

CONTRASTIVE GRAMMAR OF

ENGLISH
AND
UKRAINIAN
LANGUAGES

Iryna Karamysheva



Iryna Karamysheva

**CONTRASTIVE GRAMMAR
OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN
LANGUAGES**

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE
YOUTH AND SPORT OF UKRAINE

Second edition, revised

Vinnytsia
Nova Knyha Publishers
2012

UDC 811.111'36:811.161.2'36
BBC 81.432.1-2
K 21

*Recommended by the Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sport of Ukraine
as a textbook for students of higher education institutions.
(letter No.1/11-11721 of 22.12.2010)*

Reviewers:

Levytsky A. E., Ph. D., Prof., Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv;
Zatsny Y. A., Ph. D., Prof., Zaporizhzhya National University;
Andreichuk N.I., Candidate of Sciences, Associate Prof., Lviv Polytechnic
National University;
Mahachashvili R. K., Candidate of Sciences, Associate Prof., Zaporizhzhya
National University.

Karamysheva I. D.

K 21 **Contrastive Grammar of English and Ukrainian Languages :**
Textbook ; Second edition, revised / Iryna Karamysheva — Vinnytsia :
Nova Knyha Publishers, 2012. — 320 p.
ISBN 978-966-382-380-5

The format of the textbook is adapted for the syllabus of the academic subject “Contrastive Grammar of English and Ukrainian Languages”. It introduces students to most essential concepts of contrastive linguistics with emphasis being placed on contrastive grammar. The book centers on common and distinctive features of morphological and syntactical levels of English and Ukrainian languages. For the full mastery of the course sets of specially selected assignments for class and independent training are supplied at the end of each chapter. The book is designed to ensure theoretical knowledge of topics covered and practical habits of conducting contrastive grammatical analysis.

The textbook is intended for students-linguists of specialties “Applied Linguistics”, “Translation (English)”, “Language and Literature (English)”. It may be useful for all those who teach or study English as well as for those who deal with translation.

UDC 811.111'36:811.161.2'36
BBC 81.432.1-2

ISBN 978-966-382-380-5

© Karamysheva I. D., 2012
© Nova Knyha Publishers, 2012

CONTENTS

ПЕРЕДМОВА	8
FUNDAMENTALS	11
1. Basic units of language and speech	11
2. Word as a basic language unit. The structure of words.....	15
3. The classification of words.....	19
4. The combinability of words.....	20
5. The notions of grammatical opposition and grammatical category.....	22
6. Part of speech as one of the main grammatical notions.....	26
7. Contrastive studies of languages.....	29
8. Contrastive linguistics as a science and an academic discipline: its subject matter and tasks.....	33
9. Contrastive grammar as a part of contrastive linguistics: its tasks	39
10. Methods of research, used in contrastive studies	42
11. The problem of the language-etalon for comparison (<i>tertium comparationis</i>).....	47
12. Parts of speech classification in English and Ukrainian languages.....	49
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	53
Morphology	
CHAPTER 1. Noun as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages	56
1. Noun as a part of speech: general characteristics.....	56
2. The category of number	61
3. The category of case.....	67
4. The category of gender	73
5. The category of the names of living beings and lifeless objects.....	76
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	77

CHAPTER 2. Adjective as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages	82
1. Adjective as a part of speech: general characteristics. Grammatical categories of adjective.....	82
2. Degrees of comparison of adjectives.....	87
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	93
CHAPTER 3. Numeral as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages	98
1. Numeral as a part of speech: general characteristics	98
2. Grammatical categories of numeral.....	101
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	105
CHAPTER 4. Pronoun as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages	108
1. Pronoun as a part of speech: general characteristics. Grammatical categories of pronoun.....	108
2. Personal and possessive pronouns	112
3. Reflexive and strengthening pronouns.....	118
4. Demonstrative pronouns.....	120
5. Interrogative and relative pronouns	121
6. Indefinite and negative pronouns	123
7. Allomorphic classes of pronouns in English and Ukrainian languages.....	126
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	128
CHAPTER 5. Verb as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages	131
1. Verb as a part of speech: general characteristics	131
2. The category of person	139
3. The category of number and the category of gender	143
4. The category of aspect	145
5. The category of tense	151
5.1. The Present Tense.....	155
5.2. The Past Tense.....	156

5.3. The Future Tense. The tense form “Future-in-the-past” and sequence of tenses of the English language.	158
6. The category of voice	161
6.1. The passive voice (state).....	165
6.2. The reflexive voice (state).....	167
7. The category of mood.....	169
7.1. The Indicative and Imperative moods	170
7.2. The Conditional mood	173
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	176

CHAPTER 6. Non-finite forms of the verb in English

<i>and Ukrainian languages</i>	185
1. Non-finite forms of the verb: general characteristics	185
2. Infinitive in English and Ukrainian languages	188
3. The English participle versus Ukrainian дієприкметник and дієприслівник.....	192
4. The English gerund.....	201
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	204

CHAPTER 7. Adverb as a part of speech in English

<i>and Ukrainian languages</i>	208
1. Adverb as a part of speech: general characteristics	208
2. Degrees of comparison of adverbs	213
3. Words of the category of state (statives or adlinks)	214
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	216

CHAPTER 8. Functional parts of speech in English

<i>and Ukrainian languages</i>	222
1. Preposition as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages.....	222
2. Conjunction as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages.....	226
3. Particle as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages	228
4. Modal words as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages.....	229

5. Interjection as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages.....	231
6. The English article	233
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	237
CHAPTER 9. Syntax: introduction into basic notions	245
1. Sentence as the basic unit of syntax	245
2. The expression of syntactic relations	248
3. The classification of sentences as to their structure	249
4. One-member sentences (однокладні речення)	250
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	252
CHAPTER 10. The simple sentence. Parts of the sentence	255
1. The subject	256
2. The predicate	258
2.1. The simple predicate.....	258
2.2. The compound nominal predicate (складений іменний присудок).....	260
2.3. The compound verbal predicate (складений дієслівний присудок).	261
3. The object.....	262
3.1. The direct object.....	262
3.2. The indirect object	264
4. The attribute	265
5. The adverbial modifier	266
6. Complex parts of the sentence.....	268
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	275
CHAPTER 11. The composite sentence. The compound sentence	282
1. The composite sentence	282
2. The compound sentence with conjunctions	283
2.1. The copulative compound sentence	284
2.2. The disjunctive compound sentence	286
2.3. The adversative compound sentence.....	287
2.4. The causative-consecutive compound sentences	289

2.5. Compound sentences with the meaning of suddenness (складносурядне речення із значенням раптовості).....	289
3. Compound sentences with asyndetically joined clauses (складносурядні речення без сполучників).....	290
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	291
CHAPTER 12. The composite sentence. The complex sentence	294
1. The subject clause / Підметове підрядне речення.....	295
2. The predicative clause / Присудкове підрядне речення.....	296
3. The object/objective clause / Підрядне додаткове речення.....	297
4. Attributive clauses / Підрядні означальні речення	297
5. Adverbial clauses / Підрядні обставинні речення	299
5.1. Adverbial clauses of place / підрядні речення місця.....	299
5.2. Adverbial clauses of time / підрядні речення часу	300
5.3. Adverbial clauses of manner (attending circumstances) / підрядні речення способу дії (супровідних обставин)	301
5.4. Adverbial clauses of measure or degree / підрядні речення міри або ступеня	302
5.5. Adverbial clauses of purpose / підрядні речення мети	302
5.6. Adverbial clauses of cause / підрядні речення причини	303
5.7. Adverbial clauses of condition / підрядні речення умови.....	303
5.8. Adverbial clauses of concession / підрядні речення допусту.....	304
5.9. Adverbial clauses of result / підрядні речення наслідку.....	305
<i>Questions for discussion and exercises:</i>	305
CONCLUSION	310
REFERENCES	313
FURTHER SUGGESTED READINGS	316
Main suggested readings:	316
Additional suggested readings:.....	317

ПЕРЕДМОВА

Укладений навчальний посібник є спробою узагальнення теоретично-практичних здобутків у галузі контрастивної граматики англійської та української мов. Він покликаний заповнити прогалину у навчальних виданнях для студентів з дисципліни “Контрастивна граMATика англійської та української мов.” Указаний предмет входить до навчальних планів підготовки бакалаврів напряму “Філологія” спеціальності “Прикладна лінгвістика” та “Переклад”. У Національному університеті “Львівська політехніка” студенти відділення прикладної лінгвістики вивчають цикл предметів із контрастивної лінгвістики, оскільки майбутні прикладні лінгвісти спеціалізуються не лише на розробленні прикладних програм, спрямованих на вирішення проблем, пов’язаних із залученням та опрацюванням мовних даних, але й здобувають фахові знання перекладу (зокрема з української мови на англійську та навпаки). Отож, пропонований посібник є результатом досвіду викладання теоретично-практичного англomовного курсу “Контрастивна граMATика англійської та української мов” студентам кафедри прикладної лінгвістики. Він має певну теоретичну значущість, оскільки забезпечує потребу узагальненого подання наукових тлумачень основних граматичних понять та явищ, що недостатньо висвітлені саме з контрастивного аспекту.

Авторка посібника спирається, передусім, на надбання визнаних українських мовознавців, доробок яких вплинув на розвиток контрастивних мовознавчих студій в Україні. Насамперед

це праця Жлуктенка Юрія Олексійовича “Порівняльна грамати́ка англійської та української мов” (Посібник. — К. : Радянська школа, 1960. — 160 с.), який очолював саме україно-англійські контрастивні студії з граматики. Враховано сучасні дослідження у галузі типології англійської та української мов професора Корунця Ілька Вакуловича (Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов. Навчальний посібник. — Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2003. — 464 с.). Теоретичні основи контрастивних мовознавчих досліджень викладено, спираючись на погляди професора Кочергана Михайла Петровича (Основи зіставного мовознавства: Підручник. — К. : Академія, 2006. — 424 с.), який у своєму підручнику інтерпретує основні поняття контрастивного мовознавства і розкриває методику контрастивних досліджень з урахуванням сучасних досягнень лінгвістики, а також на положення, опрацьовані у підручнику професора Левицького Андрія Едуардовича (Порівняльна грамати́ка англійської та української мов: Підручник. — К. : Видав. — поліграф. центр “Київський університет”, 2008. — 264 с.), розробленого для фахівців у галузі перекладу.

Мета посібника “Контрастивна грамати́ка англійської та української мов” — ознайомити студентів з найактуальнішими питаннями контрастивної граматики як складової частини контрастивної лінгвістики (зіставного мовознавства); окреслити її предмет та завдання; розкрити основні категорії, методологію дослідження.

Пропонований посібник побудований за схемою традиційних курсів теоретичної граматики англійської та української мов та містить два розділи — “Морфологія” і “Синтаксис”. Структура кожної глави дає змогу студенту максимально ефективно засвоїти навчальний матеріал, а саме: 1) опис, а відтак і зіставний аналіз певного граматичного явища англійської та української мов; 2) питання до теоретичної частини викладу, які допоможуть студенту звернути увагу на ключові поняття, висвітлені у цьому розділі, а викладачеві перевірити рівень засвоєння матеріалу; 3) комплекс вправ для практичного опрацювання матеріалу та

здобуття навиків контрастивного дослідження граматичних явищ рідної та іноземної мови (вправи підібрано з сучасних англomовних та українomовних джерел та адаптовано для навчального процесу).

Оскільки особлива увага під час викладання курсу надається тому, щоб навчити студента (майбутнього фахівця-філолога) зіставляти та порівнювати сучасні структури двох мов, виявляти подібності та відмінності у їхній будові та словнику, то посібник спрямований на висвітлення та системне зіставлення таких одиниць та явищ англійської та української мов, як:

- 1) класи повнозначних та функціональних частин мови, морфологічні категорії та способи їхньої реалізації, словотвірні й формотворні афікси, класифікація лексем за певними граматичними ознаками;
- 2) синтаксичні процеси, синтаксичні зв'язки та синтаксичні відношення на рівні різних типів і парадигматичних класів словосполучень та речень; класифікація типів речень порівнюваних мов.

Зіставне вивчення обох мов сприяє їхньому взаємному засвоєнню. Оскільки під час вивчення іноземної мови з'являється матеріал для порівняння, то багато явищ рідної мови усвідомлюються краще і засвоюються глибше. Зі свого боку, й рідна мова чинить вплив на засвоєння іноземної, адже у вивченні чужої мови використовується той досвід, якого студенти набули, оволодіваючи певними мовними вміннями і навичками рідної мови. Отож, безперечно, успішне вивчення іноземної мови майбутніми професіоналами у галузі перекладу та комп'ютерного опрацювання мовної інформації неможливе без порівняння її з рідною мовою, без виявлення подібностей та відмінностей у способах вираження думки цими двома мовами.

*Провідний науковий співробітник
кафедри прикладної лінгвістики,
доцент, канд. філол. наук*

Н. І. Андрейчук

FUNDAMENTALS

1. Basic units of language and speech

The distinction between language and speech, which was first introduced by Ferdinand de Saussure (1857–1913) in his book on general linguistics, has become one of the cornerstones of modern linguistics. Most generally these two notions are understood in the following way:

- language is the system of units used in the process of speaking by all members of a community;
- speech is the process of using articulate (distinctly uttered) sounds to convey information.

Broader definitions of the notions are as follows:

Language is the system, phonological, lexical, and grammatical, which lies at the base of all speaking. It is a source which every speaker and writer has to draw upon (rely on) if he/she is to be understood by other speakers of the language.

Speech, on the other hand, is the manifestation of language, or its use by various speakers and writers of the given language. Thus any material for analysis we encounter, orally or in a written form, is always a product of speech, namely something either pronounced or written by some individual speaker or writer, or a group of speakers or writers. There is no other way for a scholar to get at language than through its manifestation in speech.

In the process of speech we use many language units to code the information we are going to convey, therefore any instance of speech is a

particular realization of a language. As we are concerned with grammar only we will not dwell on the problem of language system in phonology and lexicology, but we will concentrate on the system of grammar and its manifestation in speech where, of course, it can never appear isolated from phonology and lexicology. Actual sentences pronounced by a speaker are the result of organizing words drawn from the word stock according to a pattern drawn from its grammatical system.

Thus, in stating that English nouns have a distinction of two numbers, singular and plural, and that there are several ways of expressing the category of plural number in nouns, we are stating facts of language, that is, elements of that system which a speaker or a writer of English has to draw on (to draw on — to make use of supply of smth.). But, for instance, a concrete phrase *very fine weather* is a fact of speech, created by the individual speaker for his own purposes, and founded on knowledge, (a) of a syntactical pattern in question “adverb+adjective+noun”, and (b) of the words which he/she arranges according to the pattern [8; 6–7].

The **basic units of language and speech** are: the phoneme, the morpheme, the word and the sentence. The definitions of these units have never been generally agreed on, yet the following can serve as some brief functional characteristics.

The **phoneme** is the smallest **distinctive** unit. The phoneme [b], for instance, is the only distinctive feature marking the difference between *tale* [teɪl] and *table* [teɪbl].

The **morpheme** is the smallest **meaningful** unit. *Un-fail-ing-ly*, for instance, contains four meaningful parts, that is four morphemes.

The **word** is the smallest **naming** unit. Though the words *terror*, *terrible*, *terrific*, *terrify* contain more than one morpheme each, they are the smallest units naming a certain feeling, certain properties and a certain action respectively.

The **sentence** is the smallest **communication** unit which expresses a complete thought or an idea. *It rains* is a sentence because it communicates a certain particular idea. Though a sentence contains words, it is not merely a group of words (or other units), but something integral, a structural unity built in accordance with one of the

patterns existing in a given language. All the sounds of a sentence are united by typical intonation. All the meanings are interlaced according to some pattern to make one communication. And a **communication is a directed thought** [25; 11, 220]. It is exactly the ability to express the complete idea or some meaningful thought that makes a sentence a sentence and distinguishes it, for example, from a phrase.

The mentioned units (the phoneme, the morpheme, the word and the sentence) are units of different levels of language structure. The phoneme is a unit of the lowest level, the sentence — of the highest. A unit of a higher level usually contains one or more units of the preceding level. But the higher unit cannot be reduced to the sum of those lower units since it has a quality not inherent in the units of the lower level. For example, the naming power of the word *length* is not inherent in the two morphemes it contains. The communicating power of the sentence *It rains* is not inherent in the two words it contains.

Vice versa, a combination of units of a certain level does not make a unit of a higher level unless the combination acquires the properties of the units of that higher level. The combination of morphemes *-ing-ly* is not a word since it names nothing. The combination of words *of the teacher* is not a sentence as long as it communicates nothing [25; 7–8].

The units of each level can be analyzed as to their inner structure, the classes they belong to in the language system (otherwise, their **paradigmatic** relations), and the combinations they form in speech (or their **syntagmatic** relations). In the light of all the above mentioned we shall assume that the structure of various units and the classes they form (paradigmatic relations) are the sphere of language, while the combinations the same units form in the process of communication (syntagmatic relations) are the sphere of speech.

It goes without saying that language and speech are interdependent and interpenetrating. The combinability of every unit depends upon its properties as an element of the language system. On the other hand, the properties of every unit develop in the process of speech. Combinations of units may become stable and develop into new units, as in the case of *motor-bicycle, has written, at last* etc. [25; 9–10].

The structure, classification and combinability of phonemes is studied by a branch of linguistics called **phonology**.

The structure, classification and combinability of words is the object of **morphology**.

Syntax deals with the structure, classification and combinability of sentences.

Morphology and syntax are both parts of grammar. **Morphology** is a part of grammar that treats meaning and use of classes of words — *parts of speech*, as they are traditionally referred to. **Syntax** is another subdivision of grammar that deals with the structure of speech utterances that makes a sentence or a part of a sentence.

The term **grammar** is used to denote:

- 1) the objective laws governing the use of word classes, their forms and their syntactic structures based upon their objective content;
- 2) the laws of a language as they are understood by a linguist or a group of linguists.

In other words, **grammar** (Wikipedia Internet Source) is the study of rules governing the use of language. The set of rules governing a particular language is also called the **grammar** of the language; thus, each language can be said to have its own distinct grammar. Grammar is a part of the general study of language called linguistics. The subfields of modern grammar are phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics. Traditional grammars include only morphology and syntax.

• There can also be differentiated several types of grammar. Thus, we may speak of a practical grammar and a theoretical grammar. A **practical grammar** is the system of rules explaining the meaning and use of words, word forms, and syntactic structures. A **theoretical grammar** treats the existing points of view on the content and use of words, word forms, syntactic structures and gives attempts to establish (if necessary) new ones.

Summing up, it is worth presenting the views of A. E. Levytsky upon this subject, who considers **grammar** a branch of linguistics that treats the laws of language units' usage in speech. Grammar considers and

examines language from its smallest meaningful parts up to its most complex organization. It classifies words into categories and states the peculiarities of each category. A.E. Levitsky considers vocabulary to be the word-stock, and grammar to be the set of devices for handling this word-stock. It is due to these devices that language is able to give a material linguistic form to human thought. The semantic value of grammatical devices is developed in the process of communication. So, *grammar* is treated as *a branch of linguistics, which studies the structure of language, i.e. a system of morphological categories and forms, syntactic categories and constructions*. That is why grammar consists of two branches — morphology and syntax [12; 97].

2. Word as a basic language unit. The structure of words

One of the main properties of a word is its double nature. It is material because it can be heard or seen, and it is immaterial or ideal as far as its meaning is concerned. Therefore, the **material** aspects of the word (written and oral) will be regarded as its **forms**, and its **meanings** (**ideal** or **immaterial** aspects) as its **content**. When defining the word as “the smallest naming unit” the reference was made primarily to its content, whereas in pointing out the most characteristic features of words we deal chiefly with the form.

The word *books* can be broken up in two parts: *book-* and *-s*. The content of the first part can be rendered as “a written work in a form of a set of printed pages fastened together inside a cover, as a thing to be read” and the meaning of the second part is “plurality”. So, each of the two parts of the word *books* has both form and content. Such meaningful parts of a word are called **morphemes**. If we break up the word in some other way, e.g. *boo-ks*, the resulting parts will not be morphemes, since they have no meanings. The morphemes *book-* and *-s* differ essentially:

- 1) In their relations to reality and thought. *Book-* is **directly** associated with some object of reality, even if it does not name

it as the word *book* does (compare *bookish*). The morpheme *-s* is connected with the world of reality only **indirectly**, through the morpheme it is linked with. In combination with the morpheme *book-* it means “more than one book”. Together with the morpheme *table-* it refers to “more than one table”. But alone it does not remind us of the notion “more than one” in the same way as, for instance, the morpheme *plural-* does.

- 2) In their relations to the word which they are part of. *Book-* is more **independent** than *-s*. *Book-* makes a word *book* with a zero morpheme, with the meaning of “singular number”, added, whereas *-s* cannot make a word with a zero morpheme. It always **depends** on some other morpheme.
- 3) In their relations to similar morphemes in other words. The meaning of *-s* is always **relative**. In the word *books* it denotes “plurality”, because *books* is opposed to *book* with the zero morpheme of “singularity”. In the word *news* *-s* has no plural meaning because there is no “singular” opposite to *news*. In verbs the morpheme *-s* shows the meaning of “present tense” in relation to the morpheme *-ed* in *wanted*, but at the same time it shows the meaning of the “third person, singular” in relation to the zero morpheme of *want*. Now we cannot say that *book-* has one meaning when compared with *chair-* and another when compared with *table-*.

Summing up, we can state that, the meanings of the morphemes *-s*, *-ed*, being **relative**, **dependent** and only **indirectly** reflecting reality, are **grammatical** meanings of grammatical morphemes.

Morphemes of the *book-* type and their meanings are called **lexical**.

It is a common phenomenon in English that the function of a grammatical morpheme is fulfilled by an apparent word standing separately. The lexical meanings of the words *invite*, *invited* and the combination *shall invite* are the same. The main difference in content is the “present” meaning in *invite*, the “past” meaning in *invited* and the “future” meaning in *shall invite*. These meanings are grammatical. By comparing the relations of *invite* — *invited* and *invite* — *shall invite* we

can see that the function of *shall* is similar to that of the grammatical morpheme *-ed*. Thus, being formally a word, since it is characterized by a separate loose position in a sentence (e.g. *I shall come tomorrow.*), in regard to its content *shall* is not a word, but a grammatical morpheme. Therefore, since *shall* has the properties of both a word and a grammatical morpheme, it can be called a **grammatical word-morpheme**.

Let us now compare the two units: *invites* and *shall invite*. They contain the same lexical morpheme *invite-* and different grammatical morphemes *-s* and *shall*. The grammatical morpheme *-s* is a **bound** morpheme: it is rigidly connected with the lexical morpheme. The grammatical morpheme *shall* is a **free** morpheme or a **word-morpheme**: it is loosely connected with the lexical morpheme. Owing to the difference in the forms of the grammatical morphemes, there is a difference in the forms of the units *invites* and *shall invite*. *Invites* has the form of one word, and *shall invite* that of the combination of words.

Units like *invites*, with bound grammatical morphemes, are called **synthetic** words. They are words both in form and in content.

Units like *shall invite*, with free grammatical morphemes, or grammatical word-morphemes, are called **analytical** words. They are words in content only. In the form they are combinations of words.

Since the difference between synthetic and analytical words is a matter of form, not content, we may speak of **synthetic** (синтетична або проста форма) and **analytical** (аналітична або складена форма) forms.

Analytical forms are much more characteristic of English than of Ukrainian. Especially rich in analytical forms is the English verb where they greatly exceed the synthetic forms in number.

Owing to the prevalence of analytical forms, English is usually spoken of as an analytical language, and Ukrainian, Russian, Greek, Latin etc., in which synthetic forms prevail, as synthetic languages.

Besides lexical and grammatical morphemes there exist some intermediate types.

The first morphemes in the words *de-part*, *for-give*, and the second morphemes in the words *fly-er*, *home-less* resemble grammatical morphemes in their dependence on the lexical morphemes. But they differ from grammatical morphemes in not being relative. Thus, for

example, in pairs *merciful* — *merciless*, and *homeless*, *jobless*, etc., *-less* retains its meaning (“the absence of smth.”) even if it is not contrasted. Like grammatical morphemes, *de-*, *for-*, *-er*, *-less* are attached only to some classes of lexical morphemes, but like lexical morphemes they determine the lexical meanings of words. Compare: *part* and *depart*, *job* and *jobless*. Thus, owing to their double or intermediate nature, they will be called **lexico-grammatical morphemes**.

De-, *for-*, *-er*, *-less* are **bound** morphemes. English also possesses **free** lexico-grammatical morphemes, or **lexico-grammatical word-morphemes**.

Units of the type *stand up*, *give in*, *find out* resemble analytical words, having the forms of a combination of words and the content of a word. But there is an essential difference between *shall give* and *give in*. *Shall* does not introduce any lexical meaning, while *in* does. *Shall give* differs from *give* grammatically, while *give in* differs from *give* lexically. In this respect *give in* is similar to *forgive*. Thus, *in* is an example of a lexico-grammatical word morpheme.

A word has at least one lexical morpheme. It may also have grammatical and lexico-grammatical morphemes. The lexical morpheme is regarded as the root of the word, all the other bound morphemes as **affixes: prefixes, suffixes and infixes**.

Position is not the only difference between prefixes and suffixes. Suffixes play a much greater role in the grammatical structure of both English and Ukrainian languages. Firstly, they include grammatical morphemes besides lexico-grammatical ones, whereas prefixes are only lexico-grammatical. Secondly, the lexico-grammatical suffixes are more closely connected with grammatical morphemes than prefixes are. Adding a suffix to the root mostly changes the set of grammatical morphemes attached, which is not typical of prefixes.

Words without their grammatical morphemes (mostly suffixes, often called **endings** or **inflections**) are known as **stems**. In accordance with their structure the following four types of stems are usually distinguished:

1. **Simple** (прості основи), containing only the root, as in *day*, *dogs*, *write*, *wanted*, etc.

2. **Derivative** (похідні основи), containing affixes or other stem-building elements, as in *boyhood, rewrite, strength*, etc.
3. **Compound** (складні основи), containing two or more roots, as in *white-wash, pickpocket, appletree, motor-car, brother-in-law*, etc.
4. **Composite** (складені основи), containing free lexico-grammatical word-morphemes or otherwise having the form of a combination of words, as in *give up, two hundred and twenty five, at last, in spite of*, etc. [25; 12–18].

3. The classification of words

A morpheme usually has more than one meaning. This is the case, for instance, with both the lexical and the grammatical morpheme in the word *runs*. The morpheme *run-* has the following meanings: 1) “move with quick steps” (*The boy runs fast*); 2) “flow” (*A tear runs ...*); 3) “become” (*to run dry*); 4) “manage” (*run a business*); 5) “cause to move” (*run a car*), and many others. The meanings of the *-s* morpheme are as follows: 1) “present tense”; 2) “indicative mood”; 3) “third person”; 4) “singular number”; 5) “non-continuous aspect” and some others.

All the **lexical meanings** of the word *runs*, inherent in the morpheme *run-*, unite this word with *to run, running, will run, shall run, has run, had run, is running, was running* etc. into one group called a **lexeme**.

All the **grammatical meanings** of the word *runs*, inherent in the morpheme *-s*, unite this word with *walks, stands, sleeps, skates, lives* and a great many other words into a group we shall call a **grammeme**.

The words of a lexeme or of a grammeme are united not only by the meanings of the corresponding morpheme, but by its form too. Still the content is of greater importance, with the form often differing considerably. The words *runs* and *ran*, for instance, have the same lexical meanings and belong therefore to the same lexeme in spite of the formal difference. A similar example can illustrate formal variations

	Lexeme 1	Lexeme 2		
Grammeme 1	boy	girl	common case, singular number	
Grammeme 2	boy's	girl's	possessive case, singular number	
Grammeme 3	boys	girls	common case, plural number	
Grammeme 4	boys'	girls'	possessive case, plural number	
	<i>male, child, son, male, servant, etc.</i>	<i>female, child, daughter, maid servant, etc.</i>	meanings of lexemes	meanings of grammemes

of a grammatical morpheme uniting words into a grammeme: *lived, walked, skated, slept, ran, went.*

As we see, each word of a lexeme represents a certain grammeme, and each word of a grammeme represents a certain lexeme. *The set of grammemes represented by all the words of a lexeme is its paradigm.* The set of lexemes represented by all the words of a grammeme is usually so large that it therefore has got no name. But it is of necessity to recollect the fact that in actual speech a lexical morpheme displays only one meaning of the bunch in each case, and that meaning is singled out by the context or the situation of speech (that is *syntagmatically*, in grammar language) [25; 19–22].

4. The combinability of words

As already mentioned, only those combinations of words (or single words) which convey communication are sentences — the object of syntax. All other combinations of words regularly formed in the process of speech are the object of morphology as well as single words. Like separate words they name things, phenomena, actions, qualities, etc., but in a complex way, for example: *manners* and *table manners*, *blue* and *dark blue*, *speak* and *speak loudly*. Like separate words they serve as building material for sentences.

The combinability of words is as a rule determined by their meanings, not their forms. Therefore not every sequence of words may be regarded

as a combination of words. In the sentence *Frankly, my friend, I have told you the truth* neither *Frankly, my friend* nor *friend, I ...* are combinations of words since their meanings are detached and do not unite them.

On the other hand, some words may be inserted between the components of a word combination without breaking it. Compare:

- a) *read books*;
- b) *read many books*;
- c) *read very many books*.

In case (a) the combination *read books* is **uninterrupted**. In cases (b) and (c) it is **interrupted**, or **discontinuous** (*read ... books*).

The combinability of words depends on their lexical, grammatical and lexico-grammatical meanings. It is owing to lexical meanings of the corresponding lexemes that the word *hot* can be combined with the words *water, temper, news, dog* and is hardly combinable with the words *ice, square, information, cat*.

The lexico-grammatical meanings of *-er* in *runner* (a noun) and *-ly* in *quickly* (an adverb) do not go together and prevent these words from forming a combination, whereas *quick runner* and *run quickly* are regular word combinations.

The combination **students writes* is impossible owing to the grammatical meanings of the corresponding grammemes (Remark: with “*” we mark grammatically incorrect word-combinations or sentences).

Thus one may speak of **lexical, grammatical and lexico-grammatical** combinability, or the combinability of lexemes, grammemes and parts of speech.

Each word belonging to a certain part of speech is characterized by **valency** (валентність) or, in other words, the combinability of lexical units. For example, in the sentence *I tell you a joke* the verb *tell* is two valent, and in the sentence *I will tell you a joke about a Scotchman* — three valent. We can also say that modal verbs are valent for infinitives and not valent for gerunds, e.g. *I can't sing*; nouns are valent for an article, e.g. *a (the) table*, that is modal verbs are combined with infinitives not gerunds, and nouns are practically the only part of speech that can be combined with articles.

It is convenient to distinguish **right-hand** and **left-hand** connections or combinability. In the combination *my friend* the word *my* has a right-hand connection with the word *friend* and the latter has a left-hand connection with the word *my*.

With analytical forms **inside** and **outside** connections are also possible. In the combination *has already done* the verb has an inside connection with the adverb and the latter has an outside connection with the verb.

It will also be expedient to distinguish **unilateral**, **bilateral** and **multilateral** combinability (одностороння, двостороння та багатостороння сполучуваність). For instance, we may say that the articles in English have unilateral right-hand connections with nouns: *a book, the boy*. Such linking words as prepositions, conjunctions, link verbs and modal verbs are characterized by bilateral combinability: *book of John, John and Marry, this is John, the boy must leave*. Most verbs may have:

- zero (*Go!*),
- unilateral (*boys ← jump*),
- bilateral (*I ← did → it*),
- and multilateral (*Yesterday I ← saw → him there*) connections.

In other words, the combinability of verbs is **variable**.

One should also distinguish **direct** and **indirect** connections. In the combination *Look at him* the connection between *look* and *at*, between *at* and *him* are direct, whereas the connection between *look* and *him* is indirect, through the preposition *at* [25; 28–31].

5. The notions of grammatical opposition and grammatical category

There is essential difference in the way lexical and grammatical meanings exist in the language and occur in speech. Lexical meanings can be found in a bunch only in a dictionary or in a memory of a man, or, scientifically, in the lexical system of a language. In actual speech a lexical morpheme displays only one meaning of the bunch in each case,

and that meaning is singled out by the context or the situation of speech (in grammar terms, **syntagmatically**). As mentioned already, words of the same lexeme convey different meanings in different surroundings.

The meanings of a grammatical morpheme always come together in the word. In accordance with their relative nature they can be singled out only relatively in contrast to the meanings of other grammatical morphemes (in grammar terms, **paradigmatically**).

Supposing we want to single out the meaning of “non-continuous aspect” in the word *runs*. We have then to find another word which has all the meanings of the word *runs* except that of “non-continuous aspect”. The only word that meets these requirements is the analytical word *is running*. *Run* and *is running* belong to the same lexeme and their lexical meanings are identical. As to the grammatical meanings the two words do not differ in tense (“present”), number (“singular”), person (“third”), mood (“indicative”), etc. They differ only in aspect. The word *runs* has the meaning of “non-continuous aspect” and *is running* — that of “continuous aspect”.

When opposed, the two words, *runs* and *is running*, form a particular language unit. All their meanings but those of aspect counterbalance one another and do not count. Only the two **particular** meanings of “non-continuous” and “continuous” aspect united by the **general** meaning of “aspect” are revealed in this **opposition** or **opposeme**. The general meaning of this opposeme (“aspect”) manifests itself in the two particular meanings (“non-continuous aspect” and “continuous aspect”) of the **opposite members** (or **opposites**) [25; 22–24].

Thus, the elements which the opposition/opposeme is composed of are called **opposites** or **members of the opposition**. Opposites can be different: 1) non-marked, 2) marked. Compare the pair of noun forms *table* — *tables*. Together they create the “number” opposeme, where *table* represents the singular number expressed by a zero morpheme that is why it is called the non-marked member of the opposition, and *tables* — the plural number expressed by the positive morpheme *-s* is called the marked member of the opposition. Non-marked opposite is used more often than the marked opposite is. The marked opposite is peculiar by its limited use.

Ferdinand de Saussure claimed that everything in language is based on opposition. On phonetic level we have opposition of sounds. On all levels of language we have opposition. Any grammatical form has got its contrast or counterpart. Together they make up a grammatical category.

A **part of speech** is characterized by its **grammatical categories** manifested in the **opposemes** (the elements of the opposition — опозема, член опозиції) and paradigms of its lexemes. Nouns have the categories of number and case. Verbs possess the categories of tense, voice, mood etc. That is why paradigms belonging to different parts of speech are different. The paradigm of a verb lexeme is long: *write, writes, wrote, will write, is writing* etc. The paradigm of a noun lexeme is much shorter: *sister, sister's, sisters, sisters'*. The paradigm of an adjective lexeme is still shorter: *cold, colder, coldest*. The paradigm of an adverb *always* consists only of one word.

Thus, the paradigm of a lexeme shows what part of speech the lexeme belongs to.

It must be borne in mind, however, that not all the lexemes of a part of speech have the same paradigms. Compare:

<i>sister</i>	<i>book</i>	<i>information</i>
<i>sister's</i>	<i>books</i>	—
<i>sisters</i>	—	—
<i>sisters'</i>	—	—

The first lexeme has opposemes of two grammatical categories: number and case. The second lexeme has only one opposeme — that of number. It has no case opposemes. The third lexeme is outside both categories: it has no opposemes at all. We may say that the number opposeme with its opposite grammatical meanings of “singularity” and “plurality” is **neutralized** in nouns like *information, bread, milk* etc. owing to their lexical meaning which can hardly be associated with “oneness” or “more-than-oneness”.

We may define **neutralization** as *the reduction of an opposeme to one of its members under certain circumstances*. This member may be called **the member of neutralization**. Usually it is the unmarked member of an opposeme.

The term **grammatical category** implies that:

- 1) there exist different morphological forms in the words of a part of speech possessing different referential meanings;
- 2) the oppositions of different forms possessing referential meanings are systematic, that is they cover the whole class of words of that part of speech.

In other words a **grammatical category** is a *systematic opposition of different morphological forms possessing different referential meanings*. Each grammatical category is composed of at least two contrasting forms. Otherwise a category would stop existing.

In general, an opposeme of any grammatical category consists of as many members (or opposites) as there are particular manifestations of the general meaning. Thus, a **morphological opposeme** is *a minimum set of words revealing (by the difference in their forms) only (and all) the particular manifestations of some general grammatical meaning*. Any morphological category is the system of such opposemes whose members differ in form to express only (and all) the particular manifestations of the general meaning of the category [25; 23–24].

Grammatical category unites in itself particular **grammatical meanings**. For example, the grammatical category of gender unites the meanings of the masculine, feminine, neuter and common genders in the Ukrainian language. Each grammatical category is connected, as a minimum, with two forms. For example, the grammatical category of number comprises the forms of singularity and plurality.

Grammatical meaning is an abstract meaning added to the lexical meaning of a word, expressing its relations to other words or classes of words. As a rule, a word has several grammatical meanings. Grammatical meanings are realized in a **grammatical word form**.

Grammatical form of a word is the variety of the same word differing from other forms of this word by its grammatical meaning. For example, in the Ukrainian word-form *батьку* the ending *-y* expresses the grammatical meaning of the masculine gender, singular number, dative case.

