite and indefinite**; non-human — into *animate and inanimate*. The further essential division of impersonal sentences is into *factual* (It rains, It is five o'clock) and *perceptual* (It smells of hay here).

Finally, reflecting the subject-object relation, simple sentences should be divided into *subjective* (John lives in London), *objective* (John reads a book) and *neutral* or "*potentially*" *objective* (John reads), capable of implying both the transitive action of the syntactic person and the syntactic person's intransitive characteristic.

Traditional grammar studied the sentence from the point of view of its syntagmatic structure: the sentence was approached as a string of certain parts fulfilling the corresponding syntactic functions. As for paradigmatic relations, which, as we know, are inseparable from syntagmatic relations, they were explicitly revealed only as part of morphological descriptions, because, up to recent times, the idea of the sentence-model with its functional variations was not developed. Moreover, some representatives of early modern linguistics, among them F. de Saussure, specially noted that it was quite natural for morphology to develop paradigmatic (associative) observations, while syntax "by its very essence" should concern itself with the linear connections of words.

Thus, the sentence was traditionally taken at its face value as a ready unit of speech, and systemic connections between sentences were formulated in terms of classifications. Sentences were studied and classified **according to the purpose of communication, according to the types of the subject and the predicate, according to whether they are simple or composite, expanded or unexpanded, compound or complex, etc.**

And it is on these lines that the initial, basic element of syntactic derivation has been found, i.e. a syntactic unit serving as a "sentence-root" and providing an objective ground for identifying syntactic categorial oppositions. This element is known by different names, such as the "basic syntactic pattern", the "structural sentence scheme", the "elementary sentence model", the "base sentence", though as the handiest in linguistic use should be considered the "*kernel sentence*" due to its

terminological flexibility combined with a natural individualising force.

Structurally the kernel sentence coincides with the elementary sentence described in the previous chapter. The difference is, that the pattern of the kernel sentence is interpreted as forming the base of a paradigmatic derivation in the corresponding sentence-pattern series.

By way of example let us take the following English sentence: I saw him come.

The derivational procedures applied to the kernel sentence introduce it into two types of derivational relations in the sentential paradigmatic system: first, the "constructional" relations; second, the "predicative" relations. The constructional derivation effects the formation of more complex clausal structures out of simpler ones; in other words, it provides for the expression of the nominative-notional syntactic semantics of the sentence. The predicative derivation realises the formation of predicatively different units not affecting the constructional volume of the base; in other words, it is responsible for the expression of the predicative syntactic semantics of the sentence. Both types of derivational procedures form the two subsystems within the general system of syntactic paradigmatics.

As part of the *constructional system* of syntactic paradigmatics, kernel sentences, as well as other, expanded base-sentences undergo derivational changes into clauses and phrases.

The transformation of a base sentence into a clause can „be called "clausalisation". **By way of clausalisation a sentence is changed into a subordinate or coordinate clause in the process of subordinative or coordinative combination of sentences.** The main clausalising procedures involve the use of conjunctive words — subordinators and coordinators. Since a composite sentence is produced from minimum two base sentences, the derivational processes of composite sentence production are sometimes called "two-base transformations".

The transformation of a base sentence into a phrase can be called "phrasalisation". By phrasalisation a sentence is transformed either into a semi-predicative construction (a semi-clause), or into a nominal phrase.

As part of the *predicative system* of syntactic paradigmatics, kernel sentences, as well as expanded base-sentences, undergo such structural modifications as immediately express the predicative functions of the sentence, i.e. the functions relating the nominative meanings of the sentence to reality

Any composite (or semi-composite) sentence is analysable into two or more primary sentences (i.e. sentences elementary in the notional sense).