Grammatical form of a word can be **simple (synthetic)**, in which the grammatical meanings are formed by the ending, suffix, prefix

or stress, etc. (*дош* — *дошу* — *дощем*); or **composite (analytical)**, created by adding several words (*буду говорити, більш привабливий*). The **analytical-synthetic** grammatical word form is a combination of two previous types of word forms. For example, *в університеті* (the local case is expressed by the flexion and the preposition); *малював би, малювала б* (the grammatical meaning of number and gender is expressed by the form of the main verb, and the meaning of the conditional mood — by the particle *би*) [2; 40–41].

6. Part of speech as one of the main grammatical notions

Every language contains thousands upon thousands of lexemes. When describing them it is possible either to analyze every lexeme separately or to unite them into classes with more or less common features. Linguists make use of both approaches. A dictionary usually describes individual lexemes, a grammar book mostly deals with classes of lexemes, traditionally called **parts of speech**.

Parts of speech are generally said to be classes of words having the same meaning, morphological forms and functions. The factor of **meaning** plays an important part in all languages because the main function of language is to convey information. By meaning we do not refer to the individual (lexical) meaning of each separate word but the one common to all the words of the given class and constituting its essence. For example, the meaning of the verb as a type of word is “process” whatever the individual meaning of a separate verb may happen to be.

By **form** we mean the morphological characteristics of a type of word. Thus, the noun is characterized by the category of number (singular and plural), the verb by tense, mood etc.

By **function** we mean the syntactic properties of a type of word: method of combining with other words and forming syntactic structures. For example, a verb combines with nouns forming structures of

predication, e.g. *the boy writes* and structures of complementation, e.g. *to write letters*; a noun can combine with an adjective or another noun forming structures of modification, e.g. *a letter box, a large box*. On the other hand, by function we mean the syntactic function of a class of words in the sentence, e.g. a noun as a subject, a verb as a predicate.

The relative importance of “form” and “function” factors is different for languages in different systems. For synthetic languages (Ukrainian) form is more important, while syntactic function is important for analytical languages (English).

If we were to distinguish between the parts of speech of the words *мислити* and *мислення* we can say that their meaning is the same: *мислити — властивість людини, мислення — властивість людини*. They denote the same. Only the grammatical form helps us to distinguish between the verb and the noun. It is obvious that the basis for distinguishing parts of speech must be the unity of form and meaning. The content of a part of speech is its meaning; its form is the way it is linguistically treated. The word *мислити* is treated linguistically as process (*мислиш, мислю* etc.) while the word *мислення* is treated as substance alongside with *мисленням, мисленню* etc. The form is usually implied by morphology, syntax and phonetics.

A part of speech is a word or a class of words linguistically representing phenomena and relationships of the objective reality (including man and the products of his mind) in a specific way (as substances, properties, changes etc.)

The lexemes of a part of speech are first of all united by their content, that is by their meaning. Nevertheless, the meaning of a part of speech is closely connected with certain typical grammatical meanings. Thus the general meaning of a part of speech is neither lexical nor grammatical, but it is connected with both, and we call it lexico-grammatical meaning.

Lexemes united by the general lexico-grammatical meaning of “substance” are called nouns. Those having the general lexico-grammatical meaning of “action” are called verbs and so on.

At the same time it should be borne in mind that definitions “substance”, “action”, “quality” are conventional. It is easy to see the notion

of “substance” in nouns like *water* or *steel*, but a certain stretch of imagination is necessary to discern “substance” in nouns like *hatred*, *silence*, or “action” in the verbs *belong*, *resemble*, *contain* and the like [25; 32–33].

The general lexico-grammatical meaning is the intrinsic property of a part of speech. Connected with it are also some properties that find, so to say, outward expression. Lexico-grammatical morphemes are one of these properties. The stems of noun lexemes often include the morpheme *-er*, *-ness*, *-ship*, *-ment* (*worker*, *firmness*, *friendship*, *management*). The stems of verb lexemes include the morphemes *-ize*, *-ify*, *be-*, *en-* (*modernize*, *purify*, *becloud*, *enrich*). Adjective stems often have the suffixes *-ful*, *-less*, *-ish*, *-ous* (*careful*, *fearless*, *boyish*, *continuous*). Thus, the presence of a certain lexico-grammatical morpheme (or stem-building element) in the stem of a lexeme often marks it as belonging to a definite part of speech. Other stem-building elements are of comparatively little significance as distinctive features of parts of speech. For example, the vowel interchange observed in *food* — *feed*, *blood* — *bleed* is not systematic and is also found within a lexeme *foot* — *feet*.

A part of speech is characterized by its grammatical categories manifested in the opposemes and paradigms of its lexemes. For instance, nouns have the categories of number and case. Verbs possess the categories of tense, voice, mood, etc. Adjectives have the category of the degrees of comparison. That is why the paradigms of lexemes belonging to different parts of speech are different.

Another important feature of a part of speech is its combinability, that is the ability to form certain combinations of words. When speaking of the combinability of parts of speech, lexico-grammatical meanings are to be considered first. In this sense combinability is the power of a lexico-grammatical class of words to form combinations of definite patterns with words of certain classes irrespective of their lexical or grammatical meanings. For example, owing to the lexico-grammatical meaning of nouns (“substance”) and prepositions (“relation (of substances)”) these two parts of speech often go together in speech. The model *to (from, at) school* characterizes both nouns and prepositions as distinct

from adverbs which do not usually form combinations of the type *to (from, at) loudly.

Parts of speech are said to be characterized also by their function in a sentence. A noun is mostly used as a subject or an object, a verb usually functions as a predicate, an adjective — as an attribute. To some extent this is true. There is some connection between parts of speech and parts of a sentence, but it never assumes the nature of obligatory correspondence. The subject of a sentence may be expressed not only by a noun but also by a pronoun, a numeral, a gerund, an infinitive, etc. On the other hand, a noun can (alone or with some other word) fulfill the function of almost any part of a sentence. Now, prepositions, conjunctions, particles, etc. are usually not recognized as fulfilling the function of any part of a sentence, so with regard to them the meaning of the term “syntactical function” is quite different.

Thus, a part of speech is a class of lexemes characterized by: 1) its lexico-grammatical meaning, 2) its lexico-grammatical morphemes (stem-building elements), 3) its grammatical categories or its paradigms, 4) its combinability, and 5) its functions in a sentence.

All these features distinguish, for example, the lexeme represented by the word *teacher* from that represented by the word *teach* and mark the words of the first lexeme as nouns and those of the other lexeme as verbs. But very often lexemes or even parts of speech lack some of these features. The noun lexeme *information* lacks feature 3. The adjective lexeme *deaf* lacks both feature 2 and 3. So do the adverbs *back*, *seldom*, *very*, the prepositions *with*, *of*, *at*, etc.

Features 1, 4 and 5 are the most general properties of parts of speech [25; 33–38].

7. Contrastive studies of languages

Any human language is characterized by three types of constitutional features: *universal* (pertaining to all or to the majority of languages),

typological (characteristic only of a certain group of languages, creating a language type) and *individual* (found only in one language). To reveal the mentioned features is possible only with the help of *comparison* or *contrasting* (порівняння чи зіставлення).

The method of *comparison* or *contrasting* is not a new one and is employed as a major one by a number of linguistic disciplines, namely: the *comparative-historic linguistics* (порівняльно-історичне мовознавство), studying the genetic kinship of languages in their development; the *areal linguistics* (ареальна лінгвістика), dealing with languages of a particular geographic area despite their genetic relations with respect to their mutual influence of one language upon the other; the *typological linguistics* (типологічна лінгвістика), which on the basis of studying similarities and differences within languages classifies languages according to certain types; and, finally, the *contrastive linguistics* (зіставне мовознавство чи контрастивна лінгвістика). But the matter is that the contrastive linguistics has not yet found its final position within the system of linguistic disciplines. Debatable remain issues whether this discipline belongs to general or special linguistics, synchronic or diachronic one. To define the status of contrastive linguistics it seems expedient to clarify its connections with other mentioned linguistic disciplines.

The correlation of *contrastive linguistics* with *comparative-historic linguistics* is in the fact that both of them compare languages. Nevertheless the aim of such a comparison is different. The comparative-historic linguistics is oriented towards defining the degree of kinship, the common origin of languages, reconstructing the proto-language (the common linguistic parent or the language as a basis from which the related languages developed), as well as defining laws according to which this development followed. In its turn, the contrastive linguistics aims at revealing differences and similarities in language structures, in ways of expressing the same meanings and in differentiating functions of one-type elements of a language structure.

Unlike *contrastive linguistics* the *areal linguistics* has as its task to characterize the territorial division of language peculiarities, to define the areas of language interaction, to research the processes of language

convergence, that is to give the territorial characteristics of language peculiarities of the languages being in contact on a certain territory [11; 15–16].

The principle of contrasting is just as well used by the two linguistic disciplines: *contrastive typology* and *contrastive linguistics*. Since contrastive linguistics employs a lot of data accumulated by typological linguistics, it is of interest to look closer at their correlation.

Typology as a branch of linguistics aims at establishing similar general linguistic categories serving as a basis for the classification of languages of different types, irrespective of their genealogical relationship.

Contrastive typology (CT) represents a linguistic subject of typology, based on the methods of comparison or contrasting. Like typology proper, CT also aims at establishing the most general structural types of languages on the basis of their dominant or common phonetic, morphological, lexical and syntactic features. Apart from this the CT may equally treat dominant or common features only, as well as divergent features only, which are found both in languages of the same structural type (synthetic languages, analytical, etc.) as well as in languages of different structural types (synthetic and analytical, etc.). The object of contrastive typology may be bound with separate features and language units or phenomena pertained to both living and one or two dead languages. Consequently, the object of investigation may involve an extensive language area or the restricted object of investigation. Due to this there are distinguished several branches of contrastive typological investigation often referred to as *separate typologies*. The main of these typologies are the following:

- *Universal typology* investigates all languages of the world and aims at singling out in them such phenomena, which are common in all languages. These features are referred to as absolute universals. Their identification is carried out not only on the basis of the existing living languages but also on the basis of dead languages like Sanskrit, ancient Greek or Latin.
- *Special typology*, in contrast to universal typology, usually investigates concrete languages, one of which is, as a rule, the native

tongue. The language in which the description of isomorphic and allomorphic features is performed is usually referred to as *meta-language*. In our case the meta-language is English.

- *General typology* has for its object of investigation the most general phonetic, morphological, lexical, syntactic or stylistic features. At the same time *the partial typology* investigates a restricted number of language features, for example, the system of syntactic level units.
- Contrastive typology as a branch of linguistics employs some terms and notions of its own. The principal and the most frequently occurring are the following ones:
- *Absolute universals* (абсолютні або повні універсалії) i. e. features or phenomena of a language level pertaining (відносно) to any language of the world, e.g. vowels and consonants, word stress and utterance stress, intonation, sentences, parts of the sentence, parts of speech, etc.
- *Near universals* (неповні або часткові універсалії) i. e. features or phenomena common in many or some languages under typological investigation.
- *Typologically dominant features* (типологічні домінанти) are features or phenomena dominating at the language level or in the structure of some of the contrasted languages. Dominant in present-day English are known to be analytical means: rigid word order in word groups and sentences, the prominent role of prepositions and placement as means of connection and expression of case relations and syntactic functions (e.g. *books for my friends* and *books by my friends*). The change of placement of the part of the sentence may completely change its sense. Compare (cf.) *The hunter killed the hare.* — *The hare killed the hunter.* In Ukrainian the change of placement of the main parts of the sentence usually does not change the meaning of the sentence, as in the same sentence in Ukrainian: *Мисливець застрілив зайця.* *Зайця застрілив мисливець.* In Ukrainian everything is just on the contrary: case, gender and number categories are expressed by means of inflexions: *братові книжки* — *братових книжок*;

він співав, вона співала, дитя співало. Consequently, the dominant (and typical features) of a language predetermine its structural type as analytical, synthetic, agglutinative etc.

- *Isomorphic features* (ізоморфні риси) are common features in languages under contrastive analysis. Isomorphic in English and Ukrainian are, for example, the categories of number, person, tense, as well as parts of speech, the existence of sentences etc.
- *Allomorphic features* (аломорфні риси) are observed in one language and missing in the other, for example the gerund and analytical verb forms in English, which are missing in Ukrainian [10; 13–15, 17–19].

8. Contrastive linguistics as a science and an academic discipline: its subject matter and tasks

Contrastive linguistics (CL) (other terms confrontative and comparative linguistics) as a language discipline was formed on the basis of typology studies in the middle of the 20-th century and has been intensively developing since 50-ies of the 20-th century. **The aim of CL** is the comparative study of two, less often more than two languages, in order to find out their similarities and differences on all levels of the language structure. The early sources of CL can be regarded as investigation of differences in grammars, published in different countries (especially actively in countries of Western Europe) and the works on the typological comparison of non-related languages, carried out in connection with tasks of the typological classification of languages. As a rule, CL deals with materials on the synchronic level of the language. From the point of view of quantity, investigations concerning different levels of language are distributed not equally: the biggest part of research works is devoted to the contrastive grammar (including word formation), the smaller number is devoted to the contrastive phonology, and still smaller number — to works in contrasting lexical systems.

Singling out of CL from the large sphere of comparative studies of different languages was caused by holding special conferences de-

voted to contrastive studies (the first one took place in George-town, the USA, in 1968), as well as including the CL problem issues into the program of international linguistic congresses since the year 1972. The birth of CL is believed to be connected with the appearance of the work "Linguistics across cultures" by Robert Lado in 1957 (Ладо Р. Лінгвістика поверх кордонів культур). But it should be mentioned that works by Ukrainian and Russian scholars (the end of the 19-th — the beg. of the 20-th centuries) abounded in rich materials of contrastive language studies, though being closer to typological studies: works by O. O. Potebnya, Boduen de Courtene, L.V. Shcherba and others.

CL research of the second half of the 20-th century, especially contrastive grammar research, was enriched by works of the outstanding Ukrainian scholar Yuriy Oleksiyovych Zhluktenko (1915–1990). Yu.O.Zhluktenko is the author of a series of contrastive works of English, German, Ukrainian languages. His work "A Comparative Grammar of English and Ukrainian" (published in 1960) [5] is to be mentioned in this regard. A lot of interesting and original ideas within the field of contrastive linguistics is presented in his generally theoretical articles "Contrastive analysis as a method of language research" [3], "Some issues of the contrastive analysis of languages" [4], "Contrastive linguistics: problems and perspectives (with the co-author V. N. Bubyk) [6]. Under his editorship there were published such collective research works as: "Notes on contrastive linguistics" [3], "Contrastive studies on the grammar of English, Ukrainian, and Russian languages" [15]. Yu. O. Zhluktenko can rightly be considered the initiator of contrastive linguistics development.

Recent period in contrastive studies is marked by such an important work, concerning contrastive and typological language research, as the "Contrastive typology of the English and Ukrainian languages" by the prominent Ukrainian linguist Ilko Vakulovych Korunets' (published in 2003) [10]. Since a lot of works in contrastive linguistics tend to be of typological character, it is obvious that the place of CL among other linguistic disciplines still should be specified. This statement can be found in the work of another outstanding Ukrainian scholar Mykhaylo Petrovych Kocherhan "Fundamentals of contrastive

linguistics” (“Основи зіставного мовознавства”) published in 2006 [11]. His textbook is devoted to such issues of contrastive linguistics as: general issues of contrastive linguistics; contrastive phonetics and phonology; contrastive derivatology and grammar; contrastive lexicology and phraseology. In the textbook M. P. Kocherhan presents his understanding of contrastive linguistics as a discipline on the modern stage of linguistic theory development, namely:

Contrastive linguistics (confrontative linguistics) is a branch of linguistics which studies two or more languages irrespective of their kinship with the aim of revealing their similarities and differences on all levels of the language structure (phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical-semantic).

For the sake of precision we consider it necessary to present this definition in Ukrainian:

Зіставне мовознавство (контрастивна лінгвістика, конфронтативна лінгвістика) — розділ мовознавства, який вивчає дві чи більше мов незалежно від їхньої спорідненості з метою виявлення їхніх подібностей і відмінностей на всіх рівнях мовної структури (фонологічному, морфологічному, синтаксичному, лексико-семантичному) [11; 9].

According to M. P. Kocherhan, the *object of contrastive linguistics are any two or more languages irrespective of their genealogical and typological nature*. Nevertheless, the bigger differences in the structure (type) of languages are, the more vivid the contrast is, revealing of which is the main task of contrastive linguistics. For the linguistic science to reveal the hidden peculiarities of close by their origin and structure languages is of no less importance since their specific features can be noticed in the majority of cases only under condition of their contrastive analysis [11; 12]. As far as the number of languages to be contrasted is concerned, the majority of linguists are oriented towards two languages though recently there have been appearing a lot of works devoted to the study of three and even bigger number of languages. This statement is proved by professor A. E. Levytsky, another prominent Ukrainian linguist, who in his recent research on “Comparative grammar of English and Ukrainian languages” (pub-

lished in 2008) considers the *object* of the Comparative linguistic investigations as a comparison of two or more linguistic systems at the synchronous level. Furthermore, the *general target of comparative linguistics*, according to A. E. Levytsky (preferring the term “comparative linguistics” to the term “contrastive linguistics”), is to establish the most essential convergences and divergences in the languages of the world, their classification, systematization and, as the result, the elaboration of recommendations as to the mastering of a language [12; 8–9].

Contrastive research is largely connected with the synchronic aspect of the language, that is different languages are contrasted at a certain time period without regarding the former stages of their development. Some scholars even believe that the contrastive linguistics is uniquely a synchronous one. Nevertheless languages are, and sometimes should be, contrasted in diachrony. The synchronic approach is more suitable for the stage of the language data analysis. On the synthesis stage it, as a rule, is accompanied by the diachronic approach.

Present-day comparative linguistics (CL), according to the view of the Ukrainian linguist A. E. Levytsky [12; 9], has close ties with all branches of linguistics (phonetics, lexicology and grammar), that are reflected in particular, specific lingual form of languages under comparison. Moreover, CL interacts with a number of non-linguistic fields: psychology, pedagogy, ethnology, geography and cultural studies. Psychology and pedagogy are essential for the process of teaching a foreign language that is why CL is directly connected with them. Exceptionally important are relations of CL with ethnology and cultural studies. Professor A. E. Levytsky claims that we may also speak of close ties between CL and the theory of cross-cultural communication since each language phenomenon is marked by the asymmetry of form and meaning analogous to the one revealed in a language sign. Of importance is comparing languages in the light of external linguistics (e.g. sociolinguistics) with respect to the spheres of usage, i.e. according to the schemes of different language functioning in society and their interaction both on some territory in the course of historical development [12; 9–10].

What concerns *the subject matter and the tasks* of CL there exist two different points of view — from treating this discipline as a “purely” linguistic theory, closely connected with typology (K. James) [1], to the narrow practical application of contrastive works, meant to serve the needs of foreign languages study (G. Nickel) [14].

Contrastive linguistics as a merely auxiliary discipline, serving for the needs of the methodology of language teaching, is considered by foreign linguistics (W. Nemser) [13]. As a second rate or auxiliary one contrastive linguistics is treated also by those scholars, who consider the aim of CL to be revealing cross-cultural similarities and differences, which further can become the basis for the typological generalizations. Such an approach limits the tasks and diminishes the status of contrastive linguistics, attaching to it a merely practical character. According to this approach CL deals largely with cataloging of cross-language similarities and differences. It is true that CL focuses on language similarities and differences, nevertheless revealing and studying them is not the ultimate goal but the way to the deeper comprehension of language laws, including language universals. In this respect M.P. Kocherhan agrees with the foreign researcher K. James, who claims that contrastive linguistics includes features of both the “purely” theoretical and practical or applied linguistics [11; 13].

The *synchronic-comparative method* or *contrastive / confrontative method* (according to M. P. Kocherhan these terms are considered as synonyms in Ukrainian linguistic terminology: синхронно-порівняльний метод, контрастивний аналіз, або конфронтативний, зіставний, зіставно-типологічний аналіз тощо) gives the possibility to single out the contrastive linguistics as a separate linguistic branch. Of course, the results of such an analysis can have different ways of application, including the merely practical one. In this respect G. Nickel differentiates between the theoretical and the practical contrastive linguistics [11; 13].

According to the Ukrainian linguist M.P. Kocherhan, contrastive linguistics really aims at solving both theoretical and practical tasks.

The *theoretical tasks* of contrastive linguistics include the following:

- to reveal similarities and differences in languages, the coincidence and difference by usage of language means of expression;

- to research the tendencies characteristic for contrasted languages;
- to define the cross-language correspondences and lacunas;
- to find out the reason for similarities and differences;
- to verify the deductive universals on the material of contrasted languages.

The *practical (linguo-didactic) tasks* of contrastive linguistics are the following:

- to define the methodological relevance of similarities and differences between the contrasted languages;
- to establish the character of the cross-language interference;
- to reveal the difficulties in the study of a foreign language;
- to outline the frames of the application of comparison as a way to teach a foreign language;
- to work out the procedure of the cross-language contrasting as a means to teach a foreign language.

According to the enumerated tasks there can be singled out two directions — the contrastive study of a language with the theoretical aim and the contrastive study of a language with the *linguo-didactic* aim. Therefore, on the one hand, the contrastive research is aimed at the theoretical branch of the characterological typology, on the other — at the practical needs of translation and foreign language teaching [11; 14].

The *topical tasks* of contrastive linguistics include as well the research of the most general laws of divergence, revealed by the contrastive analysis. The contrastive analysis can be considered a complete one only in the case, when language units have been analyzed in texts and different speech genres. Previously the contrastive analysis was focused on the data of the language system, that is on contrasting of separate lexemes or their groups, morphological categories and syntactic constructions, etc.; recently the sphere of contrastive analysis includes speech as well [11; 15], in particular speech acts and their realization following the general direction of modern linguistics development [12; 48].

Modern contrastive linguistics, according to A.E. Levytsky [12; 48], appears a defined science with its goals, subject and methods of analysis. Its development and value are testified by an increasing number of works, general theoretical descriptions of language pairs that cover different language levels — from phonology to stylistics, and the expansion of the sphere of the comparative analysis. It attracts very diverse aspects of linguistics to the sphere of its interests: ethnolinguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, linguistic semiotics, cognitive linguistics, communication linguistics and others. At the same time comparison provides broader and more valuable data for linguistic typology, methodology of foreign language teaching, translation theory, lexicography and is one of the most effective forms of connection between fundamental linguistics and its applied aspects [12; 48–49].

9. Contrastive grammar as a part of contrastive linguistics: its tasks

Contrastive grammar (CG) of English and Ukrainian languages, being part of contrastive linguistics, has as its **object** the grammar structure of these two contrasted languages. The **subject matter** of contrastive grammar are the peculiarities of expression of the main grammatical categories and syntactic structures in both contrasted languages.

Grammatical phenomena of different languages can be contrasted according to three aspects: according to the content (у плані змісту), according to the expression means (у плані вираження), and according to the type of functioning (у плані функціонування).

According to the content (grammatical meanings, categories) languages can have the following differences:

- a) one language can have a certain grammatical category which is absent in another language. For example, in English, French, German, Rumanian and Swedish languages there is the category of determination (категорія означеності), whereas all Slavonic languages, except Bulgarian and Macedonian, do not possess it;

- b) a grammatical category exists in certain two or more languages but does not coincide according to the content and shades of meaning, or according to its subtypes. For example, the category of gender is present in Ukrainian and French languages, but the Ukrainian language has three genders (masculine, feminine and neuter genders), whereas the French language has only two genders (masculine and feminine genders); the categories of tense and mood are present both in Ukrainian and English, but the number of tense forms and moods is different. The type of divergence (тип розбіжності), when one type categories have a different amount of content in both contrasted languages, is the most widespread one.

According to the expression means ways of divergence can concern the correlation between the synthetic and analytical means of expression. Nevertheless one should not confuse the synthetic and analytical means of expression of a language with the synthetic or analytical language structure. There are no languages characterized purely either by synthetic or analytical means of expression. One can speak about the type of a language only taking into account the level of the language structure. For example, both Ukrainian and German languages have two major types of the word change — the synthetic one (by means of external and internal flexions) and the analytical (by means of function words). In Ukrainian the synthetic way is prevalent. The German language is characterized by a more or less equal combination of synthetic and analytical means, whereas in English analytical means are dominant.

According to the type of functioning the divergence can be obvious in the following way:

- a) in the correlation between grammar and vocabulary. Thus, in Ukrainian the forms of singularity and plurality are possessed only by countable nouns, the category of voice/state is possessed only by transitive verbs, the degree of comparison is characteristic only of qualitative adjectives. In some other languages (for example, in French) lexico-grammatical categories are not so

- strictly limited: some words can acquire certain grammatical categories non-compatible with their semantics, changing simultaneously their meaning (abstract nouns can acquire the plural form, intransitive verbs often become transitive);
- b) in the secondary functions of grammatical forms (the usage in secondary functions of different parts of speech, grammatical categories, syntactic constructions). Compare: in English *They told me* “Мені сказали” and *I was told* “Я був сказаний” (literally) — the latter is impossible in Ukrainian.

Since the morphological level of a language has different units (a morpheme, a word, a grammatical meaning, a grammatical category, a part of speech, etc.), of importance is the choice of some constant for contrasting. The unit of comparison (одиниця зіставлення) on the morphological level should meet the following criteria: it should have the functional similarity and embrace not some separate words but a class of homogeneous words. These criteria are fully satisfied by a grammatical category. The differences of morphological systems of languages are found, first of all, in the ways of expression of morphological meanings, wider — grammatical categories [11; 165–167].

Therefore, one of the most important notions of CG is the notion of grammatical category. The **grammatical category** is the system of opposed to each other rows of grammatical forms with homogeneous (однорідний) meanings, for example the grammatical category of case, gender etc. The number of grammatical categories can vary from language to language and depends on the language type.

The tasks carried out in contrastive grammar studies are first of all corresponding to the demands of practical usage, that is: the methodology of language study, compiling different textbooks, dictionaries and reference books in translation techniques etc. Especially important are such contrastive grammar textbooks for school teaching. Contrasting of the two languages should help their mutual study. Since in the process of a foreign language mastering there appears material for contrasting and comparing, a lot of native language phenomena are comprehended and studied better. On the one hand, native language

can have positive influence on the process of foreign language acquisition since learners can operate the same experience, the same methods and skills they used while studying their own language. On the other hand, such influence can be negative since learners can transfer to the foreign language those phenomena that are rather specific in their native tongue and thus we come up against the problem of the “interference” phenomenon.

Contrastive two language grammars and contrastive type of research are of use to translators and editors as well as linguists in general. Contrasting two language systems can reveal certain regularities in one of them which have not become the object of study till this time. In recent years the synchronic comparative study of languages has become still more topical in connection with the research in the field of machine translation. Close connection of contrastive grammar with the teaching methodology is obvious first of all because of the fact that CG gives the basis for methodology to invent new teaching methods. CG is a subdivision of the linguistic science, whereas methodology belongs to pedagogical studies. That is why the CG serves for the needs of a number of other spheres of culture and science, not restricting itself to the needs of school teaching [5; 4].

10. Methods of research, used in contrastive studies

Contrastive research is carried out with the help of several methods. Thus, comparing of isomorphic features can very often be performed with the help of the *deductive* and the *inductive methods* (deduction — the process of reasoning using general rules or principles to form a judgement about a particular fact or situation — від загального до конкретного; induction — the process of reasoning using known facts to produce general rules or principles — від конкретно до загального). The deductive method is based on logical calculation, which suggests all admissive variants of realization of a certain phenomenon in speech of some contrasted languages. For example, the existence of the attributive AN and NA structure of word-group

patterns in English and in Ukrainian is indisputable. Compare: *the green pasture — the pasture green* (G. Byron), *зелене пасовисько — пасовисько зелене*. Consequently, the deductive method of analysis can be rather helpful and not only when contrasting syntactic level units.

The *immediate constituents method* (the IC's) is employed to contrast only language units with the aim of establishing their constituent parts in one or some contrasted languages. The IC method is often employed to single out constituent parts of the syntactic level units both at the sentence level and at word-group level. Thus, the sentence *He learns many new words every week* can be subdivided into the following constituent word-groups: 1) *He learns* (predicative word group); 2) *many new words* (attributive word-group); 3) *every week* (adverbial word group). At word-group level a further splitting is observed: *He/learns; many/new//words; every/week*. The Ukrainian equivalent of this sentence has the same types of word groups with the identical division into ICs: 1) *Він/вивчає*; 2) *багато/нових//слів*; 3) *кожного/тижня*.

The *transformational method* is more often employed than the ICs method. The American linguist Noam Chomsky within the generative grammar introduced the notion of transformation. Many scholars dealing with the contrastive linguistics research employed the notions of deep and surface structure since the statement that different languages can have the same *deep structure* allowed them to contrast language units with different *surface structure*. Thus, transformation may reveal the difference in the form of expression in the contrasted languages. Compare: *Вас запрошують взяти участь у науковій конференції* (an indefinite personal sentence, active voice), which has for its equivalent in English *You are invited to take part in the scientific conference* (i.e. a definite personal sentence with a passive voice verbal predicate). Transformation may often be required by the peculiarity of the syntactic structure of the source language (or the target language) unit. Compare: *The lesson over, all students went to the reading hall*. can be rendered into Ukrainian with the help of employing predicative word-groups *Після того, як заняття закінчилися* (*Оскільки заняття закінчилися...*) or with the help of the prepositional noun phrase, expressing time *Після закінчення занять студенти піш-*

ли ... The nominative absolute participial construction *The lesson over* (i.e. *being* or *having been over*) has to be substituted i.e. transformed into an adverbial clause of time or cause (*Після того, як заняття закінчилися/ Оскільки заняття закінчилися, всі студенти пішли до читальні*).

Apart from these some other methods of analysis are helpful for the establishment of structural or semantic isomorphisms and allomorphisms in the contrasted languages. According to the linguist I.V. Korunets' this is the *contrastive linguistic method*, which is usually employed to investigate a restricted number of genealogically related or non-related languages. The object of contrastive linguistics in general is the meaning, form and functioning of certain language units, their features or phenomena. Unlike contrastive typology, contrastive linguistics does not treat language features or phenomena with the aim of establishing isomorphic or allomorphic features and universals. Divergent features or phenomena in the languages under contrastive linguistic investigation are considered to be irregularities or exceptions to some general rules. The aim of contrastive linguistics has never been to establish systemic relations on a global scale, or to establish universal features. Despite all this, the contrastive linguistic method, when employed both synchronically and diachronically, allows to establish valuable theoretical and practical results, providing the reliable data on various aspects of languages under investigation. Thus contrastive linguistics contributes greatly to the typologies of the investigated languages [10; 20–24].

M.P. Kocherhan is of the view that the method of *contrastive analysis is the totality of the ways of language research and description with the help of its systematic comparison with another language with the aim to reveal its peculiarities on the background of common features (зіставний метод — сукупність прийомів дослідження і опису мови шляхом її системного порівняння з іншою мовою з метою виявлення її специфіки на фоні спільних рис)* [11; 77].

The method of contrastive analysis is directed first of all towards revealing the differences between the two or the larger number of languages (the unique features — унікалії) though it does not ignore

common features of the contrasted languages. It is as if the reverse side of the comparative-historic method: the comparative-historic method has as its aim to establish the correspondences between the contrasted languages; the method of contrastive analysis, in its turn, searches, first of all, for the differences. This method can be applied to any languages irrespective of their genealogical, typological or areal origin for the analysis of the correlation of their structural elements and the structure all together mainly on the synchronic level of analysis taking into consideration all factors of their interaction, interpenetration and mutual influence on all language levels [11; 78].

The effectiveness of the contrastive analysis method depends on the appropriateness of its usage, that is what is contrasted and in what way it is contrasted. Depending on the direction of analysis, according to R.Shternemann [26], there can be distinguished one-sided and two-sided (many-sided) contrastive analysis (односторонній та двосторонній зіставний аналіз).

According to the *one-sided approach* the initial point of research is one of contrasted languages. Cross-language comparison is carried out in the direction “the initial language / or the source language — the target language” (вихідна мова — цільова мова). The source language performs the role of the system of correlated notions for the target language description. Such an approach reveals the meanings of lexical and grammatical phenomena of the source language that are reflected on the level of meanings of the target language and comprise those means of the target language which it has for rendering meanings of the source language. First of all, the structure of the meaning of a certain unit in a source language is determined, that is the semasiological analysis is carried out, later on this unit is projected on the amount of the meanings of the target language. For example, German *wenn* — English 1) *when* (temporal meaning) and 2) *if, in case* (conditional meaning).

The one-sided approach is very similar to the way of two-language or bilingual dictionaries compiling: for the word of the source language is accomplished with the equivalent correlative units of the target language. The results of the one-sided analysis are not reversible (результати одностороннього аналізу не є оборотними). If we try

to “reverse” the one-sided procedure, we will have quite other results [11; 79].

According to the *two-sided* (or *many-sided*) approach the basis for comparison is the “third member” (**tertium comparationis**) — a certain extra-linguistic notion, a phenomenon which does not belong to any of contrasted languages, but is deductively formed by a meta-language; and the ways by which it is expressed in contrasted languages are researched. The value of the two-sided approach is in the fact that it gives the possibility to reveal all language means to express something [11; 80].

For example, if the researcher is interested in the way the future action is expressed in English and in Ukrainian, he/she will find out that in Ukrainian there is only one future tense “майбутній час” where in English we have 4 future tenses (Future Simple, Future Continuous, Future Perfect and Future Perfect Continuous) and besides two present tenses (Present Simple and Present Continuous) also have the ability to express a certain future meaning. Therefore, the two-sided approach gives the possibility to give a thorough description of a researched phenomenon. Since lexical and grammatical units are mostly polysemantic, this approach takes into consideration only those meanings which correspond to the basis of comparison. Thus studying the tense forms expressing the future meaning, we take into account only the “future meaning” of present tenses and not their “present meanings”.

The two approaches have their advantages and disadvantages. The advantage of the one-sided approach is in the fact that it can be used without taking into account meta-language, and the drawback is that the comparison can be carried out only in one direction (the reflection of the second language in the mirror of the first language). The advantage of the two-sided approach is that two languages are treated as equal, whereas the disadvantage is that the comparison relies on meta-language which does not exist for the time being (there are different suggestions concerning it).

The differentiation between the one-sided and two-sided approach is close to the difference between semasiologic and onomasiologic approaches. According to the semasiologic approach facts are

considered from the form to their content, and according to the onomasiologic — from the content to the form [11; 81].

11. The problem of the language-etalon for comparison (tertium comparationis)

The effectiveness of the contrastive analysis depends on the well-chosen etalon (the basis for comparison, the common denominator), on the basis of which the realization of a certain characteristic feature is defined. That is why researchers dealing with contrastive studies believe that for this a special meta-language is necessary. Meta-language as a rule does not resemble any real language system but embodies a certain ideal type, serving as an instrument for comparison of real language systems. Such a meta-language should possess the names of all units and characteristics of languages — the objects of research (it should possess the universal characteristics of all languages), and be suitable for comparison of all languages. Ideally the meta-language should be universal to compare the systems of different languages (known and unknown). The concrete existing languages are viewed as the outcome of the language-etalon. The characteristic of a certain language lies in pointing to the way of transferring to it from the language-etalon. The comparison of languages with the unique language-etalon would positively influence the research results — it would give the possibility to achieve homogeneous results, which would easily undergo the contrastive analysis. In this case a set of differences from the language-etalon would make a specific characteristic of a researched language. Nevertheless, such a language has not been constructed yet.

For example, by contrasting English and Ukrainian languages one can take as a basis either of them. Contrastive description will vary greatly at this. If one takes the English language as a basic one, then it is important to clarify what means are used in the Ukrainian language to render the meaning of English articles. If one relies on the Ukrainian language, then it is necessary to find out in what way the English language renders the meanings of Ukrainian aspect verb forms.

Therefore, comparison with some language, which is conventionally taken as a language-etalon, does not have an absolute character and yields relative results, which do not always become the reliable basis for conclusions. Exactly by using the native language as a basis for comparison (that is the language-etalon) with a foreign language one can easily and fully reveal contrasts (allomorphic features), but in such a way one cannot build the dialectics of the common, different and unique as well as one cannot build a similar description of the language under research. In many cases such a language-etalon will not have names for the characteristic features of the language under study (the category of definiteness/indefiniteness of the English language cannot be described via the system of the Ukrainian language, in its turn, the category of aspect of the Ukrainian language — via the system of the English language [11; 81–82]).

A synonymic term *tertium comparationis* (“мова-еталон” — “третій член порівняння” або “основа зіставлення”) is often used in the meaning of the “language-etalon”. The terms mentioned are broader since they comprise not only a natural or an artificially constructed language, but also narrower, more concrete objects as a basis for comparison, for example, some notional category (causality, possessivity, modality, definiteness, etc.). Very often and not quite correctly they are called the language-etalon, nevertheless they are not a language, but only the basis for comparison, the third member, the notion on the basis of which ways of its expression in the contrasted languages are revealed. In such cases one should use the terms the *basis for comparison* or *tertium comparationis*.

As a *tertium comparationis* in language contrasting one can use separate concepts (such research is widely practised), propositions (semantic invariants common for all the members of modal and communicative paradigms of sentences and their derivative constructions), models of situations and coherent texts, taking into account the ethnic-cultural peculiarities of contrasted languages, social, age, situational correlation of the participants of a communicative act.

Therefore, as a basis for comparison one can use various means: a specifically constructed artificial language, or a symbolic language,

consisting of general artificial rules; a certain separate language with a well-developed system; a certain system; linguistic (grammatical, semantic, etc.) category; certain differential characteristics; a certain grammatical rule; a certain semantic field; phonetic, morphological, syntactic and other models; a certain method; the interlingua by translation; the typological category, etc [11; 84–85].

12. Parts of speech classification in English and Ukrainian languages

The grammatical structure of the English and Ukrainian languages has naturally a lot of differences. The Ukrainian language, as well as other eastern Slavonic languages (Russian and Byelorussian) has the typical flexional (флексивний)/ synthetic (синтетичний) grammatical structure. It means that grammatical functions of words and their relation with other words in a sentence are expressed by the way of changing the word itself, that is by adding suffixes, with the help of the inner flexion (inner flexion — is differentiating of certain word forms with the help of vowel alternation (чергування голосних), e.g.: *лягти — лиз*), consonant alternation and others. The English language vice versa has mainly analytical structure, at which the grammatical function of a word and its connection with other words are expressed with the help of special formal, or functional words (службове слово) (prepositions, auxiliary words etc.) and the word order. Therefore, as professor A.E. Levytsky generalizes [12; 18], synthetic languages are those where grammatical meaning is fused with lexical one within a word (grammatical meaning is expressed by inflections and form-building affixes, or sound interchange). Analytical languages are characterized by the tendency towards separate (analytical) expression of lexical and grammatical meaning (lexical meaning is expressed by independent meaningful words while grammatical meaning is explicated by form words, word order and intonation). Furthermore, according to A.E. Levytsky [12; 20], there are two main general tendencies in the development of the grammatical structures of Indo-European languages: analytization

and synthetization. In English, for instance, the analytization process is extremely extensive and is manifested in the functional synonymy of case inflections, reduction of the noun paradigm, word-order fixation, predominance of adjoinment in word-phrase relations, abundance in paradigmatic forms (Continuous, Perfect, Perfect Continuous), predominance of conversion, postposition formation and phrasing among word-building patterns, abundance of determiners (function-words).

It is worth mentioning that the flexional structure of modern Ukrainian possesses a lot of phenomena which have distinct analytical character, for example, the future tense of verbs of the type *буду читати*, the conditional mood (*читав би*), building of the comparative degrees of adjective and adverbs (*більш визначний, найбільш вдало*) etc. Though these analytical features are not dominating ones, they are not frequent enough to determine the general character of the language grammatical structure.

It is quite obvious that the general difference of the grammatical structure of both compared languages causes quite a number of particular differences in certain grammatical categories, as well as in features of some parts of speech.

The grammatical expression (граматичне оформлення) of a word in Ukrainian is fulfilled mainly with the help of morphological means. That is why a word does not need so much the outer means of expression of its lexical and grammatical meaning. In the English language those parts of speech, that have to a larger degree preserved their flexions (for example, the verb), depend less on the outer means, than those parts of speech that have not preserved or almost have not preserved their flexions (for example, the noun) and that is why they constantly have to interact with the outer means of expression of their meaning.

This is the reason why the boundaries between separate parts of speech in Ukrainian are more distinct and stable than in English. Possibilities of a word to change one part of speech into another are far less common in Ukrainian than in English. Such a conversion happens mainly in the sphere of names (substantivation of adjectives) (compare: *вартовий, хворий*). Strengthening of the word in the function

of the new part of speech is carried out very gradually, as a consequence of long-time/ durable usage.

In the English language morphological expression of a word is much poorer, that is why syntactic expression of words gains a considerable weight in it. This is the reason why conversion — transferring of a word from one part of speech into the other as the morphologic-syntactic way of word-formation belongs here to one of the most productive means of vocabulary enrichment. As a consequence, separate parts of speech do not have in English such distinct boundaries as in Ukrainian [5; 36–37].

Parts of speech. The English and Ukrainian languages basically have a similar system of parts of speech. In both languages we can find the following parts of speech: 1) noun (іменник); 2) adjective (прикметник); 3) numeral (числівник); 4) pronoun (займенник); 5) verb (дієслово); 6) adverb (прислівник); 7) modal words (модальні слова), 8) preposition (прийменник); 9) conjunction (сполучник), 10) particle (частка); 11) interjection (вигук).

The distinctive feature of the English language in comparison with the Ukrainian language is the availability of such a part of speech as article, that is the 12-th part of speech. Though according to B. Khaimovich and B. Rogovskaya, it is possible to distinguish not 12 but 14 parts of speech in English, namely: 1) nouns, 2) adjectives, 3) pronouns, 4) numerals, 5) verbs, 6) adverbs, 7) adlinks (statives or words of the category of state), 8) modal words (modals), 9) prepositions, 10) conjunctions, 11) particles, 12) interjections, 13) articles, 14) response words (*yes, no*) [25].

Different is not only the number of parts of speech but also the value attached to them in different languages. For example, in the book “Modern Ukrainian Language” edited by a well-known Ukrainian linguist Olexandr Danylovych Ponomariv [16; 113] it is stated that the central place in the grammar structure of Ukrainian is taken by a noun with a verb (a view shared by I.R. Vykhovanets’). An adjective and an adverb are considered to be peripheral parts of speech, and a pronoun and a numeral are taken beyond the notion of parts of speech. Although all these word classes are named conventionally as parts of speech or notional words (повнозначні слова) by modern linguistics. Preposi-

tions, conjunctions, particles and link-words (зв'язки) are devoid of features possessed by parts of speech. They are called function words or particles of speech (службові слова або частки мови) whose purpose of existing is purely syntactical and which function as analytical syntactic morphemes. They are deprived of the independent naming function. They do not differentiate between lexical and grammatical meanings. Any relations can be expressed by particles of speech not on their own but only in combination with notional parts of speech or syntactic structures: *брат і сестра, хоч би не запізнитися, були задоволені*. An interjection is considered separately: it belongs neither to parts of speech, nor to morphemes, but is related to the whole sentence. So the classification of words into parts of speech, particles of speech and interjections is treated on the basis of a morpheme, a notional word and a sentence. Besides modal words (considered, for example, by Yu.O. Zhluktenko as a part of speech in Ukrainian) as well as link-words are studied within the boundaries of syntax, and the category of state or stative is studied as a separate group within an adverb as a part of speech.

Many linguists point out the difference between such parts of speech as nouns or verbs, on the one hand, and prepositions or conjunctions, on the other.

For instance, B. Ilyish in his book "The structure of modern English" [8; 35] comes up with the idea that only prepositions and conjunctions can be treated as functional parts of speech.

V.V. Vinogradov thinks that only the noun, the adjective, the pronoun, the numeral, the verb, the adverb and the category of state in the Russian language may be considered parts of speech, since these words "can fulfill the naming function". Besides parts of speech he distinguishes 4 particles of speech: 1) particles proper, 2) linking particles, 3) prepositions, 4) conjunctions.

Other Russian linguists V. Zhigadlo, I. Ivanova, L. Iofic name prepositions, conjunctions, particles and articles as functional parts of speech distinct from notional parts of speech. Charles Fries ("The Structure of English") points out 4 classes of words called parts of speech and 15 groups of words called function words [25; 39].

According to B. Khaimovich and B. Rogovskaya function words can be called semi-notional. The difference between notional and semi-notional parts of speech is to some extent reflected in the phenomenon of substitution. Notional words usually have substitutes — other words with much more general meanings which are used to replace them in certain environments, e.g. nouns can be replaced by pronouns etc. The lexical meaning of semi-notional words is usually so weak and general that these words can hardly be replaced. Thus, prepositions, conjunctions, articles and particles may be regarded as semi-notional parts of speech when contrasted with notional parts of speech [25; 38–41].

So, as it is obvious from the mentioned above, the question, what parts of speech should be treated as functional or function and whether they are parts or only particles of speech, is still a controversial point in the theory of grammar.

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. State the difference between the notions “language” and “speech”.
2. Name the basic units of language and speech. Give their definitions.
3. Determine the difference between “paradigmatic” and “syntagmatic” relations.
4. Define the term “grammar”. What are considered to be the sub-fields of grammar? What types of grammar can be mentioned?
5. What is meant by a word structure as a basic language unit?
6. In what way do the morphemes *table-* and *-s* as constituent parts of the word *tables* differ? What is the difference between “grammatical” and “lexical” morphemes? Are there any other types of morphemes?
7. Name the difference between the “analytical” and “synthetic” forms of a word. Provide examples.

8. What is the stem of a word? What types of stems can be distinguished according to their structure? Provide examples.
9. Exemplify the difference between such notions as “grammeme” and “lexeme”.
10. Define the term “grammatical opposition”. What are considered to be the “members of the opposition”?
11. What is “grammatical category”? Provide examples of grammatical categories in English and Ukrainian languages.
12. What is the “combinability” of a word? What types of combinability can be mentioned? Provide examples.
13. Define the term “part of speech”. Name the features characterizing a part of speech as a class of lexemes.
14. Mention linguistic disciplines which deal with the contrastive study of a language. State the difference between them.
15. Specify the difference between contrastive typology and contrastive linguistics.
16. What are language universals? Provide examples.
17. What is the difference between “isomorphic” and “allomorphic features”? Provide examples considering English and Ukrainian languages.
18. How was contrastive linguistics shaped as a linguistic discipline? Mention the subject matter and main tasks of contrastive linguistics.
19. Mention the linguists who contributed to the development of contrastive linguistics as a linguistic research direction.
20. Specify the subject matter and the tasks of contrastive grammar as a subfield of contrastive linguistics.
21. According to what aspects can grammatical phenomena of different languages be contrasted?
22. Describe the methods used in contrastive language studies.
23. Specify the nature of “contrastive analysis” method.
24. What is meant by the term “tertium comparationis” in contrastive linguistics?
25. Dwell upon the issue of the parts of speech differentiation in different languages.

26. State the difference between “notional” and “functional” parts of speech.
27. Enumerate the parts of speech in the English and Ukrainian languages; point out towards similarities and differences. Provide examples of each part of speech in Ukrainian and in English.

CHAPTER 1

Noun as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

1. Noun as a part of speech: general characteristics

The noun is the most numerous lexico-grammatical class of lexemes. It is but natural that it should be divided into subclasses. From the grammatical point of view most important is the division of nouns into **countables** and **uncountables** with regard to the category of number and into **declinables** and **indeclinables** with regard to the category of case.

All other classifications are semantic rather than grammatical. Thus, in Ukrainian, for example, according to M. Zubkov [7; 159] there are differentiated the following lexico-grammatical classes of nouns in regard to their semantic and morphological characteristics:

- 1) concrete and abstract nouns (іменники конкретні й абстрактні: *ложка, парк — імовірність, кохання*);
- 2) names of living beings and lifeless objects (назви істот і неістот: *студент, дочка — технікум, завод*);
- 3) common and proper nouns (власні й загальні назви: *Роман, Ірина, Львів, Канада — дівчина, хлопець, місто, держава*);
- 4) material nouns (матеріально-речовинні: *фтор, золото, кисень, нафта*);
- 5) collective nouns (збірні: *кіннота, огудиння, студентство, листя*).

✓ According to B. Khaimovich and B. Rogovskaya [25; 52] while dividing nouns into **abstract** and **concrete** ones, we usually take into consideration not the properties of words but the properties of the things they denote. The abstract noun *smile* does not differ from the concrete noun *book* in its paradigm (*smile* — *smiles*, *book* — *books*) or its lexico-grammatical combinability (*He gave me one of his books (smiles)*). Certainly, many abstract nouns (*pride*, *darkness*, etc.) are uncountables, but so are many concrete nouns (*wool*, *peasantry*, etc.).

The group of collective nouns mentioned in many grammars is grammatically not homogeneous. Some collective nouns are countables (*government*, *family*, etc.), others are not in English (*foliage*, *peasantry*, etc.). If we consider, for example, Ukrainian collective nouns [16; 117] we shall see that unlike English collective nouns they are rather homogeneous since they denote a certain unity of the same or similar objects which are treated as one whole (сукупність однакових або подібних предметів, що сприймаються як одне ціле). Most often these are names of some living beings, plants, etc. They have distinct grammatical meaning in the way that they do not have the plural form since they denote the unity of a number of objects that cannot be counted. Ukrainian collective nouns are also characterized by gender and word-changing abilities. They can be easily recognized by suffixes they are typically used with: **-ство/-цтво** (*студентство*, *птаство*, *козацтво*); **-н(я)** (*насіння*, *мурашня*); **-инн(я)/-овинн(я)** (*ластовиння*, *картоплиння*); **-от(а)** (*кіннота*, *парубота*); **-еч(а)** (*старець*, *малеч*), etc.

✓ **Material** nouns are a peculiar group of uncountables, for example: *air*, *iron*, *sugar*, *silver*.

Proper nouns are another, even more peculiar, group of uncountables (though sometimes they form number opposemes, e.g.: *Brown* — *the Browns* (in English). In Ukrainian proper nouns are mostly singular though the plural form can also be met, e.g.: *два Чернігови*.

According to Ukrainian grammars a noun is a notional part of speech possessing the meaning of “thingness” or “substantivity” (значення предметності) expressed in the forms of gender, number

and case [16; 114]. We cannot apply this definition fully to the English noun since, as it is believed by the majority of scholars specializing in the study of the English grammar, there is no category of gender among English noun categories. So let us consider this part of speech in both languages according to five criteria mentioned above.

The English noun as a part of speech comprises the following features:

1. The lexico-grammatical meaning of “substantivity”.
2. Typical stem-building morphemes, as in: *pacif-ist*, *work-er*, *friend-ship*, *manage-ment*, etc.
3. The grammatical categories of number and case.
4. Typical combinability: left-hand connections with articles, prepositions, adjectives, possessive pronouns (also demonstrative pronouns, some indefinite and negative pronouns), other nouns, etc.; right-hand connections with nouns (creating the so called noun clusters), verbs.
5. The typical syntactic function of a subject, an object, a complement or a predicative, less frequently attribute or other parts of the sentence.

Let us compare the English noun with its Ukrainian counterpart. The mentioned above five properties for distinguishing parts of speech will serve as the basis for comparison or tertium comparationis.

1. The lexico-grammatical meanings are similar.
2. The variety of lexico-grammatical morphemes is much greater for the Ukrainian noun.

The peculiarity of Ukrainian is also the abundance of “subjective appraisal” (diminutive) suffixes, as in *дівчатко*, *носик*, *синок*, *батижечок*, *дівчинонька*, etc. The number of diminutive only noun-forming suffixes is as many as 53, which goes in no comparison with the English 14 suffixes [10; 149]. The four of English diminutive suffixes are considered to be productive, namely: -y (-ie, -ye) (*daddy*, *gran-nie*), -let (*booklet*, *streamlet*), -ette (*kitchenette*, *laundrette*), -ling (*gooseling*, *kingling*) [10; 199].

Completely missing in English but available in Ukrainian are augmentative suffixes, for example: *-ил* (*вітрило, барило*), *-ищ* (*вовчище, дубище*), *-ук/-юк* (*каменяка, зміюка*), *-уг/-юг* (*дідуга, злодюга*), *-ан/-ань* (*дідуган, здоровань*), *-яр* (*мисяр, носяр*), etc. [10; 198].

3.1. The Ukrainian language possesses the category of gender which is absent in English. The category of gender in Ukrainian is a lexico-grammatical one, since not only grammatical features but also the semantic ones (that is a division according to sex, age) are taken into account: *дід — баба, син — дочка, качка — каченя*. Morphological characteristics are also of importance (suffixes and endings): *студент — студентка, робітник — робітниця*, etc. The grammatical meaning of the masculine, feminine and neuter gender is determined according to the main index — the ending of the nominative case singular as well as the genitive and the instrumental cases. For nouns of the masculine gender the most typical is zero ending, e.g.: *степ, двір, хлопець*, but also *-а (я), -о, -е* endings can be met, e.g.: *батько, Микола, суддя, вовчище*. Nouns of the feminine gender usually have the endings *-а (я)*, e.g.: *калина, земля, Роксолана, Надія*; nouns with the zero ending can also be found, e.g.: *зустріч, сіль, більшість*. Nouns of the neuter gender have the endings, *-о, -е, -я*, e.g.: *село, поле, знання, дитя*. Nouns of the so called common case (*спільний рід — базика, трудяга, нечепура, плакса*) will belong relatively to the context either to the masculine or to the feminine gender.

In both languages we find the categories of number and case. But their opposemes, especially those of the category of case, differ greatly in the two languages: *Вісімнадцять*

- a) a Ukrainian case opposeme contains six (or seven if we take into account the vocative case) members unlike the English two-member case opposeme;
- b) in English the “singular number, common case” grammeme is as a rule not marked. In Ukrainian any grammeme can be marked, e.g.: *рука, вікно*, etc.;

The category of number of English nouns is the system of opposemes (such as *girl* — *girls*, *foot* — *feet*, etc.) showing whether the noun stands for one object or more than one, in other words, whether its grammatical meaning is of “oneness” or “more than oneness” of objects.

The connection of the category with the world of material reality, though indirect, is quite transparent. Its meanings reflect the existence of individual objects and groups of objects in the material world.

All number opposemes are identical in **content**: they contain two particular meanings of “singular” and “plural” united by the general meaning of the category, that of “number”. But there is a considerable variety of **form** in number opposemes, though it is not so great as in the Ukrainian language.

With regard to the category of number both English and Ukrainian nouns fall into two subclasses: countables (злічувані іменники) and uncountables (незлічувані іменники). The former have number opposites, the latter do not. Uncountable nouns are again subdivided into those having no plural opposites and those having no singular opposites.

The grammatical phenomenon of opposition forming the basis of the category of number is easier to present on the example of the English language. Thus, an English noun lexeme can contain two number opposemes at most (*boy* — *boys*, *boy's* — *boys'*). Many lexemes have but one opposeme (*table* — *tables*) and many other have no opposemes at all (*ink*, *news*). In the opposeme *boy* — *boys* “singularity” is expressed by a zero morpheme and “plurality” is marked by the positive morpheme [-z], in spelling -s. In other words, the “singular” member of the opposeme is not marked, and the “plural” member is marked. In the opposeme *boy's* — *boys'* both members have positive morphemes -'s, -s', but these morphemes can be distinguished only in writing. In the spoken language their forms do not differ, so with regard to each other they are unmarked. They can be distinguished only by their combinability (*boy's head* — *boys' heads*).

In a few noun lexemes of foreign origin both members of the number opposition are marked, e.g.: *phenomenon* — *phenomena*. But in the process of assimilation this peculiarity of foreign nouns gets

gradually lost, and instead of *formula* — *formulae*, the usual form now is *formula* — *formulas*.

Concluding from the mentioned above, the English language has quite a simple way of the plural form building: it has only one ending of the plural form *-(e)s* (with its three phonetic variants [s], [z], [iz]), which is added to the noun base. The exceptions of this rule are not numerous: this is the weak form of the plural of the type: *children*, *oxen*, the change of the root vowel (the inner flexion) in words of the type *man-men*, *foot-feet*, *tooth-teeth*, *goose-geese*, as well as retained by some nouns, borrowed from Latin, old Greek and other languages, the forms of plural, which they had in their own languages till borrowing (this witnesses about the fact that their assimilation by the English language was not complete), e.g.: *radius* — *radii* (*промінь*), *nucleus* — *nuclei* (*ядро*), *phenomenon* — *phenomena* (*явище*) etc.

The Ukrainian language has a more complicated way of plural form building. Each declension of nouns (*відміна іменників*) has another ending, e.g.: nouns of the first declension have in the nominative case plural the ending *-и* (*машина* — *машини*), *-і* (*межа* — *межі*), *-ї* (*надія* — *надії*); the second declension possesses accordingly the endings: *-и* (*робітник* — *робітники*), *-і* (*коваль* — *ковалі*), *-а* (*місто* — *міста*), *-я* (*море* — *моря*); nouns of the third declension have the endings: *-і* (*відповідь* — *відповіді*, *ніч* — *ночі*); of the fourth declension *-ята* (*гусеня* — *гусенята*), *-ата* (*курча* — *курчата*), *-ена* (*ім'я* — *імена*).

The plural form of English nouns is almost unchangeable. In Ukrainian the plural of noun is opposed to the singular not only by the form of nominative case, but by the whole system of six cases (compare, e.g.: *машина*, *машини*, *машині* ... — *машини*, *машин*, *машинам*...).

In both languages only those nouns that can be counted and can be combined with cardinal numerals (*кількісні*) can have the plural form. Those nouns that cannot be counted have as a rule the singular form, and, in fact, are altogether deprived of the category of number. In both languages these are the following groups of nouns:

- a) collective nouns (*збірні*) — (*cavalry*, *humanity*, *кіннота*, *людство*);

- b) nouns determining the substance or the mass (які позначають речовину або масу) (*copper, glass, мідь, скло*);
- c) abstract nouns (абстрактні) — (*knowledge, health, знання, здоров'я*).

Both in English and in Ukrainian some nouns are used only in plural. These are, first of all, the names of objects, the structure of which causes the image of plurality or a pair of something (множинність, парність), or the symmetry, e.g: *scissors, spectacles, trousers, tongs* (кліщі) etc. The notion concerning the structure of such things is though not the same by the speakers of the two languages under analysis. Thus, for example in Ukrainian *вила, ворота, граблі, сани* are used only in plural, whereas the corresponding English names: *pitchfork, gate, rake, sledge* are used in both numbers.

The nouns of other meanings express the category of number in both languages also differently. For example, Ukrainian *дріжджі, гроші, канікули* are used only in plural, and the corresponding English nouns *yeast, money, vacation* — only in singular, and vice versa: English nouns *clothes, sweepings, contents, potatoes, carrots, onions* are used only in plural, whereas the corresponding Ukrainian — *одяг, зелень, сміття, зміст, картопля, морква, цибуля* — only in singular. Very often the noun can have only one number form in one of compared languages, whereas in the other language it has two numbers (e.g., English versus Ukrainian: *fruit* — *фрукт, фрукти, advice* — *порада, поради, strength* — *сила, сили*).

Summing up the mentioned inadequacies in the expression either of singular or of plural number, it can be stated that nouns like *milk, geometry, self-possession* having no plural opposites are usually called by a Latin name — **singularia tantum**; nouns like *outskirts, clothes, goods* having no singular opposites are known as **pluralia tantum**.

Singularia tantum usually include nouns of certain lexical meanings. They are mostly material, abstract and collective nouns, such as *sugar, gold, butter, brilliance, selfishness, soldiery*. Yet it is not every material, abstract and collective noun that belongs to the group singularia tantum (*a feeling, a crowd*) and, what is more important, not in all of its meanings does a noun belong to this group.

The group of pluralia tantum is mostly composed of nouns denoting objects consisting of two or more parts, complex phenomena or ceremonies, e.g. *tongs, pincers* (щипці, кліщі), *trousers, nuptials* (весілля, весільна церемонія). Here also belong some nouns with a distinct collective or material meaning, e.g. *clothes, sweets, eaves* (повіки, вії (поет.)).

Since in these words the *-s* suffix does not function as a grammatical morpheme, it gets lexicalized and develops into an inseparable part of the stem. This probably underlies the fact that such nouns as *mathematics, optics, linguistics, mumps, measles* are treated as *singularia tantum* [25; 54–58].

Similarly in Ukrainian: those nouns that cannot be counted have either a singular or a plural number. Ukrainian singularia tantum (однинні іменники) include the following groups of nouns:

- abstract nouns (*мудрість, щастя, журба*);
- collective nouns (*начальство, лицарство, ганчір'я*);
- material nouns (*сметана, вугілля, кисень, сатин*);
- proper names (*Полтава, Михайло, "Літературна Україна"*).

Ukrainian pluralia tantum (множинні іменники) include such groups of nouns as:

- names of objects which have a pair of parts in their structure (*ножиці, сани, окуляри, штани*);
- some collective nouns (*надра, копалини, гроші*);
- names of certain materials (речовинні назви — *збоїни, вершки, консерви*);
- names of some time and weather notions (*приморозки, сутінки, обжинки, роковини*);
- names of some actions and processes (*пустощі, походеньки, заробітки, дебати*);
- names of games (*шахи, шашки, піжмурки*);
- names of abstract notions (*ресурси, хвастощі, ревнощі*);
- some geographical proper names (*Чернівці, Суми, Піренеї*) [16; 120–121].

Apart from some similarities there can also be found distinctive differences. Thus, the characteristic peculiarities in the number form usage in English as compared to Ukrainian are the following:

1. The usage of the similar form of a singular and a plural number for such words as:
 - a) some names of animals, birds, fishes, e.g.: *sheep, deer, snipe* (*бекас, піке*) etc;
 - b) some nouns denoting quantity of smth, e.g.: *stone* (*the measure of weight= 6,35 kg*), *score* (*twenty pieces*), *dozen, pair* etc, when there is a numeral before them: *two stone, four score, three dozen, five pair*;
 - c) some nouns denoting measure or the currency unit, when further there goes the denoting of the smaller unit, e.g.: *two pound ten* (*два фунти десять шилінгів*), *five foot eight* (*п'ять футів вісім дюймів*);
2. Different meanings of some nouns in the singular and the plural form, e.g.: *advice — advices* (*порада — відомості*), *manner — manners* (*спосіб — поведінка, манери*), *work — works* (*праця, робота — завод*) etc.
3. Some cases when there are two plural forms, having a different meaning, e.g.: *brothers* (*сини однієї матері*) — *brethren* (*члени однієї громади*) etc.
4. The usage of some forms of plural nouns in the singular meaning (with the verb form also in singular), e.g.: *news, gallows* (*шибениця*), *summons* (*виклик*), *works* (*завод*); some names of sciences, illnesses, games: *linguistics, physics, mathematics, measles, billiards* etc.

The absence of such phenomena in Ukrainian witnesses that in this language the forms of singular and plural are opposed more distinctly: the category of number is expressed more consistently (категорія числа в іменниках виражена більш послідовно).

3. The category of case

The category of case of nouns is the system of opposemes (such as *girl* — *girl's* in English, *хата* — *хату* — *хати* — *хату* — *хатою* — *(на) хати* — *хато* in Ukrainian) showing the relations of a noun to other words in speech. Case relations reflect the relations of the substances the nouns name to other substances, actions, states, etc. in the world of reality. *Case is the grammatical form of a noun, which reveals its relation towards other words fulfilling the functions of parts of the given sentence* (Відмінок — це граматична форма іменника, яка передає його відношення до інших слів, що виступають у функції членів цього речення).

Case is one of those categories which show the close connection (a) between language and speech, (b) between morphology and syntax:

- a) A case opposeme is, like any other opposeme, a unit of the **language** system, but the essential difference between the members of a case opposeme is in their combinability in **speech**. This is particularly clear in a language like Ukrainian with a developed case system. Compare, for instance, the combinability of the nominative case and that of the oblique/indirect cases. See also the difference in the combinability of each oblique case (непрямий відмінок): *схвалювати вчинок, не схвалювати вчинку, дивуватися вчинку/вчинкові, захоплюватись вчинком, etc.*

We can see here that the difference between the cases is not so much a matter of meaning as a matter of combinability. It can be said that *вчинок* — *вчинку* — *вчинкові* — *вчинком*, etc. are united paradigmatically in the Ukrainian language on the basis of their syntagmatic differences in speech. The same is true for the English case opposeme.

- b) Though case is a morphological category it has distinct syntactical significance. The common case grammemes fulfill a number of syntactical functions not typical of possessive case grammemes, among them the functions of subject and object. The possessive case noun is for the most part employed as an attribute.

All case opposemes are identical in content: they contain two particular meanings, of “common case” and “possessive case” united by the general meaning of the category, that of “case”. There is not much variety in the form of case opposemes either, which distinguishes English from Ukrainian.

An English noun lexeme may contain two case opposemes at most (*man* — *man's*, *men* — *men's*). Some lexemes have but one opposeme (*England* — *England's*, *cattle* — *cattle's*). Many lexemes have no case opposemes at all (*book*, *news*, *foliage*). That is not true for the Ukrainian language.

Thus, *-s* is the only positive case morpheme of English nouns. It would be no exaggeration to say that the whole category depends on this morpheme [25; 59–61]. This can be explained by the fact that in English the category of case is the remnants of the former inflexional structure and is represented by a rather small number of forms. The linguistic literature abounds in discussions concerning the existence of the case category in the sphere of the English noun as well as concerning the system of its case forms. Nevertheless, traditional school grammars express the view that modern English has two noun cases: the Common Case (загальний відмінок) and the Possessive Case (присвійний відмінок, інколи називають родовий).

The common case is the form in which the English noun can fulfill functions of almost all parts of a sentence. It is by itself the pure base (він являє собою “чисту основу”) of the word without endings (or otherwise the base with the “zero ending”). Since the common case of nouns performs a big number of functions and is poor in its morphological expression (бідність морфологічного оформлення), its meaning can be clarified by syntactic means: the word order and the usage of prepositions. Merely judging from the fact that the noun stands before the verb-predicate we perceive it as a subject, and when it stands after the verb — as an object or the nominal part of the compound predicate (depending on the type of the verb).

The possessive case has a very narrow sphere of usage: the noun in this case fulfills the function of only one part of the sentence — the attribute, thus only such a kind of attribute which expresses the

belonging or the size (приналежність чи розмір). It is expressed by only one ending -s. The separate form of the possessive case exists practically only in the singular. In the plural only a few nouns have the possessive case. These are nouns that do not have the ending -s, e.g.: *children's*. The rest of nouns do not have a separate form of the possessive case in the plural. Usually the idea of possession is expressed by placing the form of the common case plural before the modified noun, as it happens while using the noun in the attributive function. The usage of apostrophe is a mere formality and does not belong to the language facts. Compare, e.g.: *student's society* (студентське товариство/ товариство студентів) and *Brains Trust* (мозковий трест/ трест мізків, тобто об'єднання людей видатних розумових здібностей).

The range of meaning of the possessive case is incomparably narrower than that of the common case. Yet linguists point out a number of meanings a "possessive case" noun may express in speech:

- 1) possession, belonging (*Peter's bicycle*);
- 2) personal or social relations (*Peter's wife*);
- 3) authorship (*Peter's poem*);
- 4) origin or source (*the sun's rays*);
- 5) kind or species (*ladies' hats*);
- 6) the relation of the whole to its part (*Peter's hand*);
- 7) subjective relations (*Peter's arrival*);
- 8) objective relations (*Peter's being sent*);
- 9) characteristic (*her mother's care*);
- 10) measure (*a night's reflection*; *a mile's distance*) [25; 70].

Not all the nouns in English have the possessive case. Only the names of living beings and the names of lifeless/inanimate objects, meaning the size: the time interval (проміжок часу) (*a week's leave* — тижнева відпустка), the distance (*a mile's distance* — відстань в одну милю), the weight (*a ton's weight* — вага в одну тону), the cost (*a dollar's worth* — вартість в один долар). The names of countries, cities and ships as well as the words: *world, country, city, ship*, also have the form of the possessive case. Sometimes there can be met the possessive case of some other inanimate objects with the meaning the relation of the whole to its

part: *the car's lights, the chair's arm* etc. The majority of English nouns are used in the common case, that is in fact they are indeclinable.

The English possessive case has two main usages: a) *the dependent possessive case* (залежний присвійний відмінок), which always fulfills the function of the attribute and the b) *independent possessive case*, which is used independently without the noun that follows it (very often these nouns could be the words: *house, office, shop*, e.g.: *at my friend's, to the baker's* (до крамниці булочника).

The dependent possessive case usually renders the meaning of belonging to something (*the doctor's house*), the meaning of size or of the relation of the whole to its part (*the girl's hand*); sometimes it can have the subjective meaning regarding the word modified (*John's activity, my brother's arrival*) or in some cases the objective one (*Mike's trial — суд над Майком*).

The independent possessive case has most frequently the meaning of place (*at the chemist's*) and very seldom the meaning of belonging (*It is my uncle's*).

A very specific feature of English is the so-called *group possessive case* (груповий присвійний), when the ending of the possessive case serves not for one word but for a word combination, e.g.: *Peter and Helen's flat, Prime Minister of England's residence, somebody else's book*. Some linguists think that this happens due to the analytic character of the English language where very often a group of words can acquire characteristics of the complex word.

The peculiarity of the English possessive case is that it is usually placed before the noun whereas the Ukrainian attribute in the genitive case is usually placed after the noun. Also the English possessive case corresponds not only to the form of Ukrainian genitive case (*зошит студента, день відпочинку*) but also to the form of Ukrainian possessive adjectives (*батьків капелюх, братова книжка*).

In Ukrainian the noun has a very complicated *system of declension* (система відмінювання). This system consists of six cases: the nominative case, the genitive case, the dative case, the accusative case, the instrumental case and the local or locative case. Besides, all the nouns that are the names of living beings and the names of life-

less objects, used in the transferred meaning or personified, have the seventh case — the so-called vocative form (клична форма), which is used at addressing: *брате, земле*. This system of declension is still more complicated by the fact that some nouns in one and the same case can have different endings. These endings can not be semantically differentiated, e.g.: *у гаю, у гаї, батькові, батьку* but sometimes they can somehow alter the meaning of the word, e.g.: *листопада* (the month) and *листопаду* (the season of the year).

In Ukrainian the category of case is purely grammatical. Case forms are the means of connection of nouns with other words. Each case is the unity of form and meaning.

The nominative case of the noun is called the direct case. The term “direct” denotes the independence of the noun’s usage from its connection with other words. Its usage is very limited. The nominative case performs the function of a subject (підмет), being the logical subject (суб’єкт) in the sentence: “*А Рось кипіла в кам’яному ложі*” (Л. Костенко). In passive constructions it is used as an object (*Туман розгонився вітрами по долині*). It can also function as a nominative part of a compound nominal predicate (*Слава — зрадлива річ*) or as a main member of the nominative sentence (“*Заслання, самота, солдатчина ...*” — (Л. Костенко)). Sometimes it can fulfill the function of detached apposition (відокремлена прикладка — *Мінна знайшла будинок, невеличкий гарненький котедж, захований подалі від вулиці*).

The rest of cases are indirect, being used with prepositions or without them. Indirect cases can be used as secondary parts of the sentence: the object, different types of circumstances, sometimes attribute.

The genitive case has the following meanings:

- belonging to some person or thing (*батько Миколи, властивість цементу*);
- objective relations (*не дістав паперу*);
- the part of the whole or its incompleteness (*налити води, цех заводу*);
- circumstantial meanings: a) dates (*1990 року*); b) spatial relations (*наблизились до ставу*); c) time relations (*протягом тижня*); d) cause relations (*крикнув з переляку*).

The dative case denotes a person for whom or because of whom a certain action takes place (*служіння народові, привіт другові*); possession (*пам'ятник Іванові Франку*); the subject of the action in the impersonal sentence (*Кому-кому, а йому тільки цього й треба було*).

The accusative case has, first of all, the objective meaning (as a direct object with transitive verbs) (*передплатити пресу, вимкнути світло*). Used as an object in prepositional constructions it denotes the space as the direction of movement (*в'їхати в ліс, стріляти в небо*), also an object (*дбати про дітей, кинути об землю*).

The instrumental case abounds in meanings which can be the following:

- objective (*копати лопатою, міряти метром*);
- circumstantial (*їхати дорогою, плисти морем*);
- denoting the accomplice of the doer of some action (*батько з дочкою, мати з немовлям*);
- expressing the nominal part of the compound nominal predicate (*стати парубком, зробитися хмаркою*);
- denoting the subject in one-member sentence (односкладне речення) (*гуртожиток заселено студентами*).

The locative case is always used with a preposition. The most important meanings are circumstantial (*ходить по березі, говорити по щирості*), or that of an object (*кохатися в мистецтві, гратися на почуттях*); much more rarely attributive meanings are used (*баба по матері, товариство по духу*).

The vocative case denotes the addressing to some person or personified object or any creature (*мамо, брате, лисичко, кицю; Поезіє, сонце моє оранжеве!* (І. Драч) [16; 121–122]).

The mentioned above six cases have peculiar endings for all the nouns of the Ukrainian language. According to the type of ending there are differentiated four declensions of Ukrainian noun:

The first declension — includes nouns of the feminine gender with the nominative case singular ending *-а, -я* (*наука, земля*), and some group of nouns of the masculine gender and the common case (спільного роду) (*Микола, Ілля, голова, суддя*).

The second declension — includes the biggest part of nouns of the masculine and the neuter gender. Only those nouns of the masculine gender which have the final hard consonant or softened consonant and those having the ending *-й, -о* (*робітник, ключ, день, чай, батько*) belong to this declension. Among the neuter gender nouns this declension includes all the nouns ending in *-о, -е, -я* (except those that acquire the suffixes *-ят, -ен* in indirect cases), the latter usually have the doubling of the final consonant of the stem (*озеро, дерево, поле, бажання, обличчя*).

The third declension — includes all the nouns of the feminine gender with the hard or the soft final consonant (*ніч, любов, тінь, радість*) and the noun *мати*, which in indirect cases acquires the suffix *-ер* (*матері*).

The fourth declension — includes the nouns of the neuter gender with the endings *-а, -я*, denoting the names of little according to their age creatures/beings or some minute things as well as the noun *ім'я*. In indirect cases these nouns have the suffix *-ат, -ят* and the noun *ім'я* has the suffix *-ен*: *теля — теляти, лоша — лошати, ім'я — імені*.