All the cited oppositions-categories may or may not be represented in a given utterance by their strong function-members. In accord with this oppositional regularity, we advance the notion of the "predicative load" of the sentence. The predicative load is determined by the total volume of the strong members of predicative

The sentence, by definition, always expresses predication, being a predicative unit of language. But, from the point of view of the comparative volume of the predicative meanings actually expressed, the sentence may be predicatively "loaded" or "non-loaded

The construction is indeed semantically complicated; but all its meaningful complexity is linguistically resolved by the demonstrated semantico-syntactic oppositional analysis showing the stage-to-stage growth of the total functional

meaning of the sentence in the course of its paradigmatic derivation.

The composite sentence, as different from the simple sentence, is formed by two or more predicative lines. Being a polypredicative construction, it expresses a complicated act of thought, i.e. an act of mental activity which falls into two or more intellectual efforts closely combined with one another. In terms of situations and events this means that **the** composite sentence reflects two or more elementary situational events viewed as making up a unity; the constitutive connections of the events are expressed by the constitutive connections of the predicative lines of the sentence, i.e. by the sentential polypredication.

Each predicative unit in a composite sentence makes up a clause in it, so that a clause as part of a composite sentence corresponds to a separate sentence as part of a contextual sequence. E.g.:

When I sat down to dinner I looked for an opportunity to slip in casually the information that I had by accident run across the Driffields; but news travelled fast in Blackstable (S. Maugham).

The cited composite sentence includes four clauses which are related to one another on different semantic grounds. The sentences underlying the clauses are the following:

I sat down to dinner. I looked for an opportunity to slip in casually the information. I had by accident run across the Driffields. News travelled fast in Blackstable.

The correspondence of a predicative clause to a separate sentence is self-evident. On the other hand, the correspondence of a composite sentence to a genuine, logically connected sequence of simple sentences (underlying its clauses) is not evident at all; moreover, such kind of correspondence is in fact not obligatory, which is the very cause of the existence of the composite sentence in a language. Indeed, in the given example the independent sentences reconstructed from the predicative clauses do not make up any coherently presented situational unity; they are just so many utterances each expressing an event of self-sufficient significance. By way of rearrangement and the use of semantic connectors we may make them into a more or less explanatory situational sequence, but the exposition of the genuine logic of events, i.e. their presentation as natural parts of a unity, achieved by the composite sentence will not be, and is not to be replaced in principle.

As is well known, the use of composite sentences, especially long and logically intricate (complex) ones, is characteristic of literary written speech rather than colloquial oral speech.

That the composite sentence structure answers the special needs of written mode of lingual expression is quite evident. It is this type of speech that deals with lengthy reasonings, descriptions, narrations, all presenting abundant details of intricate correlations of logical premises and inferences, of situational foreground and background, of sequences of events interrupted by cross-references and parenthetical comments. Only a composite sentence can adequately and within reasonable bounds of textual space fulfil these semantic requirements.

Now, the said requirements, fortunately, go together with the fact that in writing it is actually possible to produce long composite sentences of complicated, but logically flawless structure (the second of the advanced reasons). This is possible here because the written sentence, while in the process of being produced,

is open to various alterations: it allows corrections of slips and errors; it can be subjected to curtailing or expanding; it admits of rearranging and reformulating one's ideas; in short, it can be prepared. This latter factor is of crucial importance, so that when considering the properties of literary written speech we must always bear it in mind. Indeed, from the linguistic point of view written speech is above all prepared, or "edited" speech: it is due to no other quality than being prepared before its presentation to the addressee that this mode of speech is structurally so tellingly different from colloquial oral speech. Employing the words in their broader sense, we may say that literary written speech is not just uttered and gone, but is always more carefully or less carefully composed in advance, being meant for a future use of the reader, often for his repeated use. In distinction to this, genuine colloquial oral speech is uttered each time in an irretrievably complete and final form, each time for one immediate and fleeting occasion.