The peculiar feature in the system of declensions of modern Ukrainian nouns is the local case, which, being the analytical form, creates the common paradigm of the noun alongside with other synthetic forms. This case form always has a preposition of place *на* or *в* in its structure and a special form of a noun bound with it.

Due to such richness of case endings the noun in Ukrainian is always distinctly expressed from the morphological point of view and the meaning of its many forms is easily determined even beyond the sentence limits, that is why the importance of syntactic means in the grammatical expression of the noun is not a substantial one.

4. The category of gender

In Ukrainian all nouns without exception, irrespective of the fact whether they denote the living beings or lifeless objects belong according to their ending to one of three grammatical genders: the *masculine*

gender, the *feminine gender* or the *neuter gender*. In modern English vice versa there is no division of nouns according to the grammatical gender on the basis of their morphological characteristics. As a consequence, the noun in modern English does not have the grammar category of gender.

Some linguists believe that the English noun has the possibility (though quite a limited one) to express the category of gender. In particular, the means of expressing the gender is considered to be the ability of many nouns to correlate with some of personal pronouns (*he*, *she* or *it*). Yu.O. Zhluktenko agrees with O.I. Smirnit'sky who pointed out that the choice of the pronoun in such cases is wholly caused by the semantics of the noun, which is correlated with it, e.g.: the noun "*brother*" and the pronoun "*he*" correlate between themselves not directly and not formally but because of the fact that they both denote the person of the masculine sex. That is why, in such cases, we classify according to the gender not the words as they are but the objects, denoted by corresponding words ("за родом" класифікуються не слова як такі, а певною мірою самі предмети, що позначаються відповідними словами) [5; 45].

Almost the only word building element that has the distinct gender characteristic is the noun suffix *-ess*, with the help of which we form the nouns of the feminine gender from nouns of the masculine gender: *host* — *hostess*, *poet* — *poetess*, *tiger* — *tigress*, *actor* — *actress* (compare the Ukrainian suffix *-к(а)*: *лікар-ка*, *школяр-ка*).

In the rest of cases the fact of belonging to this or that sex is expressed by the semantics of the word itself, as it can be observed similarly in Ukrainian (*cow* *корова*, *bull* *бик*); or it can be rendered with the help of adding of one of such words to the word, semantics of which is not clear regarding its gender. As a result of such agglutination there appear compound words in the language of the type: *he-goat*, *she-goat*, *boy-student*, *girl-student*, *bull-elephant*, *cow-elephant* etc. Sometimes in the role of such an agglutinative particle *-*, a determiner of gender, — the proper name is used, e.g.: *tom-cat* (masculine gender). In spite of this a large number of English words can be similarly used to denote either the female or the male sex, e.g.: *pupil*, *friend*, *teacher*, *wolf* etc.

Though the category of gender is expressed very distinctly by the nouns of the Ukrainian language, it should be pointed out that it has undergone considerable changes as well. The grammatical gender of the noun is determined according to some characteristics, namely: the meaning of the word, its morphological structure (suffixes, flexions) and the syntactic connections in the sentence (forms of coordinated (узроджений) adjectives, pronouns, verbs). The word ending has a great importance in determining the gender of a noun — the name of the lifeless object. The characteristic ending of the feminine gender in Ukrainian is the ending -а (я) and the hard or the soft consonant (*шахта, земля, ніч, повість*), of the neuter gender -о, -е (*вікно, поле*). Nouns of masculine gender usually end in a consonant (*чоловік, учитель, студент*). In plural nouns of all genders in the Ukrainian language have similar endings, in other words, the forms of plural now, in fact, do not render gender characteristics. That is why nouns that are used only in plural (*ворота, вила, окуляри, висівки, покидьки*) do not have gender.

The ending of the nominative case merely though is not enough to determine the noun gender. In Ukrainian there are some nouns of masculine gender which have similar endings with nouns of the feminine and the neuter genders, e.g.: *собака, п'яниця, голова, суддя, ключ* (пор. *ніч*), *промінь* (пор. *повість*), *Дніпро, батько, Сірко*. That is why at determining the noun gender the whole paradigm (the system of cases) is taken into consideration: compare, *промінь, променя, променем* ... and *повість, повісті, повісті* ... Some nouns are used both for the masculine and the feminine gender without any change of endings: *сирота, голова, суддя*. Such nouns as usual have the masculine gender though can be used to denote persons of the female sex: *професор, доктор, кандидат, бригадир* etc. For a lot of nouns — the names of creatures/animals, the gender is something conventional, since they are usually used to denote two biological species, without their differentiation, e.g.: *кінь, собака, кішка, олень* etc. The same happens to the majority of small according to their age creatures/animals, they are usually of neuter gender: *теля, порося, лоша* and even *дівча, хлоп'я*.

Therefore, in the modern Ukrainian language the grammatical gender is to a large extent a formal category, sometimes very little con-

nected with the content of the notion, expressed by the word itself. In spite of this the category of gender has not died out and is perceived by the linguistic way of thinking as the necessary one, since it fulfills an important function of the organization of words in the sentence, in coordinating nouns with adjectives and other words of the adjectival type as well as gender forms of verbs (категорія сприймається мовним мисленням як необхідна, бо вона виконує важливу функцію в організації слів у реченні й узгодженні з іменником прикметників та інших слів прикметникового типу і родових форм дієслова). The English language does not have such a system of coordination, that is why the category of gender could not remain for a long time in the language [5; 46].

5. The category of the names of living beings and lifeless objects

Some linguists believe that besides the categories of number, case, gender, the noun can also express some other categories. Thus, according to Yu.O. Zhluktenko [5; 46–47], there can be differentiated the category of the names of living beings and lifeless objects (категорія назв істот та неживих предметів).

According to their semantics nouns always denote living beings, lifeless objects or abstract notions. This semantic division can be reflected as well in the grammatical structure of the noun. In English some differences in this relation exist only by the usage of the possessive case, characteristic usually of nouns which are the names of living beings. The possessive case though is also used with quite a large number of nouns denoting lifeless objects or abstract notions. Nouns can also differ one from the other by the fact that the names of living beings correlate with personal pronouns *he, she* and the relative pronoun *who*, whereas the names of lifeless objects correlate with the personal-objective pronoun (особово-предметний) *it* and relative pronouns — *that, which*. Above it was mentioned that these correlations are of lexical character but not of the grammatical one. That is why it can be considered that the category of names of living beings and

lifeless objects is not expressed in the grammatical structure of English nouns.

Somehow the other way it happens in Ukrainian where there exist some formal and some grammatical differences between nouns denoting living beings and lifeless objects. These differences are not numerous: nouns of the masculine gender (names of living beings) have the form of the accusative case of both numbers similar with the form of the genitive case (*немає батька, бачу батька; не було брата, покликали брата, братів*), and the names of lifeless objects have the form of the accusative case similar with the form of the nominative case (*стоїть стіл, бачу стіл; це наш двір, бачимо двір, двори*). But nouns of the feminine and neuter gender in singular are not differentiated according to this category: all the nouns of the feminine gender in *-а, -я* have the ending *-у, -ю* in the accusative case (*бачу жінку, чую пісню*) and nouns of the feminine gender with the final consonant and all the nouns of the neuter gender have the form of the accusative case similar with the form of the nominative case (*читаю повість, відчиняю вікно*). Only in plural form of nouns of the feminine gender in *-а, -я* there also is a formal difference between the names of living beings and lifeless objects, e.g.: *стоять жінки, бачимо жінок* but *лунають пісні, чуємо пісні*.

The consistent (послідовний) grammatical expression of the category of names of living beings and lifeless objects is pertaining in Ukrainian only to the names of persons. This noun class has also the peculiar vocative case form (особлива клична відмінкова форма): *хлопче, жінко* etc. The names of lifeless objects can be used in the vocative form only in the case of personification, e.g.: *О земле, велетнів роди!* (П. Тичина). But in general there is also a number of deviations from the consistent expression of this category.

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. Dwell upon the classes of nouns differentiated according to different criteria. Provide examples.

2. State the difference between countable and uncountable nouns. Are there any similarities and differences in these groups of nouns in the contrasted English and Ukrainian languages?
3. Describe the noun as a part of speech according to the five characteristics. Compare the English noun with the Ukrainian noun in regard to their grammatical paradigm, grammatical categories, combinability potential, ways of functioning in the sentence.
4. Provide examples of nouns containing typical stem-building elements in English and Ukrainian.
5. Describe the typical oppositions within the system of the English noun and the Ukrainian noun. Show differences and similarities.
6. Give the general characteristic of grammatical categories of the noun in English and Ukrainian. Are there any differences in their number or ways of their expression?
7. Dwell upon the category of number in English and in Ukrainian. By way of contrasting show similarities and differences in the forms of number expression in both languages.
8. What groups of nouns are included by “singularia tantum” nouns and correspondingly “pluralia tantum” nouns in English and in Ukrainian? Are these groups similar in both contrasted languages or are there any differences?
9. Give the general characteristic of the category of case in two languages under study.
10. What is the sphere of usage of the English possessive case in comparison with the common case?
11. What is the difference between the “dependent possessive case” and “independent possessive case”? Provide examples.
12. Describe the meanings expressed by the Ukrainian 7 cases. Provide examples.
13. How is the category of gender expressed in English and in Ukrainian?
14. Present the opinions of scholars who differentiate other grammatical categories of a noun besides the categories of

number, gender and case. Are there grounded reasons to present such points of view?

15. Provide the summing up of the main similar and different characteristics of the English noun versus the Ukrainian noun.

II. Recognize different types of nouns. Identify the nouns as belonging to the following types: common or proper noun, countable noun or uncountable noun, concrete or abstract noun, collective noun, etc. Remember that the same noun can represent multiple types and vice versa not all the categories apply to each noun (e.g. *philosophy* is a common, abstract, uncountable noun).

a) in the English language:

1. “Your books have sold millions of copies,” the young interviewer was saying. (fiction writing)
2. According to Kant and Laplace, the original mass of gas cooled and began to contract. (academic prose)
3. The minibar was filled with candy, mineral water, decaffeinated soft drinks and dairy products. “These are the kind of munchies which our research found helps sleep,” said Jeremy Baka, Hilton spokesman. (newspaper writing)
4. You guys can go to a whole bunch of places and you should not go to New Mexico. (conversation)

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P.21.

b) in the Ukrainian language:

Як свідчить людська історія, спочатку смисл слова “толерантність” зводився лише до віротерпимості — прийняття (часто з внутрішньою духовною боротьбою, негативними емоціями) різноманітних думок і принципів різних людей в одному соціумі, але згодом виникло й інше трактування цього поняття, водночас із історичними змінами в житті людства. Саме воно якнайкраще відповідає реаліям сучасного життя. Це — поважне ставлення

до існування альтернативи в соціальному й побутовому житті людини, вартісність самої присутності Іншого із самобутнім світоглядом, культурою, формою поведінки, життєвими орієнтирами й цінностями. Толерантність є і має бути необхідною якістю поведінки індивіда початку ХХІ століття, бо передбачає водночас і терпимість до несхожості іншого, і готовність прийняти його як рівного в середовищі Своїх і Чужих.

*The material is taken from the article “Валерія Нечерда. Толерантність // Урок Української. № 9–10, 2007”. — Р.17.

III. Read each sentence, and identify the underlined noun as countable or uncountable. What aspects of each noun’s form, meaning or context helped you to decide whether it was countable or uncountable? Provide Ukrainian equivalents to the underlined English nouns. Do English and Ukrainian nouns coincide in their characteristics?

1. He spends as much time out of the home as possible (fiction writing).
2. Young people have got to stand up for their rights (conversation).
3. How to achieve a happy love life (newspaper writing).
4. Nevertheless speaking French imposes some order, some uniformity (newspaper writing).
5. For many of us this is a matter of life and death (newspaper writing).
6. She had to save face with David and Connie knew it (fiction writing).
7. Andrew even bought a football but hid it from Louise (fiction writing).
8. “No more sex and violence, Katheryn,” joked David (fiction writing).

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P.21–22.

IV. Define the type of declension (I, II, III or IV) and the gender of the given Ukrainian nouns. Make up at least five sentences, using some of these nouns, and render these sentences into English. Do the case and gender characteristics coincide in both languages?

Зустріч, стаття, круча, площа, голуб, пристань, миша, журнал, робітник, ніч, молодь, лоша, нарис, слоненя, порося, ім'я, друг, Ілля, подорож.

V. a) Define the semantic group of Singularia Tantum nouns to which the following English and Ukrainian nouns belong:

Courage, weather, peasantry, hair, womankind, advice, the North, gold, water, brushwood.

Визнання, гамір, південь, молоко, деревина, капустиння, хліб, професура,птаство, мир.

b) Define the semantic group of Pluralia Tantum nouns to which the following English and Ukrainian nouns belong:

Binoculars, contents, scissors, outskirts, commas, the Alps, the Carpathians, sweepings, nuptials, clothes.

Граблі, Атени, Черкаси, будні, іменини, покидьки, кеглі, шорти, сани, жмурки.

Think of the examples when certain singularia or pluralia tantum nouns do not coincide in the contrasted English and Ukrainian languages. For example, the Ukrainian pluralia tantum noun *вечорниці* does not have its English pluralia tantum equivalent.

CHAPTER 2

Adjective as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

1. Adjective as a part of speech: general characteristics. Grammatical categories of adjective

In both languages adjectives as a class of lexemes are subdivided into **qualitative** adjectives which directly express some characteristic features and qualities of some objects or substances (**якісні**, що безпосередньо передають ознаку предмета) (e.g., *large, white, heavy; великий, білий, важкий*) and relative adjectives that express some characteristics bound with the relation to some other object or phenomenon (**відносні**, що передають ознаку, зв'язану з відношенням до іншого предмета чи поняття) (e.g., *former, wooden, silken; колишній, дерев'яний, шовковий*). Both in English and in Ukrainian the division line between qualitative and relative adjectives is a conventional (умовний) one.

The English language has a considerably fewer number of relative adjectives than the Ukrainian language. Especially few are those adjectives that denote some material: *wooden (дерев'яний), woolen (шерстяний), silken (шовковий)* and some others. Meanings rendered in the Ukrainian language with the help of relative adjectives are very often expressed in English by nouns in the common case in the function of an attribute, e.g.: *a stone house (кам'яний будинок), an iron bridge (залізний міст), the London museums (лондонські музеї), the Kyiv underground (київське метро)*.

The peculiar feature of the English language is the existence of **quantitative** adjectives (кількісні прикметники): *little, few* (*мало*), *much, many* (*багато*). The Ukrainian language does not have such adjectives and the corresponding meanings are rendered with the help of adverbs or indefinite numerals (неозначені числівники: *кілька, декілька, багато* etc. present only in the Ukrainian language).

The Ukrainian language in its turn also possesses a peculiar group of adjectives, not present in English. By their meaning these adjectives, called **possessive** adjectives (присвійні прикметники), express belonging of some object to this or that person or creature, from the name of whom they are created, e.g.: *батьків, братів, сестрин. Андріїв, Ганнин, учительова, шкільне*. The corresponding notions are rendered in English usually with the help of the possessive case of a noun (*father's* (*батьків*), *sister's* (*сестрин*)) or with the help of preposition + noun combination (*of the father* (*батьків*), *of the sister* (*сестрин*)).

All the three groups of Ukrainian adjectives — qualitative, relative and possessive — have their own semantic and grammatical peculiarities.

Qualitative adjectives are different in meanings. They can render: duration in space (протяжність у просторі: *довгий, вузький, глибокий*), in time (у часі: *повільний, швидкий, довгий*), spiritual or physical properties of living beings (духовні чи фізичні властивості живих істот: *талановитий, інтелектуальний, незграбний, хворий, гарний*), peculiarities perceived by sense perception organs (ознаки, що сприймаються органами чуття: *гарячий, гіркий, запашний, твердий*). Qualitative adjectives vary also according to their grammatical peculiarities. In majority of cases they have degrees of comparison (*високий — вищий — найвищий*); create pairs of antonyms (*гіркий — солодкий, вузький — широкий*); serve as word-building stems for abstract nouns (*гіркий — гіркота, доблесний — доблесть*) and adverbs with suffixes *-o, -e* (*далекий — далеко, гарячий — гаряче*); and can be combined with adverbs of measure and degree (*дуже холодний, завжди уважний, вічно молодий*).

According to their morphological structure adjectives are divided in Ukrainian into two groups: full adjectives (повні або членні) —

these are adjectives with flexions, e.g.: *невний, повний*, and short adjectives (короткі або нечленні) — without flexions, e.g.: *винен, зоден, повен, певен*. Short forms of adjectives are used in parallel with the form of full adjectives and only in the nominative case singular of masculine gender. They have lost their system of declension and thus are indeclinable now. In modern Ukrainian short adjectives are used mainly in the function of the nominative part of predicate (*Скільки я вам винен? Будинок повен людей. Рад би ще раз побачити*). They are practically not met in the function of an attribute (the exceptions are some uses in the language of folklore or poetry: *ясен місяць, дрібен дощик, зелен сад*) [5; 52].

English adjectives do not have any endings and consist of the “pure” base, so according to their structure they are similar to Ukrainian short adjectives. Nevertheless, the loss of flexions has not been reflected on their grammatical characteristics. Deprived of any morphological means of expressing syntactic relations, English adjectives still perform two characteristic for this part of speech syntactic functions — the function of an attribute and the function of a nominal part of the compound predicate, whereas Ukrainian short adjectives, having lost their flexions, lost as well a part of their expressive abilities.

The English adjective as a part of speech is characterized by the following typical features:

1. The lexico-grammatical meaning of “attributes (of substances) / quality (of substances)”. It should be understood that by attributes we mean different properties of substances, such as their size (*large, small*), colour (*red, blue*), position in space (*upper, inner*), material (*wooden, woolen*), psychic state of persons (*happy, furious*), etc.
2. The typical stem-building affixes *-ful, -less, -ish, -ous, -ive, -ic, un-, pre-, in-*, etc.
3. The morphological category of the degrees of comparison (The absence of the category of number distinguishes English adjectives from adjectives in all other Germanic languages).
4. The characteristic combinability: right-hand connections with nouns (*a beautiful girl*), and the pronoun *one* (*the grey one*); left-

hand connections with link-verbs (... *is clever*), adverbs, mostly those of degree (*a very clever boy*).

5. Its typical syntactic functions are those of an attribute and a predicative complement.

The Ukrainian adjective is a notional part of speech which renders some characteristic of an object (but not that of a process — *непроцесуальна ознака предмета*) expressing it via the grammatical categories of gender, number and case. In a sentence it performs the functions of an attribute and a nominal part of a compound nominal predicate.

Following is the comparison of the basic features of English and Ukrainian adjectives.

1. The lexico-grammatical meanings are essentially the same.
2. The Ukrainian adjective has a greater variety of stem-building affixes than its English counterpart.

The so-called “suffixes of subjective appraisal” (as in *дрібнесенький, багатющий, синюватий, величезний* etc.) are alien to the English adjective (the only exception is *-ish* in *whitish, reddish*, etc.).

- 3.1. The English adjective does not have the grammatical categories of gender, number and case, which were lost already in the Middle English period. In Ukrainian vice versa all adjectives are changed according to genders and numbers. Besides, all full adjectives (and we have the majority of them) have their own system of case endings. Similar to nouns, adjectives are changed according to six cases. Besides, according to the character of the final consonant of a stem they are divided into **hard** (тверда група: *дужий, червоний*) and **soft** (м'яка група: *нижній, безкрайй*) groups. In plural all adjectives lose the gender differentiation (родове розрізнення) and have similar endings in all three genders.

All the mentioned categories of Ukrainian adjectives are expressed in a rather peculiar way. Speaking about Ukrainian nouns, their

categories of gender, number and case are to this or that extent determined by the meaning of words; whereas in adjectives they are reflected only according to the form of a word which the adjective is combined with. Thus, the categories of gender (*довгий* — *довга* — *довге*), number (*довгий* — *довгі*) and case (*довгий*, *довгого*, *довгому*, etc.) of Ukrainian adjectives are merely forms of grammatical relation of adjectives regarding the modified words, the forms of adjective agreement with them (Отже, категорії роду, числа і відмінка в українській прикметниках — це не що інше, як форми граматичного відношення прикметників до означуваних слів, форми узгодження прикметників з ними). English adjectives have lost any forms of coordination with modified words, that is why it is clear that they have lost simultaneously categories of gender, number and case. The only category Ukrainian and English adjectives have in common is the category of degrees of comparison.

Therefore, adjectival grammemes in English are monosemantic (i.e. having but one grammatical meaning), while in Ukrainian an adjective grammeme is usually polysemantic, e.g. the grammeme represented by *розумна* carries the grammatical meanings of “feminine gender”, “singular number”, “nominative case” and “positive degree”.

3.2. In Ukrainian as well as in English the category of the degrees of comparison is represented in three-member opposeemes, but there are some distinctions.

- a) The “positive degree” is unmarked in English, whereas it is marked in Ukrainian (compare: *red*, *червоний*). Taking into consideration that more than 90% of all adjectives in speech belong to positive grammemes, we may say that in the overwhelming majority of cases the form of an English adjective does not signal to what part of speech the word belongs. In the Ukrainian language every full adjective is marked. It shows by its form that it is an adjective.
- b) The formations *більш цікавий*, *найбільш красивий* resemble the analytical forms *more interesting*, *the most beautiful*, but they can hardly be regarded as analytical forms since they are not in complementary distribution with the correspond-

ing synthetic forms. *Більш цікавий* and *цікавіший* are rather stylistic synonyms.

- 3.3. In both languages there are qualitative and relative adjectives. In both languages relative adjectives and some qualitative ones have no opposites of comparison, i.e. they form the subclass of non-comparables. Despite the mentioned similarities there are some differences between the two languages.
 - a) The proportion of relative adjectives is greater in Ukrainian. In English “common case” nouns often render the meanings of Ukrainian relative adjectives, e.g.: *господарські витрати* — *household expenses*, *настільна лампа* — *a table lamp*, etc.
 - b) in Ukrainian there is a peculiar group of **possessive** adjectives (*сестрин, Настин, мамин*) having no English counterparts.
4. The combinability of adjectives is to some extent similar in the two languages. Yet there are some differences. In English one can speak only of two levels of combinability: lexical and lexico-grammatical. In Ukrainian grammatical combinability is of great importance too. Compare: *білий стіл, біла стеля, білих стін*, etc.
5. In both languages the typical functions of adjectives in the sentence are those of attribute (*white wall* — *біла стіна*) and predicative or the nominal part of a compound nominal predicate (*This girl is beautiful.* — *Ця дівчина прекрасна.*).

2. Degrees of comparison of adjectives

The only change that can be undergone by English adjectives is the change according to comparison degrees. Therefore the category of comparison is now the only grammatical category which is common for English and Ukrainian adjectives.

The category of the degrees of comparison of adjectives is the system of opposemes (like *long-longer-longest, довгий-довший-найдовший*) showing quantitative distinctions of qualities. More exactly,

it shows whether the adjective denotes the property of some substance absolutely or relatively as a higher or the highest amount of the property in comparison with that of some (or all) other substances. Accordingly we speak in both languages of the “**positive**” (*long, good, beautiful, довгий, хороший, красивий*), “**comparative**” (*longer, better, more beautiful, довший, кращий, красивіший/більш красивий*) and “**superlative**” (*longest, best, most beautiful, найдовший, найкращий, найкрасивіший/найбільш красивий*) degrees.

Nevertheless, there are certain peculiarities in both languages concerning the means of expression of the degree of comparison, namely the peculiarities of the manifestation of opposition underlying this category.

Thus, as far as English adjectives are concerned their positive degree is not marked. We may speak of a zero morpheme in this case. The “comparative” and the “superlative” degrees are built up either synthetically (by affixation or suppletivity) or analytically, which mainly depends on the phonetic structure of the stem, not on its meaning. If the stem is monosyllabic, or disyllabic with a stress on the second syllable or ending in *-er, -y, -le, -ow*, the comparative and the superlative degrees are usually built up synthetically by adding the suffixes *-er* and *-est* respectively, e.g.: *bright-brighter-brightest*.

In all other cases the comparative and superlative degrees are formed analytically with the help of the word-morphemes *more* and *most*, e.g.: *cheerful — more cheerful — most cheerful*.

Suppletive opposemes are few in number but of very frequent occurrence, e.g.: *good — better — best, bad — worse — worst*.

The quantitative pronominal adjectives (or adjective pronouns) *many, much* and *little* form opposites of comparison in a similar way: *many/much — more, most, little — less — least*.

Some scholars (V. Zhigadlo, I. Ivanova, L. Iofic) treat *more beautiful* and (*the*) *most beautiful* not as analytical forms, but as free syntactical combinations of adverbs and adjectives. One of their arguments is that *less* and *least* form combinations with adjectives similar to those with *more* and *most*, e.g. *more beautiful — less beautiful, the most beautiful — the least beautiful*. The mentioned similarity is however superficial [25; 75–77].

A. I. Smirnitsky, following O. Jespersen, thinks that there is good ground to speak of two forms of comparison only: the positive degree and the relative degree which exists in two varieties — the comparative degree and the superlative degree [25; 80].

As we know, with regard to the category of the degrees of comparison adjectives fall under two lexico-grammatical subclasses: **comparables** and **non-comparables**. The nucleus of the latter is composed of derived adjectives like *wooden*, *Crimean*, *mathematical*, etc. denoting some relation to the phenomena the basic stems refer to. Thus *a wooden house* is “a house of wood”, *Crimean weather* is “weather typical of the Crimea”, etc. These adjectives are called **relative** as distinct from all other adjectives called **qualitative**.

Most English qualitative adjectives build up opposeemes of comparison, but some do not:

- a) adjectives that in themselves express the highest degree of a quality, e.g.: *supreme*, *extreme*;
- b) those having the suffix *-ish* which indicates the degree of a quality, e.g. *reddish*, *whitish*;
- c) those denoting qualities which are not compatible with the idea of comparison, e.g.: *deaf*, *dead*, *lame*, *perpendicular*.

Naturally, all the adjectives which have no comparative and superlative opposites are outside the category of comparison, but they are united by the oblique or lexico-grammatical meaning of the positive degree [25; 79].

Therefore, an English adjective lexeme may contain three words at most (*strong* — *stronger* — *strongest*) representing three grammemes. The fourth grammeme contains words with the oblique meaning of the “positive degree” (*deaf*, *vertical*, *wooden*, etc.). There are no oblique meanings of the “comparative” and the “superlative” degrees in English, that is words like *calmer*, *bravest* always have “positive degree” opposites [25; 81].

Speaking about Ukrainian adjectives, here the category of degrees of comparison is similarly the ability to render some characteristic feature in different qualitative dimensions (вияв ознаки в різних

кількісних вимірах). The positive degree of Ukrainian adjectives is characterized by rendering a certain quality as it is (*зелений луг, блакитне небо*). The comparative degree acquires a certain relative comparative meaning (*розумніший, ніж інші*). The adjectives of the superlative degree render the complete absolute advantage of one object over the other (*найактивніші студенти на курсі*). The difference between Ukrainian and English adjectives, first of all, lies in the form of expression of degrees of comparison.

Ukrainian comparative degree adjectives have two forms of expression — the simple (synthetic) and the composite (analytical) ones (проста і складена).

The simple form of the comparative degree is formed in the following way: the base of the positive degree is combined with suffixes *-іш, -и* and the case or gender ending (*біл-ий, біл-іш-ий, біл-іш-і*). Some adjectives have the suppletive forms of formation (*гарний — кращий*).

The composite form of the comparative degree is formed with the help of words *більш/менш* and the positive degree adjective.

Ukrainian superlative degree adjectives have three forms of expression — simple, complex and composite (проста, складна і складена).

The simple form is created from the comparative degree form with the help of the prefix *най-*: *вищий — найвищий*.

The complex form is combining of the superlative degree form with particles *як, що*: *якнайдовший, щонайсильніший*.

The composite form is formed with the help of using words-antonyms *найбільш/найменш* with the positive degree form: *найбільш вибагливий, найменш примхливий*.

The synthetic form of the superlative degree adjectives can acquire the relative meanings, that is render the largest degree of some quality without comparing it with qualities of other objects, e.g.: *найширші кола читачів, без найменших зусиль*.

Ukrainian relative and possessive adjectives do not have features characteristic of Ukrainian qualitative adjectives, that is they do not form degrees of comparison, they cannot combine with adverbs, and they do not have antonymous counterparts [16; 134–142].

Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that by expression of this category English and Ukrainian adjectives have a lot in common.

Since the category of comparison renders the degree of intensity of some characteristics, expressed by an adjective, it is expressed only by qualitative adjectives in both languages (in the English language also by quantitative adjectives).

Both languages have three degrees of comparison — the positive, the comparative and the superlative ones (звичайний, вищий і найвищий). The comparison can express both the increasing intensity of some characteristics (*long-longer-the longest; довгий-довший-найдовший*) or the decreasing intensity (*interesting-less interesting-the least interesting; цікавий-менш цікавий-найменш цікавий*). Degrees of comparison in both languages are created synthetically and analytically.

The synthetic way of comparison creation is carried out with the help of affixes, but differently in each language. In English the comparative and the superlative degrees are formed with the help of suffixes added (*-er, -est*) to the form of the positive degree. In the Ukrainian language the comparative degree is formed with the help of adding the suffix *-и* or *-іш* to the root (*ширший, біліший*), and the superlative is formed from the comparative degree by adding the prefix *най-* (*найширший, найбіліший*).

The analytical way of degree expression, both according to the increasing and the decreasing intensity of characteristic, is formed similarly in both languages: *convenient — more convenient — (the) most convenient, зручний — більш зручний — найбільш зручний*. The synthetic way of comparison building according to the decreasing intensity of some characteristic is absent in both languages.

There are some peculiarities in the usage of synthetic and analytical forms of comparison in both languages. In English the synthetic forms are created only from one-syllable and partially two-syllable adjective (*long, pretty*), whereas the analytical way is used to form the comparison of only polysyllabic adjectives (*interesting, important*). In Ukrainian the usage of that or other way of comparison formation does not depend on the quantity of syllables in the adjective. Both synthetic and

analytical forms can be used as parallel ones (*зручніший — більш зручний*). The choice of that or other form is as a rule dictated by stylistic tasks, but in general synthetic forms of comparison are more spread than analytical ones.

In both languages there is a certain group of adjectives, the degrees of comparison of which are formed in a suppletive way (that is from another base), compare: in Ukrainian *великий-більший-найбільший, малий-менший-найменший, поганий-гірший-найгірший, хороший-кращий (or лінший)-найкращий (найлінший)* and in English *many/much-more-the most, little-less-the least, bad-worse-the worst, good-better-the best*.

In Ukrainian the forms of comparative and superlative degrees are changed, the same as forms of the positive degree, according to genders, numbers and cases in correspondence with the forms of the noun with which they are connected. In English forms of all degrees of comparison of adjectives are similarly indeclinable.

In both languages the form of the superlative degree can be used with the so-called elative meaning (елятивне значення) (elative — is the absolute superlative degree). It renders the maximum measure of quality without the comparison with other objects, e.g.: *найглибша повага, найсуворіша заборона, a most interesting theory, a most clever boy*. As it is obvious from the examples in Ukrainian in such cases the synthetic form of the superlative degree is usually used, and in the English language vice versa only the analytical form but with the indefinite article instead of the definite one.

The peculiar form of Ukrainian adjectives is the strengthened superlative degree (підсилений найвищий ступінь) formed by putting together of the superlative degree with the strengthening particle *як- or що-*: *якнайкращий, якнайбільший, якнайрозумніший, щонайкращий, щонайбільший, щонайрозумніший*. These forms are also widely used in the elative meaning.

One more peculiar feature of the Ukrainian language in comparison with the English one is the wide usage of qualitative adjectives with two types of suffixes, that is those having the diminutive meaning, and those expressing some sort of augmentative meaning (*-есеньк-*,

-ісіньк-, -юсіньк-, -еньк-, -езн-, -енн-), as well as with the prefix *пре-*, e.g.: *малесенький, тонесенький, білісінький, чистісінький, тонюсінький, манюсінький, величезний, широчезний, прегарний, предобрий*. Such adjectives already by themselves render the degree of the quality expression in one object without the need to compare it with other objects that have a similar characteristic, that is why they do not build degrees of comparison.

Similarly in the English language adjectives with the suffix *-ish* do not form degrees of comparison (*greenish (зеленуватий), darkish (темнуватий)*), since they by themselves express weak degree of the characteristic.

In general in English there is a considerably fewer number of adjectives with emotional suffixes, that is why meanings which are rendered in Ukrainian by caressing forms are rendered in English in a descriptive way with the help of defining word combinations (означальні словосполучення) (e.g.: *білісінький — very (extremely) white*) [5; 53–54].

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. Mention the groups, into which adjectives are subdivided as a class of lexemes, taking into account their grammatical and semantic characteristics. Provide examples.
2. What are the peculiarities of the Ukrainian qualitative adjectives? Is there any difference between Ukrainian and English qualitative adjectives?
3. Mention the allomorphic groups of adjectives in both contrasted languages.
4. What groups are Ukrainian adjectives divided into according to their morphological structure?
5. Characterize adjective as a part of speech (think of the number of grammatical categories, typical stem-building elements, combinability, syntactic functions). Do these characteristics differ in the contrasted languages?

6. Describe the grammatical categories of adjective as a part of speech. Does their number differ in the contrasted languages?
7. Define the category of the degrees of comparison as a grammatical phenomenon. State the basic similarities and differences in its manifestation by two languages.
8. What is meant by the “elative meaning” expressed by some forms of adjectives? Is it a peculiar feature of both English and Ukrainian adjectives? Provide examples.

II. Find all the adjectives in the following piece of writing. Classify these adjectives as being either qualitative or relative (if possible other type); comment on their grammatical characteristics.

a) in the English language:

A large number of people sat round a table: young girls in white muslin: older women with untidy hair and harassed expressions: a few men peered shyly and solicitously out of the background. All of the faces were made up of small dots. It was a newspaper photograph of a first communion party taken years ago; a youngish man in a Roman collar sat among the women. You could imagine him petted with small delicacies, preserved for their use in the stifling atmosphere of intimacy and respect. He sat there, plump, with protuberant eyes, bubbling with harmless feminine jokes (fiction writing).

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P.51.

b) in the Ukrainian language:

Якого кольору слова? Іноді все в цьому світі уявляється мені синім. Ото начебто ростуть сині тополі понад шляхом, випадають сині дощі.

Тихесенько вимовляю слово “зелений”, і постає переді мною все зелене.

Вимовляю слово “мама” — і ввижається мені добра її усмішка, каре іскристе мерехтіння в очах, ласкаве звучання голосу. Жоден

колір, мабуть, не пов'язується з її образом. Тільки здається, наче сяє чимось золотистим від очей, вишневим од губ, яблуками антонівками від щік.

Слово “осінь” туге й жовте, наче віск.

Слово “підсніжник” — біле, і чомусь од нього пахне сніжком, який починає танути, і гострою весняною землею, і торішнім перепрілим листом. (За Є. Гуцалом).

*The material is taken from the article “Нове в програмах і методиці” // Урок Української. — № 5–6, 2005. — Р.42–43.

III. Identify whether adjectives used in each sentence are in the positive, comparative or superlative form. Define whether each form is synthetic or analytical.

a) in the English language:

1. They became more distinct (fiction writing).
2. My grandfather wanted to stay in the kitchen because it was warmest there and he was near every one (other written language).
3. A storm of laughter arose and even the tiniest child joined in (fiction writing).
4. The espresso, in small cups, is dark and serious and packs a more powerful punch (newspaper writing).
5. The plane ascends and descends at a shallower angle when horses are aboard (other written language).
6. As the test goes on, you're gonna get more and more tired (conversation).
7. Her eyes, between her bright, ironic smile, and her short, white-gray hair, seem tireder, more deeply set in their sockets (fiction writing).
8. Sabina had never looked more lovely (fiction writing).
9. I've never seen May looking lovelier (fiction writing).
10. The reply was soon the property of every taxi-driver in Moscow, the most certain network in those days for news (fiction writing).
11. The more efficient you get, the more questions you ask (conversation).

12. The headaches are usually more severe in the morning (academic prose).

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P.54.

b) in the Ukrainian language:

Прикметник. Я глибоко переконаний, що перший прикметник, який сказала людина, мав позитивне значення. Так уже воно повелося, що людина *per aspera ad astra* прагне кращого, вищого, благороднішого, тож перший прикметник просто неодмінно мав означати щось прекрасне. Він був символом цього святого прагнення до кращого і водночас ніс у собі те чудове, на що натрапив його невідомий творець.

Цей прикметник окрилив свого творця і підніс його на сьоме небо.

Можливо, там до нього прийшло розуміння прекрасного, на якому і тримається наша людяність.

І хоча я не знаю, яким міг бути цей прикметник, та я все ж підсвідомо відчуваю його.

Навіть не його одного, а той ланцюг, який він повів за собою. Добра, розумна, ніжна. Весела. Дотепна, красива. Найкрасивіша! (Марко Шарий).

*The material is taken from the article “Цікава морфологія” // Урок Української. — № 5–6, 2006. — P. 53.

IV. The syntactic roles of adjectives. Study the examples of underlined adjectives in the presented syntactic roles. Translate the given sentences into Ukrainian. Analyze whether in Ukrainian you have also used adjectives to render the underlined pieces. Are Ukrainian adjectives used in the same syntactic functions?

1) attributive

Waste generation and environmental pollution are visible consequences of any form of industrial activity. (academic prose)

- 2) subject predicative
That's cool. (conversation)
- 3) object predicative
If they find him innocent they won't be able to charge him (conversation).
- 4) postposed modifier
Don't watch anything scary before you go to bed (newspaper writing).
- 5) noun phrase head
A modest effort was begun in some countries toward compensating women for the work they had always done for nothing: cooking, cleaning, taking care of children, the sick and the old. (academic prose)
- 6) part of a linking expression
I had no one else to go to when my parent was angry with me or when I felt unjustly treated. Equally important, my parent had no one with whom to discuss child rearing or domestic crises (other written language)
- 7) free modifier
Silent with awe and pity I went to her bedside (fiction writing).
- 8) exclamation
A: ... and he got a scholarship so ...
B: Fantastic! (conversation).

*The material is taken from "Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook" by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P.50–51.

CHAPTER 3

Numeral as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

1. Numeral as a part of speech: general characteristics

In both languages numerals are divided into **cardinal** (кількісні числівники — *one, two, один, два*) and **ordinal** (порядкові числівники — *the first, the second, перший, другий*). Ukrainian cardinal numerals have the peculiar group of indefinite numerals (неозначені числівники): *кілька, декілька, багато, чимало, стільки, кільканадцять, кількадесят*. Besides Ukrainian numerals possess such a peculiar subgroup as **collective numerals** (збірні числівники — *двоє, обоє, троє, четверо*), denoting a certain quantity of objects as a whole. These numerals are created from the base of the corresponding cardinal numerals with the help of the suffix of collectiveness (суфікс збірності) *-р+о*. Collective numerals denote numbers within two tens and the numeral *тридцять*. They can have synonymous forms, e.g.: *двоє (двійко), четверо (четвірко), сімнадцятеро*. Besides, the following words are included into this group: *обоє, обидва, обидві* [16; 155]. One more peculiarity of the system of Ukrainian numerals is the caressing forms or diminutive forms of collective numerals (пестливі форми збірних числівників): *двійко, двійко, двоєчко, трійко, четвірко, обойко* and others. The English language does not have collective numerals and diminutive forms are met only by nouns (*sonny, Johnny*). Some meanings of indefinite quantity are expressed here with the help of quantitative adjectives and adverbs (кількісні прикметники та прислівники): *many, much, few, little, a little*.

The basis of counting in both languages is the decimal system (в основі лічби обох мов лежить десяткова система). That is why the structure of numerals' system formation does not have a big difference. As to their stem structure English and Ukrainian numerals fall into:

- 1) Simple or root numerals (прості числівники), such as *one, two, three* (in English from one to twelve), *один, два, три* (in Ukrainian from one to ten and the numeral 'сорок').
- 2) Derivative numerals (похідні числівники) formed with the help of the suffixes *-teen* (from *thirteen* to *nineteen* — these numerals have the double stress: 'four'teen), *-ty* (from *twenty* to *ninety*) in English. In Ukrainian the numerals from 11 to 19 are formed by the way of adding the suffix *-надцять* (which is created from the word group "на десять" — *одинадцять*) to the numerals of the first ten. Ukrainian numerals denoting tens are formed with *-дцять* (*тридцять*). Both suffixes (English *-ty* and Ukrainian — *-дцять*) have in the basis of their meaning "ten"/"десять". The exceptions in Ukrainian are only two numerals *сорок* and *дев'яносто*.

In both languages numerals *мільйон*–*million*, *мільярд*–*milliard* are borrowed and have in their structure the Latin root "thousand"/"тисяча" (*mille*). The peculiarity of English numerals *hundred, thousand, million* is the fact that they do not have the plural form, when they are placed after the cardinal numerals bigger than 1, e.g.: *two hundred/двісті, three thousand/три тисячі, four million/чотири мільйони*.

- 3) Compound numerals (складні числівники) in English (from *twenty-one* to *ninety-nine*);
- 4) Composite numerals (складені числівники), such as *nine hundred and three* in English and in Ukrainian *двадцять один, вісімсот вісімдесят* are formed in both languages according to the general principle. By forming of English numerals higher than 100 it is necessary to use the conjunction "and": *two hundred and forty eight*. In Ukrainian such numerals are created in the same way as the numerals till 100: *сто два, двісті двадцять п'ять*.

Fractional numerals (дробові числівники) have as well a similar way of formation. The difference is that in Ukrainian the cardinal numeral for the numerator (кількісний числівник для чисельника) is in the nominative case and is combined with the ordinal for the denominator (порядковий для знаменника), which is in the genitive case plural: *п'ять шостих*. In English numerals do not have the category of case, but the ordinal numeral for the denominator is substantivized and acquires the plural form (when the numeral is bigger than 1): *five sixths*. When we have “one” in the numerator, then both the numerator and the denominator are expressed by numerals of the feminine gender in Ukrainian (since we mean here the word “частина”) in the nominative case: *одна сьома* (compare in English — *one seventh*).

In Ukrainian such words as *нів, нівтора, чверть* are also used as numerals. In English they are expressed correspondingly with nouns *half, quarter*. The numeral *нів* — is not an independent word, it is usually used with nouns as a whole, and such a noun is always in the genitive case: *півдня, піввідра, півроку, піваркуша, пів'яблука*. Unlike mentioned above the English *half* is never combined together with the noun to form one word, though they are considered as the united syntactic word group, in which the noun is in the common case: *half a year/ півроку*.

In Ukrainian with the mixed-fractional numerals (змішано-дробові числівники) bigger than 2 we use the noun *половина* instead of *нів*, e.g. *2½ два з половиною*, whereas in English the same word *half* continues to be used: *two and a half*.

From the Ukrainian *нів* numerals *нівтора, нівтори* are formed, and in English we have the correspondent word group *one and a half* and *нівтораста* — in English *one hundred and fifty*.

In English the word *dozen* is very often used by counting whereas in Ukrainian the word *дюжина* is used very seldom. Of interest is also the usage of the separate numeral *score* in English meaning *twenty pieces* (*двадцять штук*). It does not have the plural form similar to words *hundred, thousand*, e.g.: *three score “шістдесят”*, *four score “вісімдесят”*, *five score “сто”*.

Ordinal numerals are formed from the cardinal ones by adding the suffix **-th** in English, and in Ukrainian — the adjectival endings — **-ий, -а, -е**.

The first four ordinal numerals are created in the contrasted languages not according to general rules: the Ukrainian *один* — *перший* from the old base “*нѣрѣ*” (with the old meaning “*передній*”), the English *one* — *first* from *fyrest* (the form of the superlative degree of the old English *fore* meaning “*the front*”/*перед*). The numerals *другий* (compare *два*) and *the second* (compare *two*) are also formed from different stems, the latter is borrowed from the French language. The numerals *третій, четвертий* and English *third* also have the changed base in comparison with the corresponding cardinal numerals *три, чотири, three* [5; 55–56].

2. Grammatical categories of numeral

The English numeral as a part of speech is characterized by the following features:

- 1) its lexico-grammatical meaning of “number”;
- 2) such typical stem-building suffixes as *-teen, -ty*;
- 3) the category of numerical qualification represented in opposites like *seven* — *seventh*;
- 4) its unilateral combinability with nouns (*three children, the third child*);
- 5) its syntactic function as an attribute, less frequently as some other part of the sentence.

The lexico-grammatical meaning of “number” is not to be confused with the grammatical meaning of “number”:

- a) The former is the generalization of a multitude of lexical meanings of individual numerals (*five, ten, fifty seven, etc.*). The latter is the generalization of only two grammatical meanings: “singular” and “plural”.
- b) The plural number, as in *boys*, shows indefinite plurality, whereas the meanings of numerals, as in *twenty, forty* are definite plurality.

Numerals are usually divided into two groups, as it has been mentioned above, — cardinal numerals (*one, five, twenty*) and ordinal numerals (*first, fifth, twentieth*). The former denote some *numerical quantity*, the latter — some *numerical order*.

The difference between these two groups is sometimes exaggerated to such an extent that they are treated as belonging to different parts of speech. For instance, A.I. Smirnitsky is of the opinion that only cardinal numerals form a separate part of speech, whereas ordinal numerals are adjectives [25; 92–93].

In the opinion of B. Khaimovich and B. Rogovskaya, the pair *ten* — *tenth* forms an opposeme of the grammatical category of numerical qualification [25; 92–93].

The lexical meaning of the two words expressed by the lexical morpheme *ten-* is the same. They are opposed only grammatically by the opposition of the zero morpheme in *ten* and the *-th* morpheme in *tenth*. The opposition is as regular as that of the zero morpheme of the singular and the *-(e)s* morpheme of the plural. The meaning of the zero morpheme is that of “numerical quantity”, and the meaning of the *-th* morpheme is that of “numerical order”.

In the opposemes *one* — *first*, *two* — *second*, *three* — *third* the meaning of numerical qualification is expressed by means of suppletivity and sound interchange.

The words *half, quarter, zero, nought, score*, etc. which have no ordinal opposites, but possess plural opposites are nouns, not numerals. The same in Ukrainian: words like *одиниця, десяток, дюжина, сотня, пара* are the numeral nouns (числові іменники).

English and Ukrainian numerals are similar as to their lexico-grammatical meanings, ways of stem-building, combinability and syntactic functions, but they differ greatly regarding their grammatical categories.

- 1) Unlike their English counterparts, Ukrainian numerals possess the categories of gender (*третій — третя — третє*), case (*три — трьох — трьом*), and number (*перший — перші*).
- 2) There is a great difference between ordinal and cardinal numerals in Ukrainian as far as their categories are concerned. Ordinal numerals resemble adjectives not only in having the categories

of number, gender and case, but in the forms of the grammatical morphemes as well. Compare: *третій* — *мужній*, *третього* — *мужнього*, etc. Cardinal numerals do not possess the categories of number and gender (with the exception of *один*, *два*). Therefore, the numeral in English is an indeclinable part of speech, whereas in Ukrainian it is declined according to the same six cases as nouns.

In both languages numerals expressing the number as the characteristic feature of some object do not have the category of number themselves. In Ukrainian only the numeral *один* somehow retains the correlation of singular and plural forms, though in reality its plural form is reconsidered (*переосмислений*). Thus in combination with nouns, which do not have the singular number, it really renders the singleness of the object (*одичність предмета*) (compare: *одні сани*, *одні окуляри*), but in other cases it acquires the meaning of pronoun (compare: *одні хлопці мені говорили*).

The category of gender is altogether absent in English numerals. In Ukrainian the majority of numerals do not have it either (from 3 to 999). The gender characteristics are differentiated only in numerals *один* (*одна*, *одно*), *два* (*дві*), *обидва* (*обидві*), *півтора* (*півтори*). Besides the numeral *один* the rest of these numerals have the common form for the masculine and the neuter gender. The gender forms in all the numerals are expressed only in the nominative and accusative cases. For the rest of the cases all three genders coincide in one form (e.g.: *двох чоловіків*, *жінок*, *вікон*).

The declension of Ukrainian numerals is not a united consistent (*послідовний*) system, it contains the samples of different declensions. The numeral *один* is declined as a demonstrative pronoun *той*, *та*, *те*. The rest of numerals are declined very differently. Numerals from 5 to 90 (except 40) have in the genitive, the dative and the local cases one common form with the flexion *-и*. Also they have the common form for the nominative and accusative cases, and only in the instrumental case they have the separate form with the flexion *-ма* (*шістьма*). Numerals 40, 90, 100 have the common form for the whole rest of indirect cases (*сорока*).

Such a unification of indirect cases shows that the system of declensions in Ukrainian is being ruined. Morphological forms of numerals transfer their semantic load onto the syntactic forms.

The collective numerals *двоє, троє* and others have only the nominative case, in other cases the forms of usual cardinal numerals are used instead of them (*двох, двом, двома*). The collective numerals *обидва, обидві, обоє* have the forms of the numeral *оба* in indirect cases, which was widely used in older times.

The numerals *нівтора, нівтори, нівтораства* are not declined altogether.

In both languages numerals can be used independently without the modified noun. In such cases they are somehow substantivized, performing different syntactic functions, typical for nouns. In Ukrainian the collective nouns of the type *двоє, троє, четверо* and others and their diminutive forms *двійко, трійко* are very often used without nouns.

The peculiarity of the English language is the often use of cardinal numerals in the role of ordinal ones. It happens usually by denoting the year, the chapter of the book, the page, the number and so on, e.g.: *page five (п'ята сторінка), number six (шостий номер), lesson two (другий урок), in the year nineteen seventeen (у 1917 році)*. In Ukrainian such a usage is only possible with the word *номер (аудиторія номер десять)*. In other cases ordinal numerals are always used.

Ordinal numerals are most often used in the function of attribute in both languages: *the first floor, другий поверх*. The forms of ordinal numerals, similar to forms of adjectives, are wholly syntactic ones: they are revealed only as a consequence of existing of certain categories by the corresponding nouns with which these ordinal numerals are agreed (Форми порядкових числівників, як і форми прикметників, цілком синтаксичні: вони виявляються виключно як наслідок існування певних категорій у відповідних іменниках, з якими ці порядкові числівники узгоджуються) [5; 58–59].

The combinability of English and Ukrainian numerals is rather limited. As a rule, they form combinations with nouns. Numerals usually precede the nouns they modify, e.g.: *three boys — три хлопці, first day — перший день*. Numerals, as a rule, are not modified by

other words. This negative combinability is also a characteristic feature of the part of speech.

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. Characterize the groups of numerals in English and Ukrainian languages.
2. What are the peculiarities of Ukrainian collective numerals?
3. What are the groups of English and Ukrainian numerals according to their stem-structure?
4. Compare the group of fractional numerals in both contrasted languages.
5. What are the peculiarities of Ukrainian ordinal numerals in comparison with the English ones?
6. Characterize numeral as a part of speech (think of the number of grammatical categories, typical stem-building elements, combinability, syntactic functions). Do these characteristics differ or coincide in the contrasted languages?
7. How can you characterize the combinability of numeral as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages?

II. Find all the numerals in the following piece of writing. Classify these numerals being either cardinal or ordinal (if possible other type); comment on their grammatical characteristics.

1. Four people were arrested (newspaper text).
2. Four of the ten traders have pleaded guilty (newspaper text).
3. Cops in twos and threes huddle and smile at me with benevolence (fiction text).
4. Damage is estimated at hundreds of millions of pounds (newspaper text).
5. I was doing my third week as a young crime reporter and had just about finished my second and last story of the day when the phone rang (fiction text).

6. Three men will appear before Belfast magistrates today on charges of intimidation. A fourth will be charged with having information likely to be of use to terrorists. The fifth, a woman, was remanded on the same charge yesterday (newspaper text).
7. Probably two thirds of the people who live here now are not natives (conversation transcript).
8. The pupil can identify the place value of a column or a digit for values of tenths, hundredths and thousandths (academic text).

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P.34–35.

III. Classify the given numerals being either cardinal or ordinal (if possible other type).

П'ятий, вісім, дванадцятий, четвертий, дев'ять, двісті, чотири, двадцять перший, третій, сім, одна четверта, тридцятєро, обидва, п'ять шостих, дванадцять, сто, двоє, обое, нуль цілих і п'ять десятих, десятиєро, один.

IV. Comment on the grammatical characteristics of Ukrainian numerals, using the text given below. Stress on the isomorphic and allomorphic features of English and Ukrainian numerals.

Якось тато-числівник запитав у своїх синочків-числівників П'ятдесят і П'ятсот, чи робили вони ранкову зарядку.

– А як? Як її робити?

Тато й каже:

– А ви розімніть м'язи, провідмінійтесь за відмінками.

Першим почав відмінюватися числівник П'ятдесят — літери аж миготять.

Н. *п'ятдесят*

Р. *п'ятдесяти*

Д. *п'ятдесяти*

– Ну, як у мене виходить?

З. *п'ятдесят, п'ятдесятьох*

О. *п'ятдесятьма*

М. *на п'ятдесяти*

– Добре, синку, добре.

А числівник П'ятсот каже:

– Та ти слабак! Хто ж так відмінюється! От дивись, як треба! Я провідмінюю обидві частини!

Н. *п'ятсот*

З. *п'ятсот, п'ятисот*

Р. *п'ятисот*

О. *п'ятьмастами*

Д. *п'ятистам*

М. *на п'ятистах*

Прикро стало числівникові П'ятдесят, аж сльози на очі навернулися, але Тато-числівник його заспокоїв:

– Ти ж молодший, означаєш десятки, менше число, то тобі цілком досить відмінювати одну частину. А він старший, більше число означає — сотні, то й відмінює обидві частини.

*The material is taken from the article: “Плохотнюк Галина. Чарівна карусель (лінгвістичні казки на уроках мови) // Урок Української. — № 5–6, 2006. — Р. 43.

CHAPTER 4

Pronoun as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

1. Pronoun as a part of speech: general characteristics. Grammatical categories of pronoun

Words fall into classes known as parts of speech in accordance with their lexico-grammatical meanings, morphological categories, typical stem-building elements, combinability and functions.

The peculiarity of pronouns as a class of words is that they are not united by any of the above-mentioned features. True, they have certain grammatical peculiarities, but what unites them is the way they denote reality.

Pronouns are words serving to denote substances, qualities, quantities, circumstances, etc. not by naming or describing them, but by *indicating* them.

As words of the vocabulary pronouns have extremely general meanings. But in speech pronouns indicate particular objects or qualities. When a speaker says *I*, he refers to himself, that is to a particular person of definite age, height, colour of hair, etc. When another speaker says *I*, he also refers to himself, but this time it is another person, with other features. Thus, the meaning of *I*, general as it is, remains the same, but the objects referred to are different.

The meaning of the pronoun *such* is of “the same kind”, but one speaker may use *such* to indicate a definite colour, another speaker may use it with reference to some size, a third one to indicate a particular temperature, etc.

On the other hand, one and the same person may be referred to as *I*, *you* or *he*, depending upon who speaks. *This* and *that* may indicate the same object, depending on the relative position of the speaker and the object. Thus, **pronouns** can be defined as *words whose meanings are very general and stable, but whose references in speech are particular, variable and relative with regard to the speaker and the situation of speech.*

We insist on the stability of meaning and the variability and relativity of reference, because many authors speak of the relative meaning of pronouns. But when we ask *What is this?* referring now to the blackboard, now to a piece of chalk, we use the word *this* with the same meaning, “the object I point at” or “the object I demonstrate”, and not with the meanings of “blackboard”, “piece of chalk”, etc. Those are only the objects of reference and not the meanings of the word *this*.

Etymologically the word “pronoun” means “a word used instead of a noun”. This meaning reflects to some extent the role of pronouns in language. Owing to the exceptional variability of reference a pronoun may replace hundreds of nouns with comparatively stable or limited references. This explains the fact that pronouns are used very frequently and form a considerable part of any text; though as a class of words they are not numerous.

The role of pronouns is much greater than it can be inferred from the meaning of the word *pronoun*. It is not always that a pronoun is substituted for a noun. For instance, what noun does the pronoun *it* replace in *It rains?*

What is more important, pronouns can be substituted not only for nouns, but for other parts of speech as well. Traditionally, pronouns are divided into “noun pronouns”, and “adjective pronouns”. In reality pronouns may also be used instead of numerals (compare: *twenty books* — *several books*, *many books*) and adverbs (*here*, *there*, *now*, *then*). Using the prefix *pro-* in its meaning “instead of”, we may, therefore, classify pronouns with regard to the parts of speech into **pro-nouns**, **pro-adjectives**, **pro-numerals** and **pro-adverbs**.

Thus, pronouns are a collection of words correlated with different parts of speech, which accounts for their not being united by any morphological categories or syntactical functions.

Sometimes a pronoun is correlated with one part of speech only. But very often this is not so. In a part of speech, as we know, variants of the same lexeme may belong to different subclasses. The peculiarity of pronouns is that variants of the same lexeme may be correlated with different parts of speech. *This* in the sentence *Is this a bike?* is a pronoun, while in a sentence *He gave me this bike* it is a pro-adjective. *Here* in *He lives here* is a pro-adverb, but in *from here to Kyiv* it is a pro-noun.

As pointed out by A.I. Smirnitsky, the boundaries of pronouns and those parts of speech with which they are correlated are rather indistinct. The word *this* in *this bike* may be regarded both as an adjective pronoun and as a pronominal adjective, the word *here* — as a pronominal adverb and as an adverbial pronoun [25; 96–99].

According to Yu.O. Zhluktenko [5; 59] in grammars of both languages there are differentiated the following classes of pronouns: 1) personal (особові), 2) possessive (присвійні), 3) reflexive (зворотні), 4) demonstrative (вказівні), 5) interrogative (питальні), 6) relative (відносні), 7) indefinite (неозначені), 8) negative (заперечні). The class of English pronouns which in some grammars are referred to as generalizing (узагальнюючі) (*all, each, every, both, either* and others) have a lot in common with such Ukrainian pronouns which are distinguished into the class of defining pronouns (означальні: *весь, всякий, сам, кожний, інший* etc.). The pronoun *сам* belonging to this class corresponds in English to the whole class of pronouns which are called strengthening (підсильні) (*myself, yourself* and others). Besides the mentioned ones in English there are still distinguished the reciprocal pronouns (взаємні) (*each other, one another*), distinguishing (видільний) (*other, another*), and indefinite-personal (*one*) (неозначено-особові) pronouns. The mentioned classes are not distinguished among Ukrainian pronouns by existing grammars.

Nevertheless, views concerning the number of classes of pronouns in both contrasted languages differ from scholar to scholar. Thus, unlike Yu.O. Zhluktenko, B.S. Khaimovich and B.I. Rogovskaya differentiate the following classes of English pronouns, taking into account their semantic peculiarities as well as some grammatical peculiarities: 1) personal, 2) possessive, 3) reflexive, 4) demonstrative,

5) interrogative, 6) connective, 7) reciprocal, 8) indefinite, 9) negative, 10) generalizing, 11) quantitative, 12) contrasting. Also they state that a pronoun may belong to more than one group at the same time. The pronoun *whose* may be treated as interrogative (or connective) and possessive. The pronouns *one*, *one's*, *oneself* may be grouped together as indefinite personal, or they may be classified separately: *one* as personal, *one's* as possessive, *oneself* as reflexive, etc. [25; 99].

In his turn the Ukrainian linguist O.D. Ponomariv (with co-authors) [16; 162–168] presents the following subdivision of Ukrainian pronouns into classes (розряди займенників) in the book “Modern Ukrainian language”: 1) personal pronouns (особові займенники); 2) the reflexive pronoun (зворотний займенник *себе*); 3) possessive pronouns (присвійні займенники); 4) demonstrative pronouns (вказівні займенники); 5) defining pronouns (означальні займенники); 6) interrogative pronouns (питальні займенники); 7) relative pronouns (відносні займенники); 8) indefinite pronouns (неозначені займенники); 9) negative pronouns (заперечні займенники).

It must be mentioned that in Ukrainian the pronoun is also a notional part of speech which does not name objects, their qualities and quantities but only indicates them. So the differentiation of a pronoun as a part of speech is based upon its peculiar semantics — the high level of the meaning generalization (висока узагальненість значення).

Ukrainian pronouns are different in regard to their word-building and word-changing characteristics (різноманітні за формами словотворення і словозміни). Ukrainian pronouns are declinable, though each separate group of pronouns has its own peculiarities of declining, for example personal pronouns are characterized by: suppletivism — *я*, *мене*, *мені*, the availability of prepositional and non-prepositional case forms — *його*, *до нього*; the Ukrainian reflexive pronoun *себе* does not have the nominative case form.

In both languages we differentiate simple, complex and compound pronouns according to their morphological structure (прості, складні і складені займенники). There are no derivative pronouns (похідні займенники) in these languages since affixation is not used to form pronouns both in English and in Ukrainian.

Grammatical categories of pronoun. The category of number is only characteristic of the English demonstrative pronouns (*this, that*), the differentiating pronoun (*other*), reflexive and strengthening pronouns (*myself — ourselves*).

In Ukrainian the category of number is expressed by demonstrative pronouns (*той, цей, такий*), possessive pronouns (*мій — мої*), some interrogative and relative pronouns (*який, чий, котрий*) and created from them negative pronouns (*ніякий, нічий*) and indefinite pronouns (*деякий, абиякий*), as well as in some defining pronouns (*всякий, кожний, інший, сам, весь*).

All the mentioned Ukrainian pronouns also have the category of gender, which is absolutely missing for English pronouns.

The category of case is expressed in the system of English pronouns also unequally. Some part of pronouns have like nouns the common and possessive cases (indefinite, reciprocal, the indefinite-personal and defining pronouns), the rest (personal, interrogative and relative pronouns) have unlike English nouns the nominative and the objective cases (*називний та об'єктний відмінки*).

In Ukrainian pronouns have the same six cases as the nouns. But similar to numerals, Ukrainian pronouns do not have the common system of declination. A lot of pronouns are characterized by the suppletivism in their declension (the absence of the stable stem to which the case endings are added: *я — мене, він — його, хто — кого, що — чого*). To some extent, it is characteristic also of some English pronouns (compare: *I — me, she — her, we — us*).

2. Personal and possessive pronouns

English personal pronouns are the nucleus of the class. They are: *I (me), he (him), she (her), it, we (us), you, they (them)*.

Personal pronouns serve to indicate all persons and things from the point of view of the speaker who indicates himself/herself or a group of persons including him/her by means of the personal pronouns of the first person — *I, we*. The speaker indicates his/her interlocutor or

interlocutors by means of the pronouns of the second person — *you*. All other persons or things are indicated by him/her with the help of the pronouns of the third person — *he, she* (for persons), *it* (for things), *they* (for both).

In Modern English personal pronouns have the category of case represented in two-member opposeemes. But these opposeemes differ from the case opposeemes of nouns. The general meaning of “case” manifests itself in the particular meanings of the “nominative” and “objective” cases.

Person	Singular	Plural
1.	I — me	we — us
2.	you — you	you — you
3.	he — him	they — them
	she — her	
	it — it	

Case, as we know, is a morphological category with syntactical significance. The opposition of the nominative and the objective case is realized syntactically in the opposition of the subject and the object of the sentence, e.g.: *She asked her*.

With nouns it is different because a noun in the common case fulfills the functions of both the subject and the object. The pronouns *you* and *it* having only one form for both cases seem to resemble nouns in this respect.

As to the category of number, it should be observed that, strictly speaking, personal pronouns have no category of number, *I* and *we* or *he* and *they* cannot be treated as number opposites inasmuch as they differ from each other not only grammatically, but lexically as well. *We* is not *I + I* but rather *I* and *you*, *I* and *she*, *I* and *they*, etc. *They* is not always *he + he*, it may as well mean *he + she*. *You* is said to indicate both the singular and the plural. So it ought to be similar to cases like *sheep, deer*. But it is not $2 \text{ sheep} = 1 \text{ sheep} + 1 \text{ sheep}$, in other words *sheep pl.* = *sheep sg.* + *sheep sg.* With *you* it is different. *You pl.* does

not always indicate *you sg.* + *you sg.* It may indicate *you sg.* + *he, you sg.* + *they*, etc.

Since *I* and *we* differ lexically, they do not belong to the same lexeme, they do not form an opposeme, and their number meanings are not grammatical. But *I, he, she, it* form a group of words whose combinability resembles that of singular nouns. Compare: *I, he, she, it, John, the student ... was (not were) ...*. The pronouns *we, you, they*, on the contrary, have the combinability of plural nouns. We may then regard the pronouns of the first group as *singularia tantum*, and those of the other group as *pluralia tantum*. In other words, the personal pronouns possess oblique or lexico-grammatical meanings of number.

Similarly we speak of the lexico-grammatical meaning of person. The words *I, me, we, us* (as well as pronouns of other groups: *my, mine, our, ours, myself, ourselves*) are united by their reference to the first person, the speaker. Of these only *I* has grammatical combinability with *am*. Only the “singulars” (*I, me, my, mine, myself*) refer to the first person alone. The “plurals” include, besides the first person, reference to the second (*I and you*), or the third (*I and he, she, or they*), or both.

The words *you, your, yours, yourself, yourselves* are united by their reference to the second person, the hearer. But all of them (except *yourself*) may include reference to the third person as well (*you and he, she or they*). So, in fact, they are united negatively by not including reference to the first person.

The words *he, him, she, her, it, they, them* (also pronouns of other groups) are united by their reference to the third person, the “spoken-of”, or negatively by not including reference to the first and second persons, the speaker and the hearer. Of these words *he, she and it* have explicit grammatical combinability (*he speaks, she has ..., it is ...*).

According to O.D. Ponomariv [16; 163] **Ukrainian personal pronouns** are subdivided into two groups: personal and personal-demonstrative (особові та особово-вказівні). Personal include such pronouns as *я, ти, ми, ви*, personal-demonstrative — *він, вона, воно, вони*.

Personal pronouns do not substitute nouns but serve to name a person: the pronoun of the first person singular *я* denotes a person

that is speaking; the pronoun *ти* denotes an addressee to whom the speaker refers. Pronouns *я, ти*, and pronouns *ми, ви* are opposed as singular and plural forms, though have the following meanings: *ми* — this is me and somebody else (*я і ще хтось*); *ми* as the author's plurality (авторське "я") used in the publicistic and scientific styles, e.g.: *ми опрацювали великий матеріал ...*. The pronoun *ви* indicates a lot of persons to whom the author's words are directed.

Personal-demonstrative pronouns denote persons who come out of boundaries of the communicative situation, or they denote some notions or objects mentioned during the conversation.

Ukrainian personal pronouns are declined according to six cases and have two numbers singular and plural. Personal-demonstrative pronouns are also characterized by the category of gender.

Following is the contrastive analysis of personal pronouns in both languages. The number of personal pronouns is similar in both languages. Here belong first of all the proper personal pronouns: *я, ти, ми, ви, вони; I, you, we, they*. Their characteristics and meanings basically coincide, but the role of personal pronouns in the English sentence is considerably bigger than in the Ukrainian one. Whereas in Ukrainian the person and the number are expressed with the help of endings (*читаю, читаєш, читає, читаємо* тощо) in English the indexes of the verb's person and number are the personal pronouns (*I read, you read, we read* and so on). In English we cannot use the verb-predicate without the subject as in Ukrainian, e.g.: "*Каже*", "*Підходить і питає*", we necessarily should use the pronoun in the function of subject: *He says; He comes up and asks*.

The personal pronoun *they* can also be used with the impersonal meaning. In Ukrainian in such cases the pronoun is usually not used, e.g.: *they say* — *кажуть*.

Pronouns of the third person are of the person-object type (особово-предметні) in both languages. In singular they have the meaning of gender: *він, вона, воно; he, she*. Ukrainian pronouns *він, вона* unlike English ones *he, she* can point out towards both the living being and the inanimate object. The English *it* and in many cases Ukrainian *воно* denote everything that does not belong to the notion of "person".

But the Ukrainian pronoun *воно* cannot be fully referred to object pronouns (предметний займенник). It is widely used to denote small according to their age creatures (*теля, лоша, кошеня*) and even persons (*дитя, хлоп'я, дівча*). It is also used to render the indefiniteness of some creature (*Курить щось по дорозі. Що воно біжить так прудко? М. Коцюбинський.*) or to render some disrespect towards it (*Таке воно плюгавеньке!..*). The peculiar feature of this pronoun is its wide usage as a particle: *Вже воно щось є; Щось воно та вийде.*

The English *it* has a much more distinct demonstrative meaning, than the Ukrainian *воно* (compare: *It is a table "це стіл"*).

In Ukrainian the majority of nouns — names of inanimate objects have the grammatical gender. That is why the English pronoun *it* corresponds in Ukrainian not only to *воно*, but also often to *він, вона* (e.g., *стіл, лава*). Whereas English pronouns *he, she* have always the Ukrainian correspondences *він, вона*.

The English *it* is widely used in the function of the formal functional subject (формальний службовий підмет) in impersonal sentences. Here this pronoun loses any lexical meaning, being transformed into a purely functional word, e.g.: *it rains "іде дощ", it is cold "холодно", it is interesting "цікаво"*. In Ukrainian such a usage of pronouns is impossible; they always retain their lexical meaning.

The peculiar feature of Ukrainian personal pronouns is the fact that the forms of the genitive case of the third person pronouns *його, її, їх* can be used in the meaning of possessive pronouns (*його хата, її доля*). In such a function they considerably differ from the proper personal pronouns [5; 60–61].

English possessive pronouns are usually treated as adjective pronouns, whereas they are in reality noun pro-nouns or pro-nouns, but they replace only possessive case nouns with which they are correlated. Compare: *This is the teacher's (his, her) bicycle. This bicycle is the teacher's (his, hers).*

The combinability and functions of the possessive pronouns and the "possessive case" nouns are almost identical, which justifies the view that the pronouns in question are possessive case opposites of the personal pronouns. The only argument we can put forward against

that view and in favour of the opinion that possessive pronouns are a separate group, is as follows.

Modern English differs from Old English and from other Modern Germanic languages in having two sets of possessive pronouns — the conjoint possessive pronouns *my, his, her, its, our, your, their* and the absolute possessive pronouns *mine, his, hers, ours, yours, theirs*.

Therefore, it would, probably, be more in keeping with language facts (a) to treat *my (mine), her (hers), our (ours)*, etc. not as the possessive case of personal pronouns but as a subclass of pronouns; (b) to regard *my — mine, her — hers*, etc. as a kind of case opposemes.

Ukrainian possessive pronouns include: *мій, твій, ваш, наш, свій, його, її, їх, їхній*. According to their grammar characteristics they are close to adjectives, e.g.: *бажаю щастя всім вашим родичам*. Possessive pronouns have the categories of gender and number and are declined according to six cases (*мій, моє, моя, мої; мій, мого, моєму ...*).

Following is the contrastive analysis of possessive pronouns in both languages. In both languages they render the belonging and perform the function of attribute or the nominal part of the compound predicate.

The English language has a particular form of the possessive pronoun for each of the mentioned functions: for the attribute — *my, his, her, its, our, your, their*, for the nominal part of predicate — *mine, his, hers, its, ours, yours, theirs* (these forms are sometimes used in the role of the postpositive attribute with the preposition “of” — *the house of mine*).

In Ukrainian both functions are performed by one form of possessive pronouns — *мій, твій* and others. The pronoun of the third person plural has two parallel forms *їх* and *їхній*.

Ukrainian grammars point out among possessive pronouns only such words as *мій, твій, наш, ваш, їхній, свій*. What concerns the words *його (книжка), її (кімната), їх (інститут)* that are actually the reconsidered forms of the genitive case of personal pronouns of the third person they are referred to as possessive pronouns but with some warning. From the proper possessive pronouns they differ by the fact that they are indeclinable and are not coordinated with the modified noun in number, gender and case.

In Ukrainian when there appears the need to render the belonging of some object to some person, the possessive pronoun *свій* is used. It is used irrespective of the doer's person, e.g.: *я виконав свою роботу; ти взяв свій зошит; він відкрив свій портфель* and so on. In English we do not have the direct correspondence to the pronoun *свій* and in each case the possessive pronoun of the person who is the doer of the action is used, e.g.: *I did my work; you took your book; he opened his bag*. In the majority of cases (e.g., before nouns denoting parts of clothing or parts of the body, family relations and others) the usage of possessive pronouns is a norm. In such combinations possessive pronouns are very close to articles according to their usage. Compare:

Він поклав руку в кишеню. — He put his hand into his pocket.

Зніміть пальто. — Take off your coat.

Я говорив про це батькові. — I told my father about it [5; 61–62].

3. Reflexive and strengthening pronouns

English reflexive pronouns are compound noun-pronouns whose second element *-self* expresses the anaphoric relation of the first element; that is it shows that the first element refers to the person mentioned previously in the sentence. In English there are eight reflexive pronouns: *myself, yourself, himself, herself, itself, ourselves, yourselves, themselves*. Similar to possessive pronouns they correlate with personal pronouns, at this the personal pronoun *you* correlates with two reflexive pronouns: in singular with *yourself* and in plural with *yourselves*. English reflexive pronouns have the category of number and differentiate between the person and “non-person” (compare: *himself, herself* and *itself*).

The Ukrainian reflexive pronoun *себе* indicating towards some person or object does not have the nominative case form, as well as it does not possess the categories of gender and number. It can denote in certain contexts any gender in singular and in plural, replacing all personal pronouns in indirect cases, e.g.: *Я знаю себе. Ти знаєш себе. Вони знають себе. Ти будеш працювати у себе вдома (а не у тебе).*

Compare Ukrainian *Він захищав себе. Вона захищала себе* and in English *He defended himself. She defended herself*.

Following is the contrastive analysis of reflexive pronouns in both languages. English reflexive pronouns are also used to form together with the verb analytical forms of the reflexive state (аналітичні форми зворотного стану), e.g.: *he amused himself. "він розважався"*. The Ukrainian pronoun *себе* cannot be used in this function, it is replaced by the suffix *-ся*. It is created from the former pronoun object (займенниковий додаток) which in Western Ukrainian manner of speaking (західноукраїнська говірка) still can be met very often separately from the verb, e.g.: *Він ся миє* (compare the generally used Ukrainian *Як ся маєте?*). In the literary language this element has been finally merged with the verb and functionally does not differ from suffixes. But formally it differs from suffixes in the way that it is joined not to the root but to flexions (compare: *мию-ся, миєш-ся, миєм-ся, миєте-ся* and so on).