We have covered the first two reasons explaining the composite sentence of increased complexity as a specific feature of written speech. The third reason, referring to the conditions of perception, is inseparable from the former two. Namely, if written text provides for the possibility for its *producer* to return to the beginning of each sentence with the aim of assessing its form and content, of rearranging or re-composing it altogether, it also enables the *reader*, after he has run through the text for the first time, to go back to its starting line and re-read it with as much care as will be required for the final understanding of each item and logical connection expressed by its wording or implied by its construction. Thus, the length limit imposed on the sentence by the recipient's immediate (operative) memory can in writing be practically neglected; the volume of the written sentence is regulated not by memory limitations as such, but by the considerations of optimum logical - balance and stylistic well-formedness.

We have emphatically pointed out in due course the oral basis of human language: the primary lingual matter is phonetical, so that each and every lingual utterance given in a graphic form has essentially a representative character, its speech referent being constructed of so many phones organised in a rhythmomelodical sequence. On the other hand, and this has also been noted before, writing in a literary language acquires a relatively self-sufficient status in so far as a tremendous proportion of what is actually written in society is not meant for an oral reproduction at all: though read and re-read by those to whom it has been addressed, it is destined to remain "silent" for ever. The "silent" nature of written speech with all its peculiarities leads to the development of specifically written features of language, among which, as we have just seen, the composite sentence of increased complexity occupies one of the most prominent places. Now, as a natural consequence of this development, the peculiar features of written speech begin to influence oral speech, whose syntax becomes liable to display ever more syntactic properties directly borrowed from writing.

Moreover, as a result of active interaction between oral and written forms of language, a new variety of speech has arisen that has an intermediary status. This type of speech, being explicitly oral, is at the same time prepared and edited, and more often than not it is directly reproduced from the written text, or else from its epitomised version (theses).

The two main types of the connection of clauses in a composite sentence, as has been stated above, are subordination and coordination. By coordination the clauses are arranged as units of syntactically equal rank, i. e. equipotently; by subordination, as units of unequal rank, one being categorially dominated by the other. In terms of the positional structure of the sentence it means that by subordination one of the clauses (subordinate) is placed in a notional position of the other (principal).

As for coordinated clauses, their equality in rank is expressed above all in each sequential clause explicitly corresponding to a new effort of thought, without an obligatory feature of premeditation. In accord with the said quality, a sequential clause in a compound sentence refers to the whole of the leading clause, whereas a subordinate clause in a complex sentence, as a rule, refers to one notional constituent (expressed by a word or a phrase) in a principal clause. It is due to these facts that the position of a coordinate clause is rigidly fixed in all cases, which can be used as one of the criteria of coordination in distinction to subordination. **The means of combining clauses into a polypredicative sentence are divided into syndetic, i. e. conjunctive, and asyndetic, i. e. non-conjunctive.** The great controversy going on among linguists about this division concerns the status of syndeton and asyndeton versus coordination and subordination. Namely, the question under consideration is whether or not syndeton and asyndeton equally express the two types of syntactic relations between clauses in a composite sentence.

According to the traditional view, **all composite sentences are to be classed into compound sentences (coordinating their clauses) and complex sentences (subordinating their clauses)**, syndetic or asyndetic types of clause connection being specifically displayed with both classes.

COMPLEX SENTENCE

The complex sentence is a polypredicative construction built up on the principle of subordination. It is derived from two or more *base sentences* one of which performs the role of a matrix in relation to the others, the *insert sentences*.

When joined into one complex sentence, the matrix base sentence becomes the principal clause of it and the insert sentences, its subordinate clauses.

The complex sentence of minimal composition includes two clauses — a principal one and a subordinate one. Although the principal clause positionally dominates the subordinate clause, the two form a semantico-syntactic unity within the framework of which they are in fact interconnected, so that the very existence of either of them is supported by the existence of the other.