It should be kept in mind that the affix *-ся* has several meanings in Ukrainian and in some cases it cannot coincide with English reflexive pronouns, e.g.: *Сховайтесь за деревом. Hide behind the tree. Я люблю купатися в морі. I like to bathe in the sea.*

English reflexive pronouns include one more similar by its structure generalizing-personal and indefinite (узагальнено-особовий та неозначений) pronoun *oneself*. It corresponds to the most general meaning of the pronoun *себе* or the affix *-ся* in combination with the infinitive of the verb, e.g.: *to defend oneself захищати себе, захищатися* [5; 63].

Strengthening pronouns. The English reflexive pronouns are the homonyms of the similar by their quantity group of strengthening pronouns. In grammars these pronouns are sometimes united into one class of reflexive-strengthening pronouns. But in reality these pronouns are of different types.

The difference between the reflexive and strengthening pronouns is determined syntactically: when *myself, himself* and others are used in connection with the verb (e.g.: *He put himself a question "він запитав себе"*), then their meaning is reflexive. When the same words are used

in combination with the noun or pronoun, they have the strengthening meaning (e.g.: *I myself saw it or I saw it myself* “я сам це бачив”).

In Ukrainian the strengthening function is performed by only one defining pronoun (означальний займенник) *сам*. It has the category of gender (*сам, сама, само*) and number (the plural form *самі*) [5; 64].

4. Demonstrative pronouns

In English usually only the pronouns *this (these)*, *that (those)*, *such* and *the same* are regarded as **demonstrative**. The sphere of *this* or *these* is the space and time close to the speaker and the moment of speech, whereas the sphere of *that* and *those* is the time or space farther away from the speaker and the moment of speech. The pronouns *such* and *(the) same* indicate objects or qualities by comparison with those pointed at by the speaker.

Ukrainian demonstrative pronouns *той, отой, цей, оцей, такий, отакий, сей (ся, сі, се)* and their variants *тая, тую, тії, ця, ції, стільки* (нестягнені форми) indicate towards the objects and their qualities. The demonstrative pronoun *стільки* correlates with the cardinal numeral. In combination with the word *самий (той самий, цей самий, такий самий)* they not only point towards the object but also identify it.

Following is the contrastive analysis of demonstrative pronouns in both languages. English pronouns *this* and *that* have the category of number (plural: *these, those*) and usually correlate with the modified nouns in number. Other demonstrative pronouns are indeclinable.

Ukrainian demonstrative pronouns (except *стільки*) have the category of gender and number and are declined similar to adjectives.

The English pronoun *this (these)* points to something closer to the speaker, and *that (those)* — to something more distant from it. Approximately the same meanings are expressed by the Ukrainian pronouns *той, цей*, though in Ukrainian this difference is not as distinct as in English. Ukrainian *цей* can be used also for denoting more distant objects, or the objects which are not available, also for

denoting past and future moments or time periods — in all these cases the English pronoun *that* is used, e.g.:

Ви бачите там під горою білий будинок? У цьому будинку живе мій товариш.

Do you see the white house down there? My friend lives in that house.

The pronoun *такий* is often used with adjectives for the strengthening of their quality: *такий молодий, такий страшний*. In English in such cases we use the adverb *so*: *so young, so terrible* [5; 64–65].

5. Interrogative and relative pronouns

English interrogative pronouns are united by the meaning of an inquiry about some object (*what, who*), its properties (*whose, which, what*), place of some event (*where*), its time (*when*), cause (*why*), manner of existence (*how*).

Ukrainian interrogative pronouns include: *хто, що, який, чий, котрий, скільки*. They contain the question about a person, an object, some quality, possession and quantity of objects.

Following is the contrastive analysis of interrogative pronouns in both languages. In both languages interrogative pronouns express the question concerning the object (*who, what, хто, що*), its quality (*what, який*), belonging (*whose, чий*), the place it takes among similar to it objects (*which, який, котрий*). Part of these pronouns correlates with nouns (*who, what, хто, що*), and others — with adjectives (*what, whose, which, який, чий, котрий*). From them *who* is used regarding living beings (first of all human beings), *which* — regarding inanimate objects. The pronoun *whose* can sometimes be used regarding inanimate objects.

In English only one of these pronouns has forms of the nominative and objective cases (*who — whom*). But in conversational language there is a tendency to use the nominative case instead of the objective one (*Who (whom) did you ask about it?*). So this pronoun also becomes indeclinable similar to other interrogative pronouns.

In Ukrainian all interrogative pronouns are declinable. Pronouns *чий, який, котрий* have the forms of gender, number and are declinable similar to adjectives.

The peculiarity of English *what* are its different meanings. This pronoun can be used as a noun (*What has happened?* “*Що трапилось?*”) and as an adjective (*What books did you buy?* “*Які книжки ви купили?*”); it can refer to objects (*What have you brought?*) and to persons (*What is he?* — *What is his occupation?*); this pronoun is used in interrogative and in exclamatory sentences (*What fine weather!*).

English pronouns *who, what, which, whose, that, where, when, why, how* are called “connective” when they serve to connect clauses in complex sentences. In accordance with their meaning and the types of clauses they introduce they fall into two groups: conjunctive and relative pronouns [25; 108–109].

Ukrainian relative pronouns. If the mentioned above interrogative pronouns join the subordinate clause to the main one, that is perform the function of linking words and correlate with nouns or pronouns of the main clause then they become relative pronouns. They have certain peculiarities concerning their sphere of usage.

The pronoun *який* is used in all styles of a language when it is necessary to point towards the qualitative character of some characteristic, e.g.: *Природно, яка позиція — такі й результати* (журн.).

The pronoun *котрий* is used in the case when it is necessary to underline the choice of some persons, objects or qualities in a row of homogeneous persons, objects or qualities, e.g.: *Полювання з крикухою дуже добутливе, спокійне полювання, особливо для мисливців, котрі вже в літах, котрим уже бродити по болотах та лазити по очеретах, сказати би, важкувато* (О. Вишня).

The relative pronoun *чий* points towards the object belonging and is used mainly in bookish style. Pronouns *хто, що* correlate with nouns: *хто* with the person, *що* — either with a person or with some object; *скільки* correlates with the numeral [16; 165].

Following is the contrastive analysis of relative pronouns in both languages. In English the role of relative pronouns that are used as a means of joining complex sentences is performed by interrogative

pronouns *who, which, whose, what* and pronouns *that, as*; in Ukrainian — only interrogative pronouns *хто, який, котрий, що*. Being used in the function of the connecting word they at the same time perform the function of the subjective member of the sentence (the subject or the attribute).

Relative pronouns similar to interrogative pronouns differentiate the person and the non-person (особу і не особу). In English this differentiation is revealed in contrasting of *who* and *which* (and by interrogative *who* — *what*), in Ukrainian *хто* — *що*. *Who* (Ukr. *хто*) is used regarding persons, and *which* — regarding inanimate objects and animals.

The pronoun *whose* is usually placed before the noun, whereas the corresponding Ukrainian pronoun is mainly put after the noun:

That is the girl whose brother works at our institute. —

Це дівчина, брат якої працює в нашому інституті.

The pronoun *that* can refer both to living beings and to inanimate objects. In this respect it reminds of the Ukrainian relative pronoun *що*:

The article that I translated ... — Стаття, що я переклав

The doctor that I visited ... — Лікар, що його я відвідав ... [5; 65–66].

6. Indefinite and negative pronouns

English indefinite pronouns. In grammatical tradition the class of indefinite pronouns is said to include *some, any, every* (and their compounds *something, anything, somebody, anybody, someone, anyone*) *all, each, either, much, many, few, little*, etc., that is words of different lexical and grammatical nature.

Ukrainian indefinite pronouns: *дехто, дещо, хтось, щось, хто-небудь, що-небудь, який-небудь, будь-хто, будь-що, казна-що, казна-хто, абихто, абиякий*, etc. are built from the corresponding interrogative pronouns by adding particles *-небудь, казна-, хтозна-, аби-, де-, -сь*. They are used to point towards unknown, indefinite objects and their qualities, e.g.: *Хтось задихається над ними — хто це, хто це?* (І. Драч).

Following is the contrastive analysis of indefinite pronouns in both languages. These pronouns in English and in Ukrainian leave the unclear or non-defined notion about some object, person or quality, characteristics or quantity of objects.

The characteristic feature of these pronouns in both languages is the tendency to differentiate the person and the non-person (compare in English *somebody, something*; in Ukrainian *дещо, дехто; щось, хтось*).

In English the meaning and the usage of pronouns of this class often depends on syntactic factors: pronouns *some, any; something, anything; somebody, anybody* and others can render the similar meaning in different types of sentences (*some* and its derivatives — in affirmative sentences, *any* and its derivatives — in interrogative and negative sentences). On the other hand, pronouns that have *any* in their structure have different meanings in interrogative or negative and affirmative sentences. Ukrainian indefinite pronouns, vice versa, have stable, forever attached to them lexical meaning, which does not depend on the syntactic context and is not changed according to the sentence type.

The English indefinite pronouns *somebody, anybody* and *someone, anyone*, which denote the person, have the forms of common and possessive cases and can be used in the function of attribute (*somebody's bag* “*чийсь портфель*”). The rest of pronouns of this type are unchangeable.

In Ukrainian all indefinite pronouns have the category of case, and those with interrogative pronouns *чий, який* in their structure — also have the category of gender and number. Altogether, Ukrainian interrogative, relative and indefinite pronouns possess the category of case, e.g.: *хто, кого, кому, кого, ким, на кому (на кім)*. Ukrainian interrogative-relative pronouns of the type *чий* have categories of case, number and gender, e.g.: *чий, чие, чия, чий; чий, чийого, чийому, чійм, на чийому*.

English indefinite pronouns *some, any* are often used as noun determiners, being almost similar to articles [5; 66–67].

English negative pronouns are *no, nobody, nobody's, none, nothing, neither, nowhere*.

Ukrainian negative pronouns include such words as *ніхто, ніщо, ніякий, нічий*. They are built from the corresponding interrogative pronouns by adding the particle *ні-* and point towards the total absence of some object or quality. Therefore they possess grammar categories characteristic of interrogative pronouns.

Following is the contrastive analysis of negative pronouns in both languages. Pronouns of this type denote the absence of some object or quality. In both languages they correlate with indefinite pronouns, in English also with the so-called “generalizing” pronouns (*all, everybody, everything, both* (the meaning of collectiveness), *every, each either* (the meaning of separateness), and in Ukrainian — with the part of defining pronouns, objecting to the availability of the notion, expressed by the mentioned above pronouns.

The number of such pronouns in both languages is not large; in English here belong *no, nobody, nothing, none, no one, neither*; in Ukrainian — *ніхто, ніщо, нічий, ніякий, нікотрий*. English negative pronouns are created by joining together the main negative pronoun *no* with nouns of a very abstract meaning: *body, thing* and the indefinite pronoun *one*. Corresponding Ukrainian pronouns are formed by adding the negative particle *ні* to interrogative pronouns *хто, що, який, чий*.

In English negative pronouns are unchangeable, except *nobody* and *no one*, which have common and possessive cases. Ukrainian negative pronouns are all declined in a similar way to interrogative pronouns, from which they are created. Two negative pronouns *нічий, ніякий* have the forms of gender and number.

The English pronoun *none* is often used to replace the word combination “*no + noun*”, e.g.: *There was no apparent slope downward, and distinctly none (no slope) upward (Th. Dreiser)*.

In both languages negative pronouns serve in the sentence as a lexical means to express negation (оформлення заперечення). In English their presence is enough to make the sentence a negative one, and that is why the predicate is not put into the negative form (*I know nobody here*). In Ukrainian the grammatical and the lexical expression of negation in the sentence are distinctly differentiated.

The negative form of the predicate is obligatory even in cases when we have the negative pronoun in the sentence (*Я не знаю нікого*) [5; 67].

7. Allomorphic classes of pronouns in English and Ukrainian languages

English reciprocal pronouns are the group pronouns — *each other* and *one another*. They serve to express mutuality, as in *They helped each other or (one another)*, or point out towards the common and reciprocal character of the activity of two or more persons as the subject and the object of the action. In Ukrainian they have the correspondent pronoun word combination *один одного*.

English reciprocal pronouns have the same cases as nouns (e.g.: the possessive case *each other's hand*). They are used mainly in the function of object or attribute. These pronouns always retain their lexical meaning and do not perform functions characteristic of functional parts of speech. Prepositions referring to them are always placed before the first element (*each* or *one*), e.g.: *about each other* “*один про одного*”, *for each other* “*один для одного*”, *with one another* “*один з одним*”. This witnesses the fact that English reciprocal pronouns are of bigger semantic unity than the corresponding Ukrainian combination.

In some cases the English verb with the pronoun *each other (one another)* has as the Ukrainian correspondence the verb with the suffix *-ся*, which has a reciprocal-reflective meaning, e.g.:

They kissed each other. — *Вони поцілувалися.*

They never met each other. — *Вони ніколи не зустрічалися.*

But in the mentioned cases the usage of pronouns *each other* and *one another* is not obligatory in English sentences [5; 68].

Ukrainian defining pronouns (означальні займенники) *увесь (ввесь, весь)*, *усякий (всякий)*, *кожний (кожен)*, *жодний (жоден)*, *інший, сам, самий* are used in the sentence in the role of generalizing-qualitative attributes (узagalнено-якісні означення), besides in the process of substantivation they can be used in the function of subjects and objects. Ukrainian defining pronouns possess the categories of

gender, number and case, e.g.: *увесь, усе, уся, усі; увесь, усього, усьому, усім, на всьому* [16; 164].

English generalizing pronouns (узагальнюючі займенники) include such pronouns as *all, each, either, every* and its compounds (*everyone, everybody, everything, everywhere*) which give a generalizing indication of persons, things, properties and circumstances [5; 67–68].

English quantitative pronouns include *much, many, (a) few, (a) little, several, enough* which may function as pro-nouns (*much, many, (a) few, several, (a) little, enough*); pro-adjectives (*much, (a) little, enough*); pro-numerals (*many, several, (a) few*); and pro-adverbs (*much, (a) little, enough*) [25; 113].

English contrasting pronouns include *other (others, other's, others')*, *another (another's)* and *otherwise*. They are united by the meaning “not the (object, property, circumstance) indicated” and contrast therefore with the demonstrative pronouns [25; 114].

English indefinite-personal pronoun. The English pronoun *one* is used with the generalizing-personal (showing that the action refers to any subject) and with the indefinite-personal meaning (which refers the action to some person which is not exactly defined). Being used in the function of subject of indefinite-personal sentences, it performs the function, which is in Ukrainian attached to the forms of the third person plural of verbs (*One says ... Кажуть ...*) and to the forms of the second person singular (*One never knows ... Ніколи не знаєш ...*).

One always denotes some person; grammatically it always has the meaning of singularity, and is used in common and possessive cases (*One must always keep one's word. Треба завжди дотримуватися свого слова*).

This pronoun should not be mixed with the word *one* which serves as replacement. It differs from the pronoun by the fact that it does not have its own meaning, performs the function of replacement and has other formal characteristics (the form of plural *ones*).

The pronoun *one* in the function of subject is widely used with the verbs *must, should, ought, can, may*. In Ukrainian the mentioned combinations are rendered with the help of unchangeable predicate words (присудкові слова) *треба, потрібно, слід, можна: One must*

take — треба взяти; *one should study well* — слід добре вчитися; *one can find* — можна знайти.

The reciprocal pronoun *oneself* correlates with the pronoun *one*.

In Ukrainian there is not a single pronoun that could express the person in such an indefinite and generalized way, as *one*. That is why all similar notions are rendered in Ukrainian with the help of verb forms, which are used without subject [5; 69].

Summing up, we may say that pronouns are not united by any morphological categories, or syntactic functions similar to other notional parts of speech. Nevertheless they constitute a separate class of words with peculiar meanings and references to the world of reality [25; 99–116].

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. Present the general characteristics of pronoun as a part of speech. Do pronouns differ from other classes of words?
2. Enumerate the classes of pronouns in the contrasted English and Ukrainian languages. Does their number differ?
3. Highlight the opinions of different linguists concerning the issues of differentiating classes of pronouns.
4. Dwell upon the grammatical categories characteristic of English and Ukrainian pronouns.
5. What are the peculiarities of English versus Ukrainian personal pronouns?
6. Compare English and Ukrainian possessive pronouns.
7. Compare English and Ukrainian reflexive pronouns. State the difference between English reflexive and strengthening pronouns.
8. What are the peculiarities of Ukrainian versus English demonstrative pronouns?
9. What is the correlation between the classes of interrogative and relative pronouns in the contrasted languages?
10. What is the correlation between the classes of indefinite and negative pronouns in English and Ukrainian languages?

11. Characterize the allomorphic classes of pronouns in the contrasted languages.

II. Underline the pronouns in the following pieces of text, conversation. Identify the type of each pronoun; comment on their grammatical characteristics.

a) in the English language:

1. EastEnders star Tom Eyle sang to the Duchess of York as she attended a charity tea party. Mr Eyle, grandfather Jules Tavernier in the hit BBC1 soap, played the guitar and sang Summertime to the Duchess at her request. "I would love to hear Summertime. It seems appropriate for such a nice day," she had told him. Then she sat beside Mr Tavernier and listened. As the song finished she applauded and said: "Thank you very much. I haven't heard that song since I was at school and I really love it" (newspaper writing).

2. A: Yes, I bought two new containers. They're out in the garage.
[Person A goes to the garage and returns]

A: Oh, hey, this is nice.

B: What?

A: They come out so you can fill them (conversation).

3. A: That's all I needed to do.

B: Yeah, it was painless. Somebody left their keys. Those aren't yours? (conversation)

4. A: We didn't have the peanut butter, that's what I'm going back for.

B: Oh, I made it for you guys, I didn't make it for myself (conversation).

5. A: Do you have papers?

B: I have none. I left mine with Dave (conversation).

*The material is taken from "Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook" by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P.26-27.

b) in the Ukrainian language:

Українські веснянки — чудові зразки усної народної творчості, їх тексти засвідчують майстерне володіння словом, поетикою і мелодикою фрази. У них прагнення українця умилювати природу, психологічно настроїти себе на важку роботу перед відповідальним циклом сільськогосподарського календаря, а водночас — це і вихлюп радості від усвідомлення своєї присутності в житті, ось тут і тепер, серед близьких людей і на оновленій весною рідній землі. Для нас веснянки — ще й відголосок історичного минулого українського народу, багатого духовно і величного в своїй самодостатності, міцного і незнищенного, здатного відродитися для нового буття. Вони — ці веселі, голосисті, багаті змістом пісні — здатні розважити всіх: і дітей, і молодь, і літніх людей, котрі милуючись молодечими забавами, й самі серцем молодіють. Це неперервний зв'язок поколінь, пов'язаних духовно — піснями і веснами, мовою і долею. Її, нашу долю, пісні не просто супроводжували — вони й творили її, щоразу актуалізуючи в ній те весняне, перед яким відступають найлютіші зими.

*The material is taken from the article “Петленко Лариса. А вже весна, а вже красна...” // Урок Української. — № 3–4, 2005. — Р.58.

CHAPTER 5

Verb as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

1. Verb as a part of speech: general characteristics

The verb is a system of systems. The main division within the English verb system is that between the finite verbs (finites) and non-finite verbs (non-finites or verbids). The finites can further be subdivided into three systems called moods (indicative, conditional (subjunctive), imperative). The infinitive, the gerund and the participle are also three systems within the verbids.

In Ukrainian this system is arranged in a slightly different way. The Ukrainian verb includes the conjugated verb forms (відмінювані форми) — the verbs and participles (дієслова та дієприкметники) and non-conjugated verb forms (невідмінювані форми) — infinitives, дієприслівники, and forms ending with *-но*, *-то* (інфінітиви, дієприслівники та форми на *-но*, *-то* (окрема група пасивних дієприкметників: *завдання виконано*, *лист написано*). The subdivision can also be named in another way, that is: personal and non-personal verb forms. Depending on the system of endings of personal form verbs (both singular and plural) of the present and future tenses (simple form) Ukrainian verbs are subdivided into two conjugations. The first conjugation (перша дієвідміна) includes verbs that in the third person plural (in present and future tenses) have the endings *-уть*, *-ють* (*читають*, *везуть*); the second conjugation (друга дієвідміна) includes verbs that in the third person plural (in present and future tenses) have the endings *-ать*, *-ять* (*роблять*, *побачать*).

The verb as a part of speech is characterized by the following properties in English and Ukrainian:

- 1) the lexico-grammatical meaning of “action/process” in both languages.
- 2) typical stem building elements, such as the suffixes *-ize, -en, -ify*, the prefixes *re-, under-, over-, out-, de-, sub-, mis, un-* in the English language;
- typical Ukrainian verb building elements are: suffixes *-ти (платити), -ати (запитати)*, or the combination of suffixes *-ува* and *-ти* in derivative verbs (*перечитувати, пересилювати*); prefixes: *-о (оминати), у- (уможливити), об- (обробити), пере- (перебільшувати), ви- (видужати), з- (звзити, знеболити)* and the peculiar Ukrainian postfix *-ся (недорозвинути-ся, митися)*.

One more peculiarity of English verbs is their ability to be combined with the lexico-grammatical word-morphemes *up, in, off, down, out*, etc. which together with verbs form the so-called “phrasal verbs”, e.g.: *put down, set off*, etc.

- 3) grammatical categories: out of the six categories of the English verb (the categories of person, number, aspect, tense, mood and voice) three are found not only in the finites, but in English verbids as well. The category of voice (*asks — is asked, to ask — to be asked, asking — being asked*) is found in all the English verbids, and the that of aspect (*asks — is asking, to ask — to be asking*) — in the infinitive.

In Ukrainian, grammatical categories of the verb are closely connected with its meaning and its syntactic function. The category of aspect and voice (категорії виду і стану) are characteristic of all verb forms. The category of mood (категорія способу) is characteristic of verbs that can be conjugated (*читає, читай, читав би*), the category of tense (категорія часу) — of the indicative mood verbs (*читає — читав — читатиме*), the category of person (категорія особи) — of the imperative and indicative mood verbs (*читаєш, читаєте*,

читай, читайте), the category of number (категорія числа) — of all verb forms that can be conjugated. The Ukrainian language also possesses the seventh grammatical category, that is the grammatical category of gender. Nevertheless this category is used only with the conjugated verb forms of the past tense, compare: in the past — *він читав, вона читала, воно читало*; in the present — *він / вона / воно читає*, in the future — *він / вона / воно читатиме / буде читати*.

- 4) its typical combinability: a verb can be associated with nouns (noun-equivalents) denoting the doer (agent) and the recipient of the action expressed by the verb; it is regularly modified by adverbs. Some classes of verbs can have their own peculiarities of combinability.
- 5) its typical syntactic function of the predicate (possessed by the finites only, in Ukrainian by the conjugated form of verbs). Verbs have other syntactic functions, but they can be secondary predicates in secondary predication structures.

As we know, it is the stem that unites words into lexemes. Therefore, though stem-structure is not a reliable criterion for distinguishing parts of speech, it can show whether certain words belong to the same lexeme or not. Now finites and the corresponding verbids have identical stem-structure, which characterizes them as words of the same lexemes, in spite of certain differences in combinability, function, etc. Compare: *gives* — *giving*, *gives up* — *giving up*, *nationalizes* — *nationalizing*, *whitewashes* — *whitewashing*; *стояти* — *стояв*, *стояв* — *стоячи*, etc.

In accordance with their stem structure verbs, like other parts of speech, fall under the following groups:

- a) Simple verbs (*write, know, love; їсти, їсти*).
- b) Derived verbs (*organize, rewrite, purify, underestimate; викоринити, пересилити*).

It should be mentioned here that among the English affixes used to form new verbs prefixes are of greater importance than suffixes. The most common derivational prefixes, in order of frequency of

occurrence, are: *re-* (*reabsorb, rebuild*), *dis-* (*disarm, disconnect*), *over-* (*overcome, overhear*), *un-* (*unbend, unfold*), *mis-* (*misbehave, misinform*), *out-* (*outdo, outgrow*). Other derivational prefixes include: *be-*, *co-*, *de-*, *fore-*, *inter-*, *pre-*, *sub-*, *trans-*, *under-*. There are fewer derivational suffixes for verb formation, although some of these are quite productive. The suffixes, listed in order of frequency of occurrence, are the following: *-ize/-ise* (*characterize, computerize*), *-en* (*awaken, broaden*), *-ate* (*alienate, captivate*), *-(i)fy* (*beautify, exemplify*). The prefix *re-* and the suffix *-ize* (or *-ise*) are by far the most productive, both in terms of the total number of verb lexemes formed and in terms of the number of relatively rare coinages.

Typical Ukrainian verb-building affixes have been shown above, among them prefixes are of greater variety as well.

Sound-interchange is unproductive (*food — feed, blood — bleed*), so is the change of stress, as in *'export — (to) ex'port, transport — (to) trans'port*. In Ukrainian the following types are not characteristic of the verb.

The most productive way of forming verb lexemes in English is conversion: (*a*) *book — (to) book, (a) man — (to) man, better — (to) better*. In Ukrainian it is absent in regard to verbs.

- c) Compound verbs consisting of two stems, as in (*to*) *broadcast, (to) whitewash, (to) blindfold*. Composition is of low productivity in the class of verbs. In Ukrainian this type of verb formation is also rare, e.g.: *благодіяти, боготворити, зубоскалити, хліборобствувати*.
- d) Composite verbs — made up of a verb with a lexico-grammatical word-morpheme attached to it, as in *give up, give in, take off, put on*. This way of forming verbs is productive.

Before discussing the grammatical categories we shall consider some general classifications of English verbs based on their formal, semantic and functional properties, and thus the division of verbs into standard and non-standard, notional and semi-notional, subjective and objective, terminative and non-terminative. In Ukrainian there are usually differentiated two groups of verbs: transitive and intransitive (перехідні і неперехідні дієслова: *написати листа, розповісти казку, зеленіти, дякувати*). Comparing English and Ukrainian

classes of verbs, what is lacking in Ukrainian is the subdivision of verbs into standard and non-standard (that is regular and irregular); the mentioned transitive and intransitive verb groups are correlated with the corresponding subjective and objective verbs.

The peculiar group of Ukrainian verbs is the so called reflexive verbs (зворотні дієслова) formed with the help of postfix *-ся*. They can be found of different kinds:

- 1) reflexive proper (власне зворотні: *умиватися, взуватися*);
- 2) indirectly reflexive (непрямо зворотні: *запасатися (їжею), поратися (біля печі)*);
- 3) generally reflexive (загальнозворотні: *сміятися, журитися*);
- 4) objectless reflexive (безоб'єктно-зворотні: *(корова) б'ється, (собака) кусається*);
- 5) reciprocal-reflexive (взаємно зворотні: *листуватися, зустрічатися*).

One more peculiar group of Ukrainian verbs is impersonal verbs (безособові дієслова). From the semantic point of view they can be subdivided into the following groups:

- 1) verbs of the physical state (дієслова фізичного стану: *морозить, трясє*);
- 2) verbs of the mental state (дієслова психічного стану: *спить, сниться*);
- 3) verbs denoting nature phenomena (дієслова, що означають явища природи: *свіжіє, смеркає, похолодало*);
- 4) verbs denoting disasters (дієслова, що означають стихійні явища: *вигоріло, висушило, залило*);
- 5) verbs denoting existence or the degree of availability (дієслова, що означають буття, міру присутності (відсутності): *сталося, минулося, бракує*);
- 6) verbs denoting success (дієслова успіху: *пощастило, повелося*) [16; 179].

Although based on grammatical meanings and categories, these classifications of verbs and the terminology they involve will come in

useful when we discuss the categories themselves and the functioning of verb grammemes in speech.

The overwhelming majority of English verbs resemble the verb *ask* in building their “past form” and “Participle II form”, that is with the help of the suffix *-ed*, and therefore they are called **standard** or **regular**.

Some two hundred verbs deviate from the standard verbs and are called **non-standard** or **irregular**. They do not present a uniform group. Some of them resemble the verb *write* (*speak, drive, eat, etc.*). Others form the “past” and “Participle II” without affixation (*cut, put, shed, etc.*). Still others use both vowel and consonant change and affixation to form the “past” and “Participle II” forms. Some make use of suppletivity (*go, be, etc.*).

As we see, the difference between the standard and the non-standard verbs is purely formal. We should therefore call this classification formal rather than morphological as the tradition goes.

Semantically verbs are divided into **notional** and **semi-notional**. Some linguists speak also of the third group, auxiliary verbs, completely devoid of lexical meanings, as, for instance, *has* in *has written*. As shown, they are words in form only. As to their meaning and function they are grammatical morphemes, parts of analytical words, hence the name — grammatical word-morphemes. In Ukrainian the analytical verb form of the future tense can be regarded as an example of this type: *буду читати*.

The majority of English as well as Ukrainian verbs are **notional**, that is they possess *full lexical meaning*. Connected with it is their isolatability, that is the ability to make a sentence alone (*Come! Read! Приходь! Читай!*). Their combinability is variable.

Semi-notional verbs have very general, “faded” lexical meanings, as in *be, have, become, seem, can, may, must, etc.*, where the meaning of ‘action’ is almost obliterated. Semi-notional verbs are hardly isolatable. Their combinability is usually bilateral as they serve to connect words in speech. They are comparatively few in number, but of very frequent occurrence, and include two peculiar groups: link verbs and modal verbs [25; 116–121]. Ukrainian verbs possess the mentioned two groups as well (link verbs: *бути, ставати*; modal verbs — *могти*,

мусити). Unlike English ones Ukrainian modal verbs are conjugated (*він може читати, вони мусять робити*).

Similarly to other parts of speech variants of the same verb lexeme may belong to different subclasses. The verb *grow* in the meanings “develop”, “increase in size”, etc. belongs to the class of notional verbs, e.g.: *How quickly you are growing!* In the meaning “become” it belongs to the link verbs, e.g.: *He is growing old*.

When the verb *have* means “possess”, it is a notional verb, e.g.: *How much money do you have?* When it expresses obligation, need or necessity, it is a modal verb, e.g.: *He had to make the best of the situation*.

Verbs can be also divided into **subjective** and **objective**, depending upon their combinability with words denoting the subjects and the objects of the actions they name.

Objective verbs are mostly associated with two nouns (or noun-equivalents) denoting the subject and the object of the action named by the verb. Subjective verbs are associated only with nouns (noun-equivalents) denoting the subject of the action.

In the sentence *She sat up and kissed him tenderly* the verb *kissed* is an objective verb because it is associated with the pronoun *she* denoting the subject of the action of kissing and with the pronoun *him* denoting the object of the same action. The verb *sat up* is a subjective verb since it is associated only with the person *she* denoting the subject of the action.

In the sentence *You are interfering with him* the verb form *are interfering* is also objective because it is associated with the pronoun *him* denoting the object of the action of interfering. But there is some difference between the two verbs in *kissing him* and *interfering with him*. The first verb is associated with the word denoting the object of an action (let us call it the “object word”) directly, the second verb is connected with the object word by means of a preposition.

Objective verbs that are connected with their object words directly are called **transitive** verbs. All the other verbs, both subjective and objective, are called **intransitive**.

As usual, variants of a verb lexeme may belong to different subclasses. Compare:

He opened the door (objective, transitive).

The door opened (intransitive, subjective).

Add some more water (objective, transitive).

The music added to our enjoyment (objective, intransitive).

The figures would not add (intransitive, subjective).

Verbs can be classified in accordance with the aspective nature of their lexical meanings into **terminative** (термінативний, кінцевий, той, що вказує на межу завершення певної дії) and **non-terminative**.

Terminative verbs denote actions which cannot develop beyond a certain inherent limit. The actions denoted by non-terminative verbs have no inherent meanings. Compare the two sentences:

He was carrying a box on his shoulders.

Take this empty box away and bring me a full one.

The verbs *to carry* and *to bring* may denote the same kind of action. But *carry* does not imply any time or space limits when or where the action would naturally stop, while *bring* does. So *carry* is a non-terminative verb and *bring* is a terminative one. *Live, love, stand, sit, work, walk*, etc. are non-terminative verbs. *Come, take, stand up, sit down*, etc. are terminative verbs.

As usual, variants of the same lexeme may belong to different subclasses. When meaning “(to) engage in physical or mental activity”, the verb *(to) work* is non-terminative, e.g.:

I have been working hard all day.

But when *(to) work* means “to produce as a result”, it is terminative, e.g.:

The storm worked great ruin [25; 122–125].

English terminative and non-terminative verbs can be to some extent correlated with Ukrainian verbs expressing the perfective and imperfective aspects (дієслова доконаного та недоконаного виду: *нести — принести, любити — розлюбити, сидіти — присісти*).

Following is the brief summary of the general characteristics of English and Ukrainian verbs. In comparison with other parts of

speech in modern English the verb has the most developed system of the word-change (словозміна), in which the grammatical categories of person, number, aspect, tense, mood and state (категорії особи, числа, виду, часу, способу і стану) are revealed.

In Ukrainian the verb as well forms a rich and complex system of forms, which express the same grammatical categories. Besides, some Ukrainian verb forms also express the category of gender.

In both languages the verb has the meaning of transitivity and intransitivity (перехідність та неперехідність).

Grammatical categories in both languages are expressed with the help of synthetic and analytical forms. The difference is that in the system of English verb analytical forms are dominant ones, whereas in Ukrainian synthetic forms are prevailing.

Verb forms in English and in Ukrainian are divided into personal and non-personal verbs (особові та неособові дієслова). Personal are those forms which perform only the function of predicate, and non-personal are those that are never used in this function and can be other parts of sentence. There is a great difference both in the composition of personal and non-personal verb forms and in their characteristics in English and Ukrainian [5; 70].

2. The category of person

In the Indo-European languages the category of person serves to present an action as associated by the speaking person with himself/herself (or group of persons including the speaker), the person or persons addressed, and the person or thing (persons or things) not participating in the process of speech. Thus, in Ukrainian it is represented in sets of three-member oppositions such as:

читаю — читаєш — читає
читаємо — читаєте — читають.

Likewise in Modern German we have: *gehe — gehst — geht*
gehen — geht — gehen.

In Modern English the category of person has certain peculiarities:

1. The category of person is practically represented by two-member opposemes: *speak — speaks, am / is — are*.
2. Person opposemes are neutralized when associated with the “plural” meaning. A.I.Smirnitsky thinks that owing to the presence of the plural personal pronouns (we, you, they) person distinctions are felt in the plural of the verb as well, e.g.: *we know — you know — they know*.

The idea is open to criticism. If the verb itself (in the plural) does not show any person distinctions we are bound to admit that in Modern English the verb in plural has no person characteristics.

3. Person distinctions do not go with the meaning of the “past tense” in the English verbs, e.g.: *I (he) asked ...* (compare the Ukrainian, e.g.: *я (ти, він) спитав — вона спитала, воно спитало, вони спитали*) [25; 148–149].

In Ukrainian the category of person is closely connected with the category of person of pronouns. Its meaning is based on the opposition of six interconnected forms: 1, 2, 3 persons singular and 1, 2, 3 persons plural (*я читаю — ми читаємо*, etc.).

In Ukrainian personal forms are one of the main morphological characteristics of the verb: “due to their ability to point out the person as the doer or the source with which the action or the state is connected, these verb forms always perform the function of predicate in the sentence [5; 70].”

Almost all personal forms of Ukrainian verbs (except forms of the past tense and conditional mood) have personal endings of the first, second and third persons of singular and plural. These endings create the system of verb forms: *пиш-у, -еш, -е, -емо, -ете, -уть; чита-ю, -єш, -є, -ємо, -єте, -ють; крич-у, -иш, -ить, -имо, -ите, -ать; сто-ю, -їш, -їть, -їмо, -їте, -ять*.

According to Yu.O. Zhluktenko [5; 70], unlike the Ukrainian language in English the category of person has only one formal expression, that is only in the third person singular of the Present Indefinite

tense, where the ending *-s* is added to the verb stem, e.g.: *he writes*. This verb form is opposed to all other forms which do not have personal endings and so do not express the category of person. Besides, there are several verbs (*can, may, must, ought, sometimes also need and dare*) which do not have even this ending, and are not conjugated according to the person altogether.

In Ukrainian the forms of the past tense and conditional mood do not express the category of person. The meaning of person is rendered by these verbs by lexical means, by usage of the corresponding personal pronouns, e.g.: *я знав, ти знав, він знав, ми знали, ви знали; я знав би, ти знав би, ми знали б, ви знали б*.

In English forms of the past tense of verbs do not have any special characteristics either. In future tense forms there has been retained the difference of the first person from the forms of the second and the third persons in singular and in plural: *I (we) shall write; he (you, they) will write*. Correspondingly, this difference is brought upon the forms of the conditional mood with help verbs *should* and *would*. But in speech this difference is also lost due to the fact that help verbs *shall* and *will* are shortened into one auxiliary element 'll (*I'll help, he'll write*), and *should* and *would* are shortened to 'd (*'d (h'd) like to see him*).

The function of person expression in the system of English verb has come over to the subject (as the main part of a sentence) to a large extent: in the first and second person this function is performed by the pronoun, and in the third person — both by the pronoun and by the noun. That is why in English the verb form is not practically used without a subject (except the imperative mood), e.g. when we have the question *What does he do?* we cannot answer simply **reads* or **sleeps*, we should necessarily say: *he reads* or *he sleeps* (compare in Ukrainian: *Що він робить? — Спить.*).

In Ukrainian personal verb forms are much more independent. They are very often used without the subject, at this the meaning of the personal verb form is not changed, e.g.: *За всіх скажу, за всіх переболію ...* (П. Тичина).

In these cases the person, having some connection with the action, can be clarified from the context. When this form cannot

be clarified then the form of the third person plural acquires the non-personal or indefinite-personal meaning, e.g.: *У нас встають рано*. Also the second person singular without the verb acquires the generalized-personal meaning: *Без науки не обійдешся* [5; 70–71].

Impersonal verbs (безособові дієслова). In English and in Ukrainian there is a group of the so-called impersonal verbs, which, though can be used in the sentence in the personal form, “denote the action or the state not connected with any doer”, the action which is as though happening by itself.

In Ukrainian such verbs are used in the present and the future tense in the form of the third person singular, which is the least connected with defining some person — the doer, e.g.: *вечоріє, світатиме*. In the past tense they have the form of the third person singular, neuter gender: *світало, смеркало*. Also these verbs can be used in the form of the infinitive, which altogether denotes the action or the state beyond any connection with the person, e.g.: *починало вечоріти*. So these verbs are not conjugated according to the person altogether.

In English impersonal verbs are also always used in the third person singular, e.g.: *it rains, it is snowing* or in the form of the infinitive: *it began to rain*.

Ukrainian impersonal verbs are never used with the subject, whereas English verbs of such a type are necessarily used with the formal subject, expressed by the pronoun *it*.

Ukrainian impersonal verbs are much more numerous than English ones. They include a bigger number of different semantic groups. For example, here belong the verbs having the following meanings:

- 1) natural phenomena: *морозить, похолодало, світає, вигоріло, вибило (градом)*;
- 2) some notions concerning the destiny, chance or independence of events from the person: *пощастило, не щастить, не вистачило*;
- 3) physical senses: *нудить, трясє, печє, коле*;
- 4) emotional states or the general state of the person: *знітить, не терпиться, не спиться, добре працювалося* and others.

English impersonal verbs include only such verbs that denote

nature phenomena: *it rains* “*їде дощ*”, *it snows* “*їде сніг*”, *it was freezing* “*морозило*”, *it is getting dark* “*стає темно*” and others.

Alongside with such verbs that are used only in impersonal meaning in both languages there are verbs that can be met in the personal and in the impersonal meaning: *голка коле, в боці коле*; in English: *I am getting home — it is getting cold*.

In Ukrainian impersonal verbs can be created from personal ones with the help of the reflexive affix *-ся*: *спить — спиться, оре — орється, сіє — сіється, живе — живеться* and others. This way of formation is very productive, but in English there is no similar way of formation of impersonal verbs [5; 71–72].

3. The category of number and the category of gender

The **category of number** shows whether the action is associated with one doer or with more than one. Accordingly it denotes something fundamentally different from what is indicated by the number of nouns. We see here not the “oneness” or “more-than-oneness” of actions, but the connection with the singular or plural doer. For example, *He eats three times a day* does not indicate a single eating but a single eater.

The category is represented in its purity in the opposeme *was — were* in the English language and accordingly in all analytical forms containing *was — were* (*was — writing — were writing, was written — were written*).

In *am — are, is — are* or *am, is — are* it is blended with person. Likewise in *speaks — speak* we actually have the “third person singular” opposed to the “non-third-person singular”.

Accordingly the category of number is represented not fully enough in Modern English. Some verbs do not distinguish number at all because of their peculiar historical development: *I (we) can ... , he (they) must ...*, others are but rarely used in the singular because the meaning of “oneness” is hardly compatible with their lexical meanings, e.g.; *to crowd, to conspire*, etc. [25; 148–150].

In Ukrainian the category of number is expressed in the forms of three pairs of opposition: 1 person singular — 1 person plural, 2 person singular — 2 person plural, 3 person singular — 3 person plural (*я читаю — ми читаємо*, etc.).

Thus, it can be stated, that in both languages the category of number is tightly connected with the category of person. The system of the Ukrainian verb expresses the category of number very distinctly: the forms of singular and plural are characteristic of the majority of Ukrainian verbs in all three moods — indicative, imperative and conditional (дійсний, наказовий, умовний).

In some cases, though, the difference in verb forms has a purely formal character. Such is the usage of the first person plural with the generalizing meaning (*нобачимо*, instead of *нобачу*), the “author’s” plurality (*ми переконалися у доповіді чи науковому творі*, instead of *я переконався*). To some extent close to them are the so called polite forms: *ви говорите* (addressing one person) and *ви говорите* (addressing a lot of persons).

In English the category of number is expressed still less distinctly than the category of person. In the forms of past and future tenses it is not revealed all together. In the present indefinite tense some expression of the category of number can be the same form of the third person singular: (*he*) *writes*. But here the ending *-(e)s* does not involve all the singularity and the form *writes* is opposed not only to plural forms but also to other singular forms, e.g.: (*I*) *write*.

Somehow more distinctly the category of number is expressed in the forms of the verb *to be*, which has in present and past tenses the singular (*am, is, was*) and plural (*are, were*) forms. But here the forms of number are expressed in a suppletive way, that is not morphologically but lexically [5; 72–73].

The category of gender. The English verb does not have any forms which would express some gender characteristics. In Ukrainian the category of gender is expressed only by verb forms of the past tense (*брав, брала, брало*) and by the conditional mood (*взяв би, взяла б, взяло б*). In plural in all these cases we have the common form for all three genders (*брали б, взяли б*).

Gender forms are created in both cases with the help of the special suffix *-в-* (*-л-*) and gender flexions *-а* (feminine gender), *-о-* (neuter gender), *zero flexion* (masculine gender). According to their origin these gender forms are by themselves the forms of short participles that entered the structure of ancient analytical forms of the past tense (*есмь писаль*).

Verbal gender forms express the person, denoted by the personal pronoun or noun that fulfills the function of the subject. So, the verbal gender forms are the forms of coordination of the verb with the subject and that is why to a large extent they have the formal meaning (but of course there is no difference in the character of the action performed, dependent on this or that person) [5; 73].

4. The category of aspect

The category of aspect is a system of two member opposemes in the English language such as *works — is working, has worked — has been working, to work — to be working* showing the character of the action, that is whether the action is taken in its progress, in its development (*continuous aspect*) or it is simply stated, its nature being unspecified (*non-continuous aspect*).

In Ukrainian it is also a system of two member opposemes represented by the verbs of *perfective* and *imperfective aspects*. Verbs having similar lexical meanings often create aspect pairs (видові пари: *писати — надписати, читати — прочитати*).

In the English grammar the problem of aspect is a controversial one. There is but little consensus of opinion about this category in Modern English.

One meets different approaches to the English aspect, which can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Aspect is interpreted as a category of semantics rather than that of grammar.
2. Aspect is not recognized at all as a category of Modern English grammar.

3. Aspect is blended with tense and regarded as a part of the tense-aspect system.
4. Aspect and tense are recognized as two distinct grammatical categories.

According to the opinion of B. Khaimovich and B. Rogovskaya [25; 135–136] the category expressed by the opposition of the continuous and non-continuous forms is not that of tense, for example, the forms *wrote* — *was writing* are opposed not as tense forms. Both of them express the same tense — the past.

Likewise it would be correct to disagree that aspect as a grammatical category cannot be separated from tense. As we know, in actual speech all the grammatical meanings of a word always go together in a bunch. Thus in *tells* we find a) present tense, b) active voice, c) indicative mood, d) singular number, etc.

It does not follow, however, that we are unable to separate the category of mood from the category of tense or the category of voice from that of aspect. By opposing *tells* to *told* and *will tell* we single out the category of tense; by contrasting *tells* with *is telling* we bring to light the category of aspect. Thus aspect is as closely connected with tense, as it is with voice, mood, person, number, etc.

The categories of tense and aspect characterize an action from different points of view. The tense of a verb shows the time of action, while the aspect of a verb deals with the development of action.

With regard to the category of aspect verbs are divided into those that have aspect opposites and those that do not have. The latter are united by the oblique or lexico-grammatical, or potential meaning of “non-continuous aspect”. As usual, the neutralization of “aspect” opposemes depends on the lexical meanings of the corresponding verbs.

Here is a brief enumeration of some groups of verbs usually having no aspect opposites in English:

- a) Verbs presenting diverse relations as actions — *belong, contain, consist, date, possess, resemble, result, etc.*
- b) Certain link-verbs (mostly those of “seeming”) such as *appear, look, prove, seem, turn out, etc.*

- c) Verbs of “physical perception” (*see, hear, feel, smell*), denoting constant properties viewed as actions.
- d) Verbs of “mental perceptions” (*believe, dislike, distrust, hate, hope, know, like, trust, understand, etc.*) which are likewise, verbs of weak dynamic force.
- e) “Point-action” verbs, denoting instantaneous acts of very short duration, unless such acts are repeated (*burst, jump, drop, pick up, etc.*).

Sometimes, however, the potential meanings are actualized by the use of a “continuous aspect” opposite showing the progress of the action at a given moment or during a certain period and stressing its temporary, transient nature, as in *She was not hating him any more at that crucial moment* [25; 134–138].

In Ukrainian there can be met one-aspect verbs of the imperfective type (одновидові дієслова недоконаного виду: *базікати, почитувати*) as well as one-aspect verbs of the perfective type (одновидові дієслова доконаного виду: *розговоритися, начитатися, поподумати*).

Ukrainian verbs of the imperfective aspect have three tense forms: present, past and future, verbs of the perfective aspect — only the past tense form and the simple form of the future tense.

Ukrainian verbs of the perfective aspect (доконаний вид) point out towards certain limits in revealing of the denoted by them action or state, or certain limit in time of their revealing; we as if feel here the beginning and the end of certain action, the certain result either in the form of the past or the future tense (compare: *взяти, написати, підрахувати*).

Verbs of imperfective aspect (недоконаного виду) express the unfinished character of some action, its durability; they do not show the limits of certain action; also they do not point towards the limits of some action from its beginning to the end even in the form of past tense, but the process of action is stressed here, e.g.: *брати, писати, рахувати*.

As a rule, Ukrainian verbs of perfective and imperfective aspects go alongside in pairs, and between them there is no other difference,

besides the aspect characteristics. Aspect meanings are expressed not by endings, but by the stem of the verb.

Morphological means of the Ukrainian aspect form building are various: 1) prefixation (*питати — спитати, розпитати*), 2) suffixation (*спийсувати — списати, загадувати, загадати*), 3) vowel alternation (*вмирати — вмерти, взяти — перевозити*), 4) stress shifting (*виміряти — віміряти, розкидати — розкідати*), 5) the use of different stems (*брати — взяти, говорити — сказати*) and others.

The aspect meaning of the verb influences its form structure. Verbs of perfective aspect that do not denote the process of action durability do not have forms of the present tense (compare: *написати, сказати*). Verbs of imperfective aspect have the forms of all three tenses. Besides, verbs of different aspects create their forms of the future tense unequally. Verbs of imperfective aspect can have two forms — synthetic and analytical: *казатиму, буду казати; стоятьтиму, буду стояти*; and verbs of perfective aspect can have only the synthetic form of the future tense: *сказати — скажу, стати — стану*. So, the aspect in Ukrainian is a lexical-grammatical category.

Ukrainian linguist Yu.O. Zhluktenko sums up the main peculiarities of the category of aspect expression in the contrasted languages in the following way [5; 74–75]:

1. The characteristic common feature of aspect forms in English and Ukrainian is their close connection with tense forms. Each tense form is simultaneously some aspect form and vice versa.
2. The essential difference between aspect forms in both languages concerns the correlation of the common and perfective aspects (співвідношення загального та доконаного видів). In this respect, the following fact is the most outstanding one: the action which happens regularly or is a repeated one, is rendered in English usually by forms of the common aspect, whereas in Ukrainian such an action cannot be rendered with the help of the perfective aspect and is regularly rendered by forms of the imperfective aspect.

It is explained by the fact that in Ukrainian in the forms of the perfective aspect the attention is paid to the fact of the action realization itself and simultaneously towards the full revealing of its content. In English for the forms of the common aspect the fact of the action realization itself comes to the first place, and the fact, whether it is fully realized or not, comes to the second place. That is why the perfective aspect should necessarily point out towards the full realization of the action. It naturally cannot render the action which is a repeated one, since it cannot be considered as the action which is fully completed. That is why in such a sentence as *The sun rises in the East.* — *Сонце сходить на сходи.*, in which it is spoken about the action which happens regularly, the action is rendered in English with the help of the common aspect form, whereas in Ukrainian — with the help of the imperfective aspect form. The perfective aspect cannot be used in such cases.

3. The English continuous aspect is “narrower” by its power of expression than the Ukrainian imperfective aspect. It is caused by the fact that forms of the continuous aspect in English do not only stress the process of action but also bring attention towards its concrete character, its visual expression (наочність), demonstrativeness, and present this action in the way as if it is happening before the speaker’s eyes. In its turn in Ukrainian the imperfective aspect points only towards the process of the action development, not singling out separately the meaning of concreteness. Depending on the context the Ukrainian imperfective aspect can express either the concrete action, happening at the moment of speaking, or the action of a more general and abstract character. Compare, e.g.:

- *Take the kettle off the stove, the water is boiling.* — *Зніміть чайник з плити: вода кипить.*
- *Water boils at 100° degrees Centigrade.* — *Вода кипить при 100° Цельсія.*
- *Are the children already sleeping?* — *Діти вже сплять?*
- *In summer we sleep here.* — *Влітку ми спимо тут.*

The complexity of the category of aspect lies in the fact that besides the mentioned basic kinds, we have a number of smaller aspect groups in both languages. Of course, they belong to some of the two basic types of aspect. For example, in English such subtypes are the following:

- a) the subtype of repletion in usage (множократність), which is expressed morphologically with the help of auxiliary verbs *will, would, used to*;
- b) the subtype of the one-time short action: *have a smoke, give a smile*;
- c) the subtype of the action beginning: *begin reading, grow dark*;
- d) the subtype of the unlimited duration: *continue speaking, keep silence*;
- e) the subtype of the action finishing: *stop smoking, come true*.

In Ukrainian such a subtype in the imperfective aspect are the verbs denoting the repetitive use: *приспівувати, примовляти, визбирувати*. The perfective aspect has the following subtypes:

- a) the subtype of the action beginning: *зашуміти, заспівати*;
- b) duration of the completed action: *поснав, посидів*;
- c) achieving the result of the completed action: *вивчити, виконати*;
- d) the sudden character of some action: *грюкнути, стукнути*;
- e) the suddenness or sharpness of the completed action: *рубонуту, штовхонуту*;
- f) the repetitive character of the limited in time action: *поперепишувати, пороздавати, понаносити* [5; 76–77].

Therefore, the grammatical category of aspect of the English verb is usually revealed by the so called aspect-tense forms (видо-часові форми). Usually there are two basic kinds differentiated: 1) the common aspect (загальний вид, by the terminology used above — non-continuous aspect (нетривалий вид)) expressed by Indefinite verb forms, and 2) continuous aspect (тривалий вид) expressed by Continuous verb forms. Forms of the common aspect render the mere fact of action whereas the forms of continuous aspect point out

towards the process of some action, its development. Unlike the Ukrainian aspect, by expression of which a great role is played also by lexical means (word building affixes, usage of different stems), in English the mentioned above aspect forms are formed by morphological means.

5. The category of tense

The category of tense is a system of three member opposeemes in the English language such as *writes — wrote — will write, is writing — was writing — will be writing* showing the relation of the time of the action denoted by the verb to the moment of speech.

In Ukrainian the category of tense is closely connected with the category of person and is manifested via the personal forms. The tense of the Ukrainian verb is expressed morphologically in the indicative mood. The following tense forms can be distinguished: the present tense of the synthetic character (теперішній: *читаю*), the past tense of the synthetic character (минулий: *читав*), the pluperfect past tense (A.E. Levytsky uses the term “plyuskvamperfekt” to denote the Ukrainian past perfect forms [12; 134]) of the analytical character (давноминулий: *був читав*) and future tense of both the synthetic and the analytical character (майбутній: *читатиму, буду читати*). The imperative and the conditional moods do not possess the tense differentiation.

The time of the action or the event can be expressed lexically with the help of such words as *yesterday, next week, now, a year ago, at half past seven, on the fifth of March, in 1999*, etc. It can also be shown grammatically by means of the category of tense.

The difference between the lexical and the grammatical expression of time is somewhat similar to the difference between the lexical and the grammatical expression of number:

- a) Lexically it is possible to name any definite moment or period of time: *a century, a year, a day, a minute*. The grammatical meaning of “tense” is an abstraction of only three particular tenses: the present, the past and the future.

- b) Lexically a period of time is named directly (e.g. *on Sunday*). The grammatical indication of time is indirect: it is not time that a verb like *asked* names, but an action that took place before the moment of speech.
- c) As usual, the grammatical meaning of “tense” is relative. *Writes* denotes a “present” action because it is contrasted with *wrote* denoting a “past” action and with *will write* naming a “future” action. *Writing* does not indicate the time of the action because it has no tense opposites. *Can* has only a “past tense” opposite, so it cannot refer to the past, but it may refer to the present or future (* *can do it yesterday* is impossible, but *can do it today, tomorrow* is normal).

The correlation of time and tense is connected with the problem of the absolute and relative use of tense grammemes.

We say that some tense is absolute if it shows the time of the action in relation to the present moment (the moment of speech). This is the case in the Ukrainian sentences:

Він працює на фірмі. Він працював на фірмі. Він буде працювати на фірмі.

The same in English, e.g.:

He works in a firm. He worked in a firm. He will work in a firm.

Quite often tense reflects the time of an action not with regard to the moment of speech but to some other moment in the past or in the future, indicated by the tense of another verb, e.g.:

Він сказав (скаже), що він працює на фірмі (працював, буде працювати на фірмі).

Here the tenses of the principal clauses *сказав (скаже)* are used absolutely, while all the tenses of the subordinate clauses are used relatively. For example, the present tense of *працює* does not refer to the present time but to the time of the action *сказав* in the first case and *скаже* in the second case.

In English such a relative use of tenses is also possible with regard to some future moment, e.g.:

He will say that he works (worked, will work) in a firm.

But, as a rule, this is impossible with regard to a moment in the past, as in *He said that he works (will work, worked) in a firm*. Instead an English speaking person should use *He said that he worked (would work, had worked) in a firm*. The point here is that in English tenses, as a rule, are used absolutely, that is with regard to the moment of speech [25; 142–146].

Such linguists as B. Khaimovich and B. Rogovskaya besides the category of tense differentiate two more verb categories: 1) the category of posteriority, and 2) the category of order.

The category of posteriority (слідування) is the system of two-member opposemes, like *shall come* and *should come, will be writing* and *would be writing*, showing whether an action is posterior with regard to the moment of speech or to some moment in the past.

As we know, a “past tense” verb denotes an action prior to the moment of speech and a “future tense” verb names a posterior action with regard to the moment of speech. When priority or posteriority is expressed in relation to the moment of speech, we call it absolute. But there may be relative priority or posteriority, with regard to some other moment. A form like *had written*, for instance, expresses an action prior to some moment in the past, that is it expresses relative priority. The form *should enter* expresses posteriority with regard to some past moment, that is it expresses relative posteriority.

This category is not distinguished by all linguists since the issues presented here are very often discussed within the category of tense (sequence of tenses of the English language) [25; 146–147].

The category of order (time correlation) (категорія часової співвіднесеності) is a system of two-member opposemes, such as *writes — has written, wrote — had written, writing — having written, to be written — to have been written*, etc. showing whether an action is viewed as prior to (“perfect”), or irrespective of (“non-perfect”), other actions or situations. The interpretation of this category also belongs to controversial problems of the English grammar [25; 130].

Summing up the main points concerning the category of tense expression in the contrasted languages, the following should be stated.

The grammatical category of tense expresses the relation of the action or state to the moment of speaking. In both languages it is closely connected with the category of aspect and is expressed by the majority of forms.

In Ukrainian the verb has the forms of the present tense (*роблю*), the future tense (two forms: *робитиму*, *буду робити*), the past tense (*робив*) and the pluperfect tense (*давноминулий*) (*був робив*). From these forms the present, past and future of the type *робитиму* are synthetic ones and the composite future tense as well as the pluperfect tense are analytical.

In English the verb has three main tenses: the present, the past and the future. Each tense form has the common (or non-continuous) and the continuous aspect. Only in the common aspect the present and the past tenses are synthetic ones in the affirmative form. In the interrogative and in the negative forms these tenses, similar to other tense forms and tense-aspect forms, are analytical ones.

According to the Russian linguist A.I. Smirnitsky in English there is a special grammatical category of **tense reference** (*часова віднесеність*) which is expressed with the help of special tense forms, known as Perfect and Perfect-Continuous forms. This category is by itself the mediate (*опосередкований*) complex form of tense reference. The reference to some tense is complicated by the fact that by this it is pointed out to the antecedence/precedence (*передування*) to some event or phenomena. Unlike this imperfect forms are the categorical forms of the immediate, simple tense reference (*безпосередня, проста часова віднесеність*).

The special class of verb forms is created by four English tense forms of the so called "Future in the Past". Their basic meaning is the action which is happening during the time, which was future from the point of view of the past moment, that is from the point of view of the speaker who produced his utterance in the past. So this tense denoting is also to some extent a relative one [5; 78].

5.1. The Present Tense

In Ukrainian the forms of present tense are characteristic only of the verbs of the imperfective aspect (*пишу, думаю*). In English all the verbs without exception can be used in the present tense.

According to the character of personal endings in the present tense Ukrainian verbs of the imperfective aspect (as well as the verbs of the perfective aspect with the future meaning) are subdivided into two conjugations (дієвідміни). The first conjugation (перша дієвідміна) includes the verbs, which in the third person plural have endings **-уть (-ють)** and in other personal forms the vocal **-е (-є)**, e.g.: *везуть — везе, везеши, веземо; читають — читає, читаємо* and so on. The second conjugation includes the verbs, which in the third person plural have the endings **-ать (-ять)** and in other personal forms the vocal **-и (-ї)**, e.g.: *лежать — лежиши, лежить, лежимо; стоять — стоїши, стоїть, стоїмо* and others.

The English language has four present tenses: Present Indefinite, Present Continuous, Present Perfect and Present Perfect Continuous. The difference between all these forms is caused by the general content of the grammar category to which they belong, that is the category of aspect or the category of time reference.

The basic meaning of the Present Indefinite tense is the action which is happening at the time always including to some extent the moment of speaking. The character of the course of action (характер перебігу дії) can be different: it can be the continuous action (*the sun shines — світить сонце*), the completed action (*I meet him again — я знову з ним зустрічаюсь*), the action indefinite concerning its duration or completeness (*I understand you — я вас розумію*). Sometimes it renders the repeated character of the action: *I often notice things that escape you — я часто помічаю речі, на які ви не звертаєте уваги*.

Similar to Ukrainian present tense it often renders past or future events. Due to this, events acquire a more vivid character, e.g.; *Then he comes to me and says ... I от він приходить до мене і каже. Tomorrow I go home. Завтра я їду додому*.

The Present Continuous Tense renders the action as the process, which is actually happening at the moment of speaking: *He is looking at you.* — *Він дивиться на вас.* The action expressed by this tense is regarded to some extent as a temporary one and its duration is considered as a limited one. For example, we can say: *The man is standing in the garden.* — *Людина стоїть у садку.*, but we can hardly say: *The house is standing in the garden.* — *Будинок зараз стоїть у садку.* This tense form can also be used in the future meaning: *He is coming tomorrow.* — *Він приїздить завтра.*

The meanings of the Present Perfect tense are very different. In many cases it has the relative-tense meaning (відносно-часове значення), e.g.: *He has just passed.* — *Він щойно тут пройшов.* In other cases the meaning of the action result is rendered: *He has arrived.* — *Він уже прибув.* That is why some linguists consider perfect forms as a separate resultative aspect. Usually the Perfect Tense renders the single action, not included into the sequence of successive events that happen one after another that is why it is not used in story telling. In Ukrainian it is usually rendered with the help of the past tense.

The Present Perfect Continuous renders the action as the process, which is brought maximally close to the moment of speaking. At this the duration of the process is stressed, e.g.: *I have been living here for two months.* — *Я живу тут уже два місяці.* Sometimes it can be substituted by the Present Perfect in such situations: *I have lived here for two months.* — the meaning remains the same. In Ukrainian it is usually rendered with the help of the present tense.

One more peculiar feature of the English aspect-tense system is the availability of special “expressive forms”, which render the same action that the corresponding tense form but with the greater emotionality and intensity. Such an expressive present tense is formed with the help of the auxiliary verb “do”, e.g.: *I do know him.* — *Я таки знаю його* [5; 78–80].

5.2. The Past Tense

In Ukrainian we have two verb forms of the past tense: the past and the pluperfect tenses (минулий та давноминулий).

The past tense is formed from the base of the infinitive with the help of the suffix *-в (-л)* as well as gender flexions: the *zero flexion* for the masculine gender, *-а* for the feminine gender and *-о* for the neuter gender. When the base of the infinitive finishes with the consonant, then the suffix *-в* is absent by the masculine gender (e.g.: *нести — ніс, сікти — сік, везти — віз*, but *грати — грав*). If the base of the infinitive contains the suffix *-ну* it is omitted in the past tense: *мерзнути — мерз, сохнути — сох* (except the stressed position: *тягнути — тягну́в*).

The Ukrainian pluperfect tense (давноминулий) is created analytically by combining the forms of the past tense form of the verb — the carrier of the lexical meaning, with the corresponding form of the past tense of the auxiliary verb *бути*, e.g.: *ходив був, ходила була, ходили були; пішов був, позичив був*. Such forms are more often created from imperfective verbs and are used to denote an action which happened a long time ago, or to denote an action which happened before another past action or was completed under the influence of another subsequent action.

In modern Ukrainian forms of the pluperfect tense are gradually becoming less used, being substituted by usual past forms. Very often the pluperfect tense can be met in the deformed form: the help verb *бути* is used in similar impersonal form *було* in singular and in plural for all genders, e.g.: *Коли було він приходив до нас ...; Коли було вона співала ...; Коли було вони спитають ...* According to its meaning this form renders the common or the repeated action in the past.

In English we have two aspect forms of the past tense: the Past Indefinite and the Past Continuous tenses. Besides there are two forms of the past tense that reveal the category of tense reference: the Past Perfect and the Past Perfect Continuous.

The Past Indefinite tense denotes the action which happened during the period of time in the past, usually indicating the completed character of the action. This verb form is widely used in narrations, where it renders the subsequent bound with each other events. According to the formation of its aspect-tense form all English verbs are subdivided into two groups of regular and irregular verbs.

The Past Continuous tense underlines that the action is in the process and shows its concrete character. It usually shows the simultaneous course of action with another past action or some definite past moment. This verb form can be compared with the past form of the imperfective aspect, but the latter one has a wider meaning, which is not limited by the simultaneous character of the action.

Of the two relative past tenses Past Perfect is more often used, showing that the action happened before another past action or before some definite moment in the past. The characteristic feature of this tense form is its ability to render the complete character of the action, whereas the Ukrainian pluperfect means first of all the uncompleted action, and secondly it only stresses the remoteness of some past action comparing to the moment of speaking. Formally these two tenses differentiate themselves also by different help verbs (*had* in English and *був* Ukrainian).

Another relative past tense — the Past Perfect Continuous — renders the course of the action from its beginning till the end in the past; the starting point of such an action is usually indicated and goes before some definite moment upon which actually the action is centered. This tense form is used rather seldom.

The expressive form of the past tense is also widely used. It is formed from the auxiliary verb “*to do*” in the past tense (“*did*”) and the base of the infinitive, e.g.: *But he did see them.* — *Але він таки побачив їх.* In Ukrainian such shades of meaning are rendered with the help of the corresponding situation as well as lexical means — adverbs *дійсно*, *справді*, particles *таки*, *же*, *ж* and others [5; 80–82].

5.3. The Future Tense. The tense form “Future-in-the-past” and sequence of tenses of the English language.

The Future Tense. In Ukrainian forms of the future tense are not created equally for all verbs. Verbs of the perfective aspect, which do not have forms of the present tense, form the future tense with the help of personal endings of present tense, e.g.: *прочитаю, напишеш, розкажу* (compare: *читаю, пишеш, кажу*). So the meaning of the future

tense is connected here not with endings but with the word formation means: prefixation, change or addition of the suffix, the change of the root vowel, the stress change and different combination of these means.

Verbs of the imperfective aspect have two forms of the future tense: 1) the analytical one which is created from the personal form of the future tense of the help verb *бути* and the infinitive of the conjugated verb, e.g.: *буду працювати, будемо співати*; 2) the synthetic form, which is formed by adding to the infinitive base of the conjugated verb personal endings, created from the former forms of the verb *яти* (*иняти, йняти*), e.g.: *писати-му, -меш, -ме, -memo, -мете, -муть*.

In English all verbs form their future tense analytically. According to the character of the course of action in English there are several aspect-tense forms to denote the action taking place in the future.

The Future Indefinite is formed with the help of auxiliary verbs *shall* and *will* with the infinitive of the verb which expresses the lexical meaning of this construction. This form can render either the single or the repeated action. In Ukrainian it corresponds to the future of both the perfective aspect and the imperfective aspect, depending on the content of a sentence.

The Future Continuous tense is formed by the combination of the auxiliary verb “*to be*” in the Future Indefinite and the Present Participle of the verb expressing the lexical meaning. This form renders the action as a process that will be taking place during some limited period of time, including some definite future moment.

One more future tense — the Future Perfect — is formed with the help of the auxiliary verb “*to have*” in Future indefinite and Past Participle of the verb, expressing the lexical meaning. This verb form renders the action that should finish before a definite moment in the future. The form of the Future Perfect Continuous is used much more rarely.

Unlike the English language where the usage of the future tense is impossible in conditional and some other tense sentences, in Ukrainian sentences the usage of the future tense is not limited by the type of the sentence.

The tense form “Future-in-the-past” and sequence of tenses of the English language. The typical feature of tense forms of the English verb is the fact that many of them render the action that happened not according to the moment of speaking but in accordance with some “center” of the corresponding tense. The vivid example of it is the Future-in-the-Past tense, which renders the action that should take place after some definite past moment; in this case such a point is considered as a “tense center”. These tense forms are created with the help of auxiliary verbs “*should*” and “*would*” and the corresponding infinitive form of the verb, expressing the lexical meaning. Such tense forms are used in Indefinite and Continuous aspects, also in the category of the tense reference (the Future-Perfect-in-the-Past). The peculiarity of “future-in-the-past” forms is the dependable character of their usage: these forms are usually used in complex sentences, when the so called sequence of tenses takes place.

The phenomenon of sequence of tenses is the characteristic regularity of English syntax. Its sense is that the verb-predicate of the subordinate sentence renders the action not in accordance to the moment of speaking, but in accordance to the action expressed by the verb in the main sentence (if the later one is used in the past tense. That is why in such complex sentences the predicate is as if coordinated with the form of the past tense, by which the predicate of the main sentence is expressed, and is also expressed by the past tense or “future-in-the-past” form.

In Ukrainian in such cases we can observe another usage of tense forms. For example, in the sentence with indirect speech *Він сказав, що ця дівчина вчиться в школі* the action *вчиться* is considered as such that is happening simultaneously with the action of the verb-form *сказав*. Using forms of the present tense *вчиться*, the author as if considers the action of the subordinate sentence from the point of view of the moment, when there happened the action expressed by the verb-form *сказав*. So in such a case the author of the sentence uses in the indirect speech this or that tense form as if being carried in his thoughts into the past [5; 83–86].

6. The category of voice

The category of voice is the system of two member opposemes (*loves — is loved, loving — being loved, to love — to be loved, has loved — has been loved, etc.*) which show whether the action is represented as issuing from the subject (**the active voice**) or as experienced by its object (**the passive voice**).

In Modern Ukrainian there are two voices differentiated: active and passive. The separate group includes reflexive verbs with the postfix *-ся* (*голитися, гніватися*). The passive voice can also be formed by the passive participle and non-personal form of participle ending in *-но, -то* (*товариство організоване, товариство організовано*). In Ukrainian the category of voice is characteristic only of transitive verbs.

Voice is one of those categories which show the close connection between language and speech. A voice opposeme is the unit of a language system, but the essential difference between its members is in their combinability in speech. The “active voice” member has obligatory connections with subject words and optional ones with object words. The “passive voice” member, on the contrary, forms obligatory combinations with object words and optional ones with subject words. Compare:

He loves (her).

She is loved (by him).

I want John to read (the letter).

I want the letter to be read (by John).

The category of voice also shows the links between morphology and syntax. Being a morphological category, voice often manifests syntactical relations. The voice opposites of finites indicate whether the subject of the sentence denotes the doer or the recipient of the action. Compare: *She asked ...* and *She was asked*.

With regard to the category of voice verbs are divided into those that have voice opposites and those which do not have. The second subclass comprises subjective verbs and some objective verbs denoting

actions of weak dynamic force (in which the meaning of “action” is hardly felt) like *belong*, *become* (“be suitable”), *cost*, *fail*, *lack*, *last*, *own*, *possess*, *resemble*, etc.

The content of all voice opposemes is the same: two particular meanings of “active” and “passive” voice united by the general meaning of “voice”. All the other meanings found in both members of the opposeme are irrelevant within the opposeme.

The form of voice opposemes in English seems to differ considerably. In the opposeme *ask — am asked* the “active” member has a zero grammatical morpheme and the “passive” member has a complicated positive morpheme (*am ... -ed*). In *asks — is asked* both members have positive grammatical morphemes (*-s*) and (*is ... -ed*). In *will ask — will be asked* the forms of the grammatical morphemes are still more complicated. But this variety of forms can be generalized. Then the “active” member can be regarded as unmarked and the “passive” member as marked by the combination of one of the forms of the lexeme “*be*” used as a grammatical word-morpheme and the grammatical morpheme of Participle II, in the formula representation *be + PII*. Compare: *to write — to be written*.

Opinions differ as to the voice system of Modern English. Though most linguists, apparently, recognize only two voices in Modern English — the active voice and the passive voice, some speak also of the reflexive voice expressed with the help of the semantically weakened *self*-pronouns, as in *He cut himself while shaving*.

Besides the three voices mentioned above B.A. Il'yish finds two more voices in Modern English — the “reciprocal” voice expressed with the help of *each other*, *one another* and the “neuter” (“middle”) voice as seen in *The door opened*, *The numbers would not add*, *The college was filling up*, etc.

According to B.S. Khaimovich and B.I. Rogovskaya, these theories do not carry much conviction:

- 1) In cases like *He washed himself* it is not the verb that is reflexive but the pronoun *himself* used as a direct object.
- 2) *Washed* and *himself* are words belonging to different lexemes. They have different lexical and grammatical meanings.

- 3) If we regard *washed himself* as an analytical word, it is necessary to admit that the verb has the categories of gender (*washed himself* — *washed herself*), person — non-person (*washed himself* — *washed itself*), that the categories of number and person are expressed twice in the word *washes himself*, etc.
- 4) Similar objections can be raised against regarding *washed each other*, *washed one another* as analytical forms of the reciprocal voice. The difference between “*each other*” and “*one another*” would become a grammatical category of the verb.
- 5) A number of verbs express the “reflexive” and “reciprocal” meanings without the corresponding pronouns, e.g.: *He always washes in cold water. Kiss and be friends* [25; 125–130].

According to Yu.O. Zhluktenko [5; 86], the issue concerning forms of the voice expression in the system of English and Ukrainian verb cannot be considered a finally solved problem. The majority of grammars express the opinion that the English language has three voices: 1) the active voice, which shows that the object or the person, expressed by the subject, performs the action; 2) the passive voice, which shows that the action of the predicate is directed towards the person or the object, expressed by the subject, but this action is not performed by them; 3) the reflexive voice, which shows that the action is centered upon the doer of the action himself/herself.

B.O. Illyish believes that there are five voices or states in English: indicative (дійсний), reflexive (зворотний), medium (середній), passive (пасивний) and reciprocal (взаємний). O.I. Smirnitsky claims that the so called reflexive and reciprocal states are not the grammar forms, these are the combinations of the active state of transitive verbs with pronoun objects (займенникові додатки) and the difference between them is only in the object character (характер додатка). According to his opinion in English there are only two states: the active and the passive ones.

The Ukrainian language has four major states: 1) the active/ or the indicative state (активний, або дійсний), which includes all the transitive verbs; 2) the medium (середній), which includes all intransitive

verbs with the meaning of movement or state (*бігти, летіти, спати, хворіти*); 3) the passive state (пасивний), which includes the verbs that render the action performed upon the object (*розмиватися, відбудовуватися*); they usually have the ending *-ся*; 4) the reflexive state (зворотний), also including the verbs in *-ся*, which render the action, the object of which is the acting person (*повертатися, роздягатися, вмиватися, чепуритися*) [5; 86–87].

Besides these mentioned groups there are differentiated some smaller state groups of Ukrainian verbs. For example, the separate group of verbs renders the reciprocal action, which is happening between two, or among a bigger number of acting persons, e.g.: *зустрічатися, листуватися, умовлятися*. Other verbs render the active-non-object/objectless action (активно-безоб'єктна дія), which is spread upon certain objects that are not mentioned: (*собака*) *кусається, (кінь) брикається*. The verbs with the ending *-ся* of the type (*не*) *хочеться, (не) спиться, (не) лежиться* are close to the medium state.