The subordinate clause is joined to the principal clause either by a subordinating connector (subordinator), or, with some types of clauses, asyndetically. The functional character of the subordinative connector is so explicit that even in traditional grammatical descriptions of complex sentences this connector was approached as a transformer of an independent sentence into a subordinate clause. The minimal, two-clause complex sentence is the main volume type of complex sentences. It is the most important type, first, in terms of frequency, since its textual occurrence by far exceeds that of multi-clause complex sentences; second, in terms of its paradigmatic status, because a complex sentence of any

volume is analysable into a combination of two-clause complex sentence units.

The structural features of the principal clause differ with different types of subordinate clauses. In particular, various types of subordinate clauses specifically affect the principal clause from the point of view of the degree of its completeness. As is well known from elementary grammatical descriptions, the principal clause is markedly incomplete in complex sentences with the subject and predicative subordinate clauses

The principal clause dominates the subordinate clause positionally, but it doesn't mean that by its syntactic status it must express the central informative part of the communication. The information perspective in the simple sentence does not repeat the division of its constituents into primary and secondary, and likewise the information perspective of the complex sentence is not bound to duplicate the division of its clauses into principal and subordinate. The actual division of any construction, be it simple or otherwise, is effected in the context, so it is as part of a continual text that the complex sentence makes its clauses into rheme-rendering and theme-rendering on the complex-sentence information level.

Thus, the interpretation of the subject clause referring to the introducer *it* as appositive, in fact, simply explains the type of syntactic connection underlying the anticipatory formula.

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

Besides the conjunctive substitutes, the predicative clause, the same as other nominal clauses, can be introduced by some conjunctions (*that, whether, as if, as though*). The predicative clause introduced by the conjunctions *as if, as though* has an adverbial force, which is easily shown by contrast: She looks *as though she has never met him*. → She behaves *as though she has never met him*.

While considering subordinate clauses relating to the finite *be* in the principal clause, care should be taken to strictly discriminate between the linking and non-linking (notional) representations of the verb. Indeed, the linking *be* is naturally followed by a predicative clause, while the notional *be*, featuring verbal semantics of existence, cannot join a predicative. Cf.:

It's *because he's weak* that he needs me. This was *because, he had just arrived*.

The cited sentences have been shown by B. A. Ilyish as examples of predicative clauses having a non-conventional nominal-clause conjunction. However, the analysis suggested by the scholar is hardly acceptable, since the introducing *be* in both examples does not belong to the class of links.

The predicative clause in a minimal complex sentence regularly expresses its rheme. Therefore there is an essential informative difference between the two functional uses of a categorially similar nominal clause: that of the predicative and that of the subject

The third type of clauses considered under the heading of clauses of primary nominal positions are object clauses.

The *object clause* denotes an object-situation of the process expressed by the verbal constituent of the principal clause.

The object position is a strong substantive position in the sentence. In terms of clausal relations it means that the substantivising force of the genuine object-clause derivation is a strongly pronounced nominal clause-type derivation.

. Subordinate clauses of secondary nominal positions include attributive clauses of various syntactic functions. They fall into two major classes: "descriptive" attributive clauses and "restrictive" ("limiting") attributive clauses.

The descriptive attributive clause exposes some characteristic of the antecedent (i. e., its substantive referent) as such, while the restrictive attributive clause performs a purely identifying role, singling out the referent of the antecedent in the given situation. The basis of this classification, naturally, has nothing to do with the artistic properties of the classified units: a descriptive clause may or may not possess a special expressive force depending on the purpose and mastery of the respective text production.

Clauses of adverbial positions constitute a vast domain of syntax which falls into many subdivisions each distinguishing its own field of specifications, complications, and difficulties of analysis

Complex sentences which have two or more subordinate clauses discriminate two basic types of subordination arrangement: *parallel* and *consecutive*.