The Ukrainian grammarian M.A. Zhovtobryukh finds only three states in the Ukrainian language: the active (the indicative), which includes all transitive verbs, the reflexive-medium and the passive states. The last two include verbs with the ending *-ся*. According to his opinion intransitive verbs rendering the movement or the state (*іти, спати, сміятися*) do not possess the category of state.

The peculiarity of the English language is the multiple meaning (багатозначність) of the verbal suffix *-ся*. Verbs with this suffix belong to different states, for example: a) the passive state: *змінюється, затверджується*; b) the reflexive: *умиваюся*; c) the reciprocal: *змагаються, б'ються*; d) the active-non-object: *кусається, ганяється*; e) the passive-non-object: (*скло*) *б'ється, (стіл) розсувається* and others [5; 87].

Some verbs in Ukrainian have only the reflexive form, that is they are used only with the suffix *-ся*: *любуватися, боятися, надіятися, сміятися* and others. Also there are a lot of verbs which cannot be combined with this suffix, that is they are unable to create the form of the reflexive state: *лягти, сохнути, сісти, виснути, гнити, вмерти, пахнути, шуміти* and others.

When we compare the building of the state forms in English and in Ukrainian (*I defended him* “я захищав його”, *I was defended by him* “мене захищав він”, *I defended myself* “я захищався”) then it can be easily noticed that in English the state is a more grammatical category than in Ukrainian, where it has a lexical-grammatical character. In Ukrainian we cannot build forms of different states from one and the same verb with such an ease as we do it in English. Besides in English a big number of verbs can act both as transitive and intransitive depending on the context where they are used, whereas in Ukrainian the meaning of a certain state is attached to a certain verb and determines the whole system of its forms [5; 87].

In Ukrainian the forms of the verb state are mainly synthetic ones, and in English analytical forms are prevailing.

6.1. The passive voice (state)

In English the passive state of the verb is formed by combining of the help verb “to be” in the corresponding tense form with the Participle II of the main verb, which expresses its lexical meaning: *He was invited*. The peculiarity of such a passive construction is that it renders two different meanings: a) the meaning of the state passiveness (пасив стану), e.g.: *The house is built* “будинок (є) збудований”, b) the meaning of the passiveness of the action (пасив дії) — “будинок будується”. This contradiction between the form and the content of the grammar category is especially obvious if we take into consideration other European languages, which have different forms to express the passiveness of the state and the passiveness of the action.

Thus in Ukrainian the passiveness of the state is expressed analytically. This form is built by combining the help verb *бути* in the corresponding tense with the past participle of the verb, expressing the lexical meaning: *був розроблений, був побудований*. This form is created only by verbs of the perfective aspect. They also create a widely used construction with the passive meaning with non-personal indeclinable forms in *-но, -то*, e.g.: *будинок було збудовано, статтю було опрацьовано, роботу буде розпочато* and others.

The passiveness of the action is rendered in Ukrainian in a synthetic way — by the verb forms with the suffix *-ся*: *програма затверджується, школа перебудовується*.

The absence of such outer characteristic features in English is compensated by the system of other language means: 1) context; 2) the form of the auxiliary verb; 3) semantics of a participle.

One more essential characteristic feature and striking difference in building passive in English and Ukrainian is the different way of usage of the meaning of verb transitivity to form the passive state.

The Ukrainian language forms characteristically the passive state mainly from the verbs which have the direct transitive meaning (прямо-перехідне значення), that is they transform the direct object of the active state construction into the subject of the passive construction: *вони будують хату — хата будується ними*.

A special and very characteristic feature of the modern English language is the fact that it uses all the meanings of the verb transitivity to form the passive: the direct transitivity, the indirect transitivity without the preposition and the indirect transitivity with the preposition. In other words English passive constructions are formed with the usage in the role of the subject of any object of the active construction: the direct object, the indirect object or the prepositional object.

So in the English language we have the following typical passive constructions:

- a) with the usage of the direct-transitive meaning of the verb:
The house was built of stone (Будинок будувався з каменю).

Such constructions are also characteristic of the Ukrainian language.

- b) with the usage of the indirect-transitive meaning of the verb:
She was given a book (Їй дали книжку).

Such constructions are impossible in Ukrainian. The main peculiarity of such a usage of the passive state in English is the fact that in such cases the passive is formed from verbs which have two objects: the direct and the indirect one (*to give something to somebody*). The subject of the passive construction corresponds to the indirect object of the active construction whereas the direct object remains without

changes and functions in the passive construction as the so called retained object (“утриманий” об’єкт).

- c) with the usage of the indirect transitivity with the prepositional form of government (керування), e.g.: *The doctor was sent for* (За лікарем послали).

Such forming of passive is altogether uncharacteristic of other Indo-European languages.

- d) Especially peculiar are passive constructions with the usage not of a transitive meaning of the verb but its circumstantial relations (з використанням не перехідного значення дієслова, а його обставинних зв’язків), e.g.: *The room has not been lived in* (У кімнаті ніхто не жив); *This bed was not slept in* (На цьому ліжку ніхто не спав).

Here the role of the subject of the passive construction is performed not by a former object of the active construction but by the former circumstance of place: *Nobody has lived in the room. Nobody slept in this bed.*

In Ukrainian such a passive construction is rendered either by an active one: *У цій кімнаті ніхто не жив*, or by the indefinite-personal construction: *У цій кімнаті не жили* [5; 88–90].

6.2. The reflexive voice (state)

The meaning of reflexiveness is rendered in English with the help of combining the transitive verb with the reflexive pronoun of the corresponding person and number, e.g.: *he hides himself* (він ховається). In grammars of the English language this combination is considered to be the analytical form of the reflexive state of the verb.

There are some other views concerning this issue. For example, O.I. Smirnitsky denies the existence of the special grammar form of the reflexive state in English and considers that in the mentioned above examples the simple combination of the verb with its object takes place.

Linguists supporting the first point of view do not deny that the reflexive pronoun, used with the verb in this combination, is not to

the same degree syntactically independent as other objects (compare: *he dressed himself* “*він одягнувся*” and *he dressed the child* “*він одягнув дитину*”). Such an object cannot be used in the role of the subject of the passive construction (we cannot say: *himself was dressed*), we cannot put a question to it similarly as to the other direct object (we cannot answer the question: “*Whom did he dress?*” with: *himself*).

Among the forms of the reflexive state in English there are differentiated two main cases:

- 1) the proper reflexive meaning of such forms (власно зворотне значення) if they show that the subject has as the object of its action itself, e.g.: *I dress myself* (*я одягаюся*), *we wash ourselves* (*ми вмиваємося*) etc. With the verbs that render regular, often repeated actions, the pronoun can be absent: *I dress*, *we wash*.
- 2) the medium-reflexive meaning (середнє-зворотнє значення) of these forms when they show that the action is not transferred upon some other object or person, but is closed upon the subject itself, is centered upon it, e.g.: *stretch oneself* (*протягтися*), *enjoy oneself* (*одержувати задоволення*), *worry oneself* (*турбуватися*).

In Ukrainian the reflexive state is formed in a synthetic way. The affix *-ся*, which is added to transitive verbs, has become abstract to such an extent that it has almost lost its former pronoun meaning *себе* (compare: *кусався* and *кусав себе*).

Ukrainian verbs of the reflexive (or as they are sometimes called of the reflexive-medium state) are also subdivided according to their meaning into several groups:

- 1) proper reflexive (власнє зворотні): *умиватися*, *взуватися*, *голитися*, *одягатися*;
- 2) indirectly reflexive (непрямо-зворотні): *готуватися* (*до зими*), *запасатися* (*їжею*), *збиратися* (*в дорогу*);
- 3) reciprocal-reflexive (взаємно зворотні): *боротися*, *змагатися*, *зустрічатися*, *листуватися*;

- 4) general reflexive (загальнозворотні): *зупинятися, просуватися, турбуватися, журитися, дивуватися, сердитися*;
- 5) active-non-object (активно-безоб'єктні): *кусатися, дряпатися, жалитися, ганятися, щипатися*;
- 6) passive-qualitative (пасивно-якісні): *рватися, гнутися, розбиватися*;
- 7) reflexive passive (зворотно-пасивні): *пригадуватися, уявлятися*.

In terms of their structure English reflexive forms differ from the corresponding Ukrainian forms, that is English reflexive pronouns are not deprived of their semantics and have not acquired the grammatical character to such an extent as the Ukrainian suffix *-ся*. That is why they have not merged with the verb into one whole as it happened in Ukrainian [5; 90–91].

7. The category of mood

Mood is the grammatical category of the verb reflecting the relation of the action denoted by the verb to reality from the speaker's point of view.

In the sentences *He listens attentively; Listen attentively; You would have listened attentively if you had been interested*, we deal with the same action of listening, but in the first sentence the speaker presents the action as the one taking place in reality, whereas in the second sentence the speaker urges the listener to perform the action, and in the third sentence the speaker presents the action as imaginary. These different relations of the action to reality are expressed by different mood-forms of the verb: *listens, listen, would have listened*. Similar examples can be found in Ukrainian (*Сонце сходить. Зійди сонце! Якщо би сонце зійшло*).

The meaning of the three moods is distinguished in the language structure not so much by the opposition of individual forms (as in the case in the opposeemes of other categories), as by the opposition of the

systems of forms each mood possesses. To illustrate this let us compare the synthetic forms of the lexeme “*have*” in the three moods:

Indicative	Conditional	Imperative
<i>have, has, had</i>	<i>have, had</i>	<i>have</i>

One of the most important differences between the indicative and other moods is that the meaning of “tense” does not go with the meanings of conditional and imperative mood. “Tense” reflects the real time of a real action. The imperative and conditional moods represent the action not as real, but as desired or imagined, and the notions of the real time are discarded.

According to B. S. Khaimovich and B. I. Rogovskaya [25; 141], the system of opposemes of each mood can roughly be represented as follows:

Opposemes	Moods		
	Indicative	Conditional	Imperative
<i>write — be writing</i> (aspect)	+	+	(+)
<i>write — be written</i> (voice)	+	+	(+)
<i>should write — would write</i> (person)	+	+	—
<i>was — were</i> (number)	+	(+)	—
<i>writes — wrote — will write</i> (tense)	+	—	—

Thus, the category of mood reveals the relation of the denoted action (позначувана дія) to reality. In both languages there are verb forms of the Indicative mood (дійсний), the Imperative mood (наказовий) and the Conditional mood (умовний).

7.1. The Indicative and Imperative moods

The Indicative mood is the basic mood of the verb. Morphologically it is the most developed system including all the categories of the verb. Semantically it is a fact mood. It serves to present an action as a fact of reality. It is the “most objective” or the “least subjective” of

all the moods. It conveys minimum personal attitude to the fact. This becomes particularly obvious in such sentences as *Water consists of oxygen and hydrogen* where *consists* denotes an actual fact, and the speaker's attitude is neutral.

Forms of the indicative mood serve to denote the action or the state that correspond to the actual reality (відповідають реальній дійсності).

All the forms of the Indicative mood in English and Ukrainian have already been considered by us previously, when we dwelled upon the categories of person, number, tense and state. The characteristic feature of the Indicative mood is its connection with the category of tense: it is expressed by the forms of the present, past and future tenses.

The imperative mood represents an action as a command, urging, or request to one's interlocutor. It is a direct expression of one's will. Therefore it is much more "subjective" than the indicative mood. Its modal meaning is very strong and distinct.

The imperative mood is morphologically the least developed of all moods. In fact, the grammeme *write, know, search, do*, etc. is the only one regularly met in speech. The "continuous" and "passive" opposites of this grammeme (*be writing, be searching*, etc.; *be known, be warned*, etc.) are very rare.

Some linguists are of the opinion that Modern English possesses analytical forms of the imperative mood since the first and the third person are built up with the help of the semantically weakened unstressed *let*, as in *Let him come, Let us go*, etc. [25; 140–156].

Ukrainian verb forms of the imperative mood similar to English ones also render the order, wish, appeal, demand, request or some other types of inducement (спонукання) to perform some action.

In Ukrainian forms of the imperative mood are built from the base of the present tense:

- a) for the second person singular with the ending **-и** (*пиши, іди*) or without endings (*сядь, встань, читай*);
- b) for the first person plural with the ending **-імо** (*несімо, ходімо*) or **-мо** (*читаймо, станьмо*);
- c) for the second person plural by means of adding the endings **-іть** (*несіть, ідіть*) or **-те** (*читайте, станьте*).

For the third person singular and plural forms of the imperative mood are built analytically by combining forms of the third person of the present or future tense of the indicative mood with the particle *хай* (*нехай*): *Хай він робить* (*зробить*). *Нехай вони прийдуть* (*приходять*). *Хай живе Україна!*

In the modern English language the system of forms of the imperative mood is much simpler than in Ukrainian. In relation to the second person singular and plural only one common form of the imperative mood is used. It coincides with the infinitive and differs from it only by the absence of the particle “to”. Not rendering the category of number this form is used at addressing both one person and several persons: *Go* “*Йди/Ідіть*”. *Take* “*Візьми/Візьміть*”.

Order or request to the first and third persons singular and plural is expressed analytically with the help of the verb “let” and the infinitive of the notional verb. These two parts of the analytical form are usually separated by the corresponding personal pronoun in the objective case or the noun in the common case: *Let me/us do it* (*Давайте я зроблю/зробимо*). *Let him/them/your brother come* (*Нехай він/вони/ваш брат прийде/прийдуть*).

The peculiarity of the English imperative mood is its expressive or emphatic form used to denote the strengthened kind of request: *Do come tomorrow!* (*Обов’язково приходьте завтра!*).

In Ukrainian there are also widely used the so called intimate or unceremonious / unofficial forms of the imperative mood, which are created by adding particles of the intimate character to the common form of the imperative mood (інтимізуючі частки) **-но/-бо**: *іди-но сюди, скажи-но мені, скажи-бо швидше*.

In Ukrainian there is also spread the use of the infinitive of the verb with the imperative meaning: *Встати!* Most often such forms can be met in different slogans, newspaper headlines, military commands: *Виконати план достроково! Підготуватися до жнив! Почистити казарми!* [5; 92–93].

7.2. The Conditional mood

Probably the only thing linguists are unanimous about with regard to the conditional mood is that it represents action as a “non-fact”, as something imaginary, desirable, problematic, contrary to reality.

In modern Ukrainian the conditional mood is formed analytically by the way of adding the particle **би** (after the vocal **б**) to the form of the past tense or the infinitive of the conjugated verb *читав би, прочитала б, погуляти б*. This particle is written separately from the verb, it can easily move in the sentence, being placed either before the verb or after it, or can be separated from the verb by other words (*він би вже давно прийшов*). With some conjunctions it is joined into one word, e.g.: *щоб, якби, начебто, мовби* and others.

The characteristic feature of the whole analytical form of the conditional mood in Ukrainian is its atemporal (позачасовий) meaning. The form *писав би* can be easily referred to any time (the present, past or future), being joined with any adverb of time: *сьогодні, завтра, зараз, учора*.

Besides the forms with the particle **би** in Ukrainian there is also used the peculiar form of the conditional mood with the particle **бодай** with the meaning of the wish of great intensity (побажання великої інтенсивності): *Бодай ви терном поросли ...* (Т. Шевченко).

Unlike this very distinct and simple system of forms of the conditional mood, in the modern English language this system is a very complex one.

Meanings of the conditional and unreal action are rendered in English by the following verb forms:

- 1) the outdated synthetic forms: *be, have* (*take* and other forms of the third person without the ending *-s* as the forms of the so called Present Subjunctive); *were* (for all the persons as the Past Subjunctive form);
- 2) forms of the indicative mood — the past tense of the common aspect (Past Indefinite) and Past Perfect that in certain syntactical conditions acquire the meaning of the unreal action;

- 3) analytical forms of the conditional mood, built by using the auxiliary verbs *should* and *would* and different forms of the infinitive of notional verbs;
- 4) combinations of modal verbs *may (might)*, *can (could)* with infinitives of notional verbs, which acquire the meaning of the unreal action depending on the type of the sentence. But in these combinations modal verbs do not lose completely their lexical meaning as it happened with *should* and *would* that have acquired a totally grammatical meaning.

Synthetic forms of the conditional mood in English are outdated ones, and are used mainly in writing, whereas analytical forms are spread in all spheres of language use.

The conditional mood is the category which is closely connected with the structure of the complex sentence (складнопідрядне речення). In all its usages there is a direct dependence on the type of the sentence in which it is used. Though this peculiarity is characteristic of both languages, it is revealed much more distinctly in English wherein even the form of the conditional mood is determined by the type of the sentence, in which it is used. Since the form cooperates with its meaning this or that shade of mood is caused by the syntactic conditions in which this form is used. A vivid example of this are analytical forms of the conditional mood “*should/would + infinitive*” that in certain types of sentences can be used as the forms of “Future-in-the-Past”, as well as “*were*” and forms Past Indefinite or Past Perfect, which in certain syntactic conditions are the forms of Indicative mood, and in others — forms of the conditional mood.

So attachment to a certain type of a sentence is the characteristic feature of the forms of the conditional mood of the modern English language.

Unlike Ukrainian, the English conditional mood can express the category of tense: analytical forms *should/would + Indefinite Infinitive* and the form of the past time (*Past Indefinite*), used with the meaning of the unreal action, point towards the action that could happen in the present or future. Analytical forms *should/would + Perfect Infinitive*

and *Past Perfect*, used with the meaning of the unreal action, serve to denote the action that could have happened in the past.

In both languages forms of the conditional mood have the category of state, compare: *були б запрошені*, *be done/ were done, should be done*, as well as the category of aspect, e.g.: *читав би, прочитав би, should be going*.

It is interesting to note that a big role in the system of conditional mood in both contrasted languages is played by forms of the past tense. It doesn't happen by chance since it is explained by the near character of the past and the unreal. Even O.O. Potebnya pointed out that the common feature of the past tense and "ideal" moods is the fact that in both cases the action is not available in reality, and we render events that do not exist at the moment of speaking. That is why in many languages forms of the conditional mood are built on the basis of the past tense [5; 93–96].

Summing up all the above mentioned information let us consider the use of **the verb grammemes in speech**. When used in speech a word has but one of its lexical meanings and all of its grammatical meanings. Thus, in the sentence *He writes to me every week*, the verb *writes* conveys only one of its lexical meanings ("communicates in writing"), whereas it has seven elementary grammatical meanings: 1) active voice; 2) non-perfect order; 3) non-continuous aspect; 4) present tense; 5) indicative mood; 6) third person; 7) singular number.

Since each of these elementary meanings can be singled out in a certain opposeme, the entire grammatical meaning of a grammeme as a unit of language must be regarded as the sum of its elementary grammatical meanings (present tense + active voice + indicative mood, etc.)

When used in speech, however, in diverse speech situations, in various lexical and syntactical surroundings, with verbs of different lexical meanings, a grammeme may acquire some complex meaning which cannot be directly inferred from the meanings of its constituents. In other words, the entire meaning of a grammeme in speech is often not equal to the sum of its elementary meanings and we may speak, in some sense, of idiomatic meanings of grammemes. Therefore, it is

necessary to analyze the meanings of grammemes not only as units of language but as units of speech as well.

For example, in most cases imperative mood grammemes in speech serve to present order, command, request, etc. as a direct expression of the speaker's will. In certain surroundings, however, mostly in the first clause of a compound sentence or when used parenthetically, they can express condition the consequence of which is stated in the same sentence, e.g.:

Do it again and you will find it much easier.

This event, only try to see it in its true light, will show you who is at the bottom of all this [25; 157, 182–183].

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. Compare the English verb system with the Ukrainian verb system.
2. Characterize the verb as a part of speech (think of the number of grammatical categories, typical stem-building elements, combinability, syntactic functions). Do these characteristics differ in the contrasted languages?
3. What is the subdivision of verbs according to their stem structure? Does it coincide in English and Ukrainian languages?
4. Mention the groups, into which verbs are subdivided as a class of lexemes, taking into account their grammatical and semantic characteristics. Provide examples in English and Ukrainian languages.
5. Describe the category of person of the verb. Does it differ in two languages under study?
6. Dwell upon the group of impersonal verbs in Ukrainian and English languages. Provide examples.
7. Describe the category of number of English and Ukrainian verbs. Are there any similarities and differences?
8. What can be mentioned concerning the category of gender within the English and Ukrainian verb systems?

9. Does the expression of the category of aspect of the verb coincide in English and Ukrainian languages?
10. Compare the aspect verb groups in both contrasted languages.
11. Dwell upon the isomorphic and allomorphic features of the category of tense in English and Ukrainian languages.
12. Describe the present tense expression within the English and Ukrainian verbs systems.
13. Describe the past tense expression within the English and Ukrainian verbs systems.
14. Describe the future tense expression within the English and Ukrainian verbs systems.
15. Dwell upon the phenomenon of the “Future-in-the-Past” tenses in the English language.
16. Describe the category of voice of the verb. Does it differ in two languages under study?
17. What are the peculiarities of the Passive voice of English verbs in comparison with Ukrainian verbs?
18. In what way is the “reflexive state” expressed in two contrasted languages?
19. Dwell upon the category of mood of English and Ukrainian verbs.
20. What are the peculiarities of the imperative mood in English in comparison with the Ukrainian one?
21. Describe the similarities and differences of the conditional; mood expression in English and Ukrainian.
22. What are the peculiarities of usage of the verb grammemes in speech?

II. Lexical verbs express many meanings, which can be classified into seven major semantic classes: activity verbs (*bring, get, make*), communication verbs (*ask, offer, talk*), mental verbs (*believe, find, listen*), causative verbs (*cause, allow, help*), verbs of occurrence (*become, grow, change*), verbs of existence or relationship (*appear, seem, exist*), and verbs of aspect (*begin, continue, keep*). **Underline all lexical verbs in the sentences below. Identify the semantic class of each verb.**

1. Erin bought it when she was in high school to learn to sew (conversation).
2. I asked him for a raise — I told him I wanted five fifty an hour (conversation).
3. In mid-September, he met Pamela Digby on a blind date and proposed (newspaper writing).
4. She moved in with him and then she helped him buy a condo (conversation).
5. We stayed at his parents' house (conversation).
6. He asserted that nothing improper occurred during the gathering (newspaper writing).
7. I said “so what do you think I can get for my computer”, and he looked at me and he smiled and he said “you just better give it away” (conversation).
8. Hyponatremia is associated with a variety of disorders, including Addison's disease, which involves the inadequate secretion of aldosterone, resulting in decreased reabsorption of sodium (academic writing).
9. A: Wait, what are you getting at again?
B: This looks so dry.
A: You've got the linguini. Stop complaining, will you?

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P.30–31.

III. Characterize the verbs in the presented piece of writing according to such grammatical meanings: 1) type of the conjugation; 2) transitivity/intransitivity; 3) perfective or imperfective aspect; 4) personal/impersonal type of the verb.

Вечоріє, палає, зачаровує.

Сиджу, дивлюся, думаю, мрію, сподіваюся.

Підходиш, сідаєш. Питаєш, відповідаю, розповідаю, пояснюю.
Намагаєшся зрозуміти. Не виходить. Перебиваєш, перепитуєш.
Сміюся, усміхаєшся. Розказую, слухаєш, вдумуєшся, розумієш.

Перебиваєш, цілуєш. Ображаюся. Відвертаюся, сиджу, сумую.
Смієшся. Обіймаєш, вибачаєшся.

Не відповідаю.

Починаєш лоскотати. Ображаюся, ОБРАЖАЮСЯ, обра ...

Сміюся, лоскочеш, сміюся. Лоскочеш. Регочу! Не могу зупинитися.

Підхоплююся, біжу, кричу: “Допоможіть!” Сміюся.

Дивуєшся, усміхаєшся, встаєш, біжиш, наздоганяєш.

Біжу, задихаюся.

Наздоганяєш.

Хапаєш, розвертаєш, падаємо, хихочемо.

Цілуєш, цілую ...

Сидимо, обіймаєш. Розповідаєш, слухаю: сміюся, співчуваю, боюся, дивуюся ...

Відволікаюся, вслуховуюся. Зупиняєш, говориш: Не слухаєш — ображаєшся!

Вибач. Чуєш, співають. Вслухайся ...

Замовкаємо. Слухаємо.

Зачаровують ...

Дивись — падає! Загадуй, бажай.

Загадую. Цілуєш: “Вгадав?” ...

Сидимо, мовчимо, думаємо, мріємо.

Люблю ...

Кохаю ... (Ганна Шевчук).

*The material is taken from the article “Цікава морфологія” // Урок Української. — № 5–6, 2006. — Р. 51–52.

IV. Lexical verbs occur with one of five different valency patterns: intransitive, monotransitive, ditransitive, complex transitive, and copular. Underline all lexical verbs in the sentences below. Identify the valency of each verb.

a) in the English language:

1. I told Dad stuff about Georgia (conversation).
2. We went to Disneyland (conversation).

3. He smiled into my eyes. "I've got news for you" (fiction writing).
4. A: A dog found it in the street and ate it.
B: Do you want that other piece? (conversation).
5. Usually these dogs bark a lot — He looks really tired (conversation).
6. He called her a stupid idiot (conversation).
7. Put it on that table, where all the other folders are (conversation).
8. U.S. officials considered them a serious threat to U.S. peace-keeping troops (newspaper writing).
9. In a study published last year, Wells found that many HMO doctors prescribe minor tranquilizers (newspaper writing).
10. Plans for the Botanical Garden started about a decade after two American botanists made an 1887 visit to England that included a stop at London's prestigious Kew Gardens (newspaper writing).
11. This lightly effervescent Italian wine seemed sharp at first (newspaper writing).

*The material is taken from "Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook" by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P.32–33.

b) in the Ukrainian language:

Дієслово — повновладний господар у реченні, його визнаний граматичний керівник. Воно керує навіть такою могутньою частиною мови, як іменник, і лише в деяких випадках залежить від нього. Дієслову у єдності з іменниками жодні перешкоди не страшні. Ця граматична пара творить різноманітні речення. Своєю постійною присутністю в реченні дієслово мовби нагадує нам про своє граматичне всесилля. Дієслово у кожному реченні — немовби диригент малого, але здібного оркестру чи ансамблю. Воно формує оркестри чи ансамблі речень. Воно визначає, скільки учасників має бути, яку партію дати кожному. Дієслово може перемістити або вилучити з речень деяких виконавців. Воно придивляється, кого зробити солістом, пильно стежить за тим, щоб хтось із підлеглих не взяв фальшивої ноти. На плечі дієслова

покладено повну відповідальність за граматичний порядок слів у реченні. Дієслова наче змагаються за те, щоб підвладні їм члени речення якнайкраще виявили себе і показали смислову точність та чіткість синтаксичних побудов (Євгенія Куца).

*The material is taken from the article “Цікава морфологія” // Урок Української. — № 5–6, 2006. — Р. 52.

V. Many copular verbs can also be used with other valency patterns. Focus on the underlined main verbs in the sentences below. Identify the valency pattern of each verb: copular, intransitive or transitive. Render these sentences into Ukrainian; make the contrastive analysis of English verbs with their Ukrainian equivalents, taking into account their valency patterns.

- 1a. As the sun slanted lower in the afternoon sky, he grew restless and ordered the band to play. (fiction writing) *grew = copular verb.*
- 1b. So I'm really not sure why we grow it (conversation) *grow = transitive verb.*
- 1c. They burned her eyebrows off, and they didn't ever grow back (conversation) *grow = intransitive verb.*
- 2a. It was the first time he had appeared in public since this incident (conversation).
- 2b. Gram appeared relaxed and at peace with his decision (newspaper writing).
- 3a. Well he'll probably stay warm in the winter time then (conversation).
- 3b. So how much longer did she stay? (conversation).
- 4a. The whole color scheme looked nice but it could have looked better (conversation)
- 4b. If you look out the window, you can see the leaves are starting to change. (conversation).
5. Your breath smells fine — I don't smell your breath, so I don't even know it smells (conversation).
- 6a. He had been in radio since he went to Everett High School in Lansing, Michigan (newspaper writing).

- 6b. I think it's the biggest concert any one act has played, and the audience went wild (newspaper writing).
- 7a. Well, uh, I got hungry and wanted something to chew on (conversation).
- 7b. And I of course want to go and get the scrub brush and scrub those walls (conversation).
- 8a. Your hero is Dr Frankenstein, you've proved that tonight (conversation).
- 8b. Finding common ground often has proved difficult over the past two years (newspaper writing).

*The material is taken from "Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook" by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P.36.

VI. Underline all the verbs in the following pieces of text. Analyze them according to the grammatical meaning they express (tense, aspect, voice, person, number, mood).

a) in the English language:

- 1. The varieties of meaning we have specified so far are summarized in Figure 6.1 (academic writing).
- 2. [A storm had damaged the raft on a journey across the ocean.] Everyone was noticeably quieter, each man thinking about the chances of whether we would be forced to leave the raft (conversation).
- 3. In spite of the splendid work in the last few decades of a highly dedicated group of neuroscientists, we are still quite ignorant about the structure and functioning of the human brain with respect to such basic cognitive functions as language. In fact, the study of the brain has often been described at the next intellectual frontier (academic writing).
- 4. For no known reason, the government assumed that four fifths of these people probably could read and, on this dangerous assumption, it was publicly announced that 99 percent of all American adults could read and write. These are the figures which the U.S.

government passed on to the United Nations for the purposes of worldwide compilations and comparisons. The numbers in the 1980 census improved a bit on those of 1970. This time it was found that 99.5 percent of all American adults could read and write (academic writing).

5. The king wore it [the Hope Diamond] on a ribbon around his neck on ceremonial occasions. There is no mention of what happened to the pieces that were chopped off. The stone was stolen during the French Revolution in 1792; it turned up two decades later in England in its present shape and size (newspaper writing).

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P.44.

b) in the Ukrainian language:

Дієслово. “Бути чи не бути?”. Цікаво, чи народилася б ця знаменита на весь світ фраза Шекспіра, якби не було такої значущої частини мови, як дієслово? Та й узагалі, чи змогли б у творах письменників гріти сонце, світити зоре і місяць, співати пташки і дути вітер? Чи змогло б людство пересилити статичність на папері? Чи змогло б зупинити на мить нашу плинну дійсність, зберігши її динаміку? І в самому реченні інші члени, втративши цього керівника у вигляді присудка, втрачають і власне значення, перетворюючись на простий набір слів.

Значущість дієслова підкреслює і його поділ на минулий, теперішній і майбутній часи, першу і другу дієвідміни, на дійсний, наказовий й умовний способи. Воно також має неозначену форму — інфінітив, із його допомогою ми можемо сміливо користуватися дієприкметниками і дієприслівниками. Та ми ніколи не замислюємося над цим, використовуючи слова у щоденній практиці. Так легко зриваються вони з наших вуст і так чітко виражають наші думки й бажання. Ми вправно будуємо речення. Насичуючи його складними зворотами, прикрашаючи епітетами і порівняннями. Все це здається таким простим і

звичним, що навіть важко уявити, що цього могло б і не бути. Та й як воно могло б бути, якби не було самого слова “бути”? (Олександра Михайлова).

*The material is taken from the article “Цікава морфологія” // Урок Української. — № 5–6, 2006. — Р. 52.

CHAPTER 6

Non-finite forms of the verb in English and Ukrainian languages

1. Non-finite forms of the verb: general characteristics

Besides personal or finite forms of the verb that perform in the sentence the function of simple predicate in both languages there are also the so-called non-finite forms of the verb (неособові форми дієслова). The system of non-finite forms (also called verbals or verbids) of Ukrainian and English verbs differs. The only common verbal form in these systems is the Infinitive (the indefinite form of the verb). The English language besides possesses a peculiar verbal form — the Gerund, which does not have its counterpart in Ukrainian. The third verbal form of the English language — Participle (in Ukrainian grammars rendered correspondingly as дієприкметник) — has a number of such qualities and functions that correspond in Ukrainian to two non-finite verb forms — дієприкметник and дієприслівник [5; 96].

The verbids have certain features of their own distinguishing them from the finite verb.

1. Their lexico-grammatical meaning is of dual nature. The verbal meaning of “action, process” is presented as some kind of “substance” (for gerunds, infinitives) or “quality” (for participles).

The lexico-grammatical meaning of verbids, though essentially that of the verb (denoting actions) has something of the lexico-grammatical meanings of other parts of speech. The gerund, for instance, denotes

an action partially treated as a substance. Thus, in the sentence *Going there put an end to her anxiety* the gerund *going*, though denoting an action, presents it at the same time as a substance which produced the act of putting an end to something. The participle denotes a “qualifying action”, that is an action as a property of some substance (like an adjective) or a circumstance of another action (like an adverb), e.g.: *He looked at his son with twinkling eyes. “Let me do it”, he said kneeling beside her.*

2. Verbals have peculiar morphemes, e.g. in English: *-ing* (gerund and participle I), *-ed, -en* (participle II), *to* (infinitive); in Ukrainian *-mu* (for infinitives), *-uŭ* (for participles).

The mentioned morphemes of English verbids are very peculiar. They are not lexical or lexico-grammatical morphemes because they do not characterize all the words of the verb lexeme. Compare, for instance, the suffix *-ize* and *-ing* in *realizes, has realized, to realize, realizing, being realized*. The suffix *-ize* is found in every word of the lexeme, the suffix *-ing* only in some words.

The *-ing* morpheme differs from grammatical morphemes as well. Grammatical morphemes are used to form grammatical opposeemes. Compare: *asks — asked — will ask*. The suffix *-ing* of the gerund is not used to form any grammatical opposeemes. It serves to oppose all the gerunds to all the non-gerunds. Thus, it is a peculiar group-suffix within the verb-lexeme.

The same could be said about the homonymous *-ing* suffix of the participle but with two additional remarks.

- a) The participial *-ing* morpheme does not unite all the system of the participle. The so-called participle II (*written, asked*) has different suffixes.
- b) Since Participle I is used to form analytical “continuous aspect” grammemes, the *-ing* suffix of the participle has become a grammatical morpheme of the finite verb as well. The suffixes of Participle II are not group suffixes because Participle II is a one word-system. In all other respects they resemble the participial *-ing* suffix. They are used as grammatical morphemes participating in the formation of “passive voice” and “perfect tense” grammemes.

Of great interest is the “to” word-morpheme of the infinitive. It is a word-morpheme because it has only the form of a separate word, but not the content, and it functions as part of a word. It is a group morpheme (like *-ing*), but unlike the participial *-ing* it is not used as a grammatical morpheme. Compare: *shall come*, not *shall * to come* [25; 183–185].

3. There is duality in verbids’ combinability. They form connections with adverbs, nouns, pronouns (denoting objects of action) like finite verbs, and with finite verbs like nouns or adverbs.

The gerund, for example, may be preceded by a preposition and a possessive pronoun, like a noun, e.g.: *One could see that without his even speaking*.

The participle is regularly connected with nouns, like adjectives, and with verbs, like adverbs, e.g.: *his smiling eyes; smiling slyly, he stretched out his hand*.

4. Their syntactical functions are quite different from those of the finite verb. They are rarely used as predicates, but they are used in almost any other function in the sentence.

One of the peculiarities of English verbids is their being used as secondary predicates. In the sentence *I saw them dancing* two actions are named as well as two doers of those actions. But there is a great difference between *I saw* and *them dancing*. *I saw* is more or less independent. It makes a predication, that is the core of the sentence or the sentence itself. *Them dancing* can exist only in a sentence where there is predication (therefore it is called “secondary”). The tense and mood relations of the finite verb are then reflected in the verbid and it becomes a secondary predicate, and combinations like *them dancing* become secondary predications (called “nexuses” by the prominent English grammarian Otto Jespersen, who was one of the first to draw attention to this kind of grammar phenomenon). The phenomenon of “secondary predication” constructions is a peculiar feature of the English language not found in Ukrainian.

Therefore, there can be noticed a lot of differences both in qualities and in usage of verbals in both contrasted languages.

2. Infinitive in English and Ukrainian languages

The infinitive is a verbid characterized by the following features:

1. Its dual lexico-grammatical meaning of “action, process partially viewed as a substance”. Both in Ukrainian and in English the infinitive names the action or process without expressing their relation to person, number, tense and mood (*work, wait, робити, чекати*).
2. Typical word-building elements of the infinitive differ greatly in both languages.

The English infinitive is characterized by the word-morpheme “to”. The infinitival “to” is often called a particle, but it is not so. It is a group-morpheme of the infinitive. Its being a word-morpheme distinguishes it from other group-morphemes, such as *-ing, -en*, etc. Like other word-morphemes, “to” can represent the whole analytical word. Compare the answers to *Will you go?* 1) *Yes, I shall*, where *shall* represents the analytical word *shall go*. 2) *I want to*, where *to* represents the analytical word *to go*.

Similar to other word-morphemes, “to” can be separated from the rest of the analytical word by some other word or words, in this case linguists speak of the split infinitive, e.g.: *He will fully appreciate They asked him to personally intervene* Compare also: *It is necessary to somehow arrange it. — Треба це якось влаштувати*. The importance of this particle is also obvious from the fact that it can replace by itself the infinitive if it has already been used, e.g.: *He wants me to go there, but I don't want to. Він хоче, щоб я пішов туди, але я не хочу (іти, робити це)*. In Ukrainian in similar cases the infinitive can be altogether missing [5; 96–98].

The presence or absence of this word-morpheme depends on the context of the infinitive in speech, thus the infinitive is used without its word-morpheme “to” after some verbs and verbal expressions, namely: a) after modal verbs (except *ought, have*), b) verbs