Subordinate clauses immediately referring to one and the same principal clause are said to be subordinated "in parallel" or "co-subordinated". Parallel subordination may be both homogeneous and heterogeneous. For instance, the two clauses of time in the following complex sentence, being embedded on the principle of parallel subordination, are homogeneous — they depend on the same element (the principal clause as a whole), are connected with each other coordinatively and perform the same function: *When he agrees to hear me, and when we have spoken the matter over, I'll tell you the result.*

Homogeneous arrangement is very typical of object clauses expressing reported speech

As different from parallel subordination, **consecutive subordination presents a hierarchy of clausal levels**. In this hierarchy one subordinate clause is commonly subordinated to another, making up an uninterrupted gradation. This kind of clausal arrangement may be called "direct" consecutive subordination. *E.g.: I've no idea why she said she couldn't call on us at the time I had suggested.*

COMPOUND SENTENCE

The compound sentence is a composite sentence built on the principle of coordination. Coordination, the same as subordination, can be expressed either syndetically (by means of coordinative connectors) or asyndetically.

The main semantic relations between the clauses connected coordinatively are copulative, adversative, disjunctive, causal, consequential, resultative. Similar semantic types of relations are to be found between independent, separate sentences forming a continual text.

To support this analysis, the following reasons are put forward: first, the possibility of a falling, finalising tone between the coordinated predicative units; second, the existence, in written speech, of independently presented sentences introduced by the same conjunctions as the would-be "coordinate clauses"; third, the possibility of a full stop-separation of the said "coordinate clauses" with the preservation of the same semantic relations between them essential or less essential

changes in meanings, of his own choice, which is determined by concrete semantic and contextual conditions.

Thus, the idea of the non-existence of the compound sentence in English should be rejected unconditionally. On the other hand, it should be made clear that the formulation of this negative idea as such has served us a positive cause, after all: its objective scientific merit, similar to some other inadequate ideas advanced in linguistics at different times, consists in the very fact that it can be used as a means of counter-argumentation in the course of research work, as a starting point for new insights into the deep nature of lingual phenomena in the process of theoretical analysis sustained by observation.

The compound sentence is derived from two or more base sentences which are connected on the principle of coordination either syndetically or asyndetically. The base sentences joined into one compound sentence lose their independent status and become coordinate clauses — parts of a composite unity. The first clause is "leading" (the "leader" clause), the successive clauses are "sequential". This division is essential not only from the point of view of outer structure (clause-order), but also in the light of the semantico-syntactic content: it is the sequential clause that includes the connector in its composition, thus being turned into some kind of dependent clause, although the type of its dependence is not subordinative.

The coordinating connectors, or coordinators, are divided into conjunctions proper and semi-functional clausal connectors of adverbial character. The main coordinating conjunctions, both simple and discontinuous, are: *and, but, or, nor, neither, for, either ... or, neither ... nor*, etc. The main adverbial coordinators are: *then, yet, so, thus, consequently, nevertheless, however*, etc. The adverbial coordinators, unlike pure conjunctions, as a rule can shift their position in the sentence (the exceptions are the connectors *yet* and *so*. When approached from the semantico-syntactic point of view, the connection between the clauses in a compound sentence should be analysed into two basic types: first, the *unmarked* coordinative connection; second, the *marked* coordinative connection.

The unmarked coordinative connection is realised by the coordinative conjunction *and* and also asyndetically. The unmarked semantic nature of this type of connection is seen from the fact that it is not specified in any way and requires a diagnostic exposition through the marked connection. Namely, the syndetic *and*-constructions discriminate, first, simple copulative relations and, second, broader, non-copulative relations. The asyndetic constructions discriminate, first, simple enumerative relations and, second, broader, non-enumerative relations.

The length of the compound sentence in terms of the number of its clausal parts (its predicative volume), the same as with the complex sentence, is in principle unlimited; it is determined by the informative purpose of the speaker. The commonest type of the compound sentence in this respect is a two-clause construction.

On the other hand, predicatively longer sentences than two-clause ones, from the point of view of semantic correlation between the clauses, are divided into "open" and "closed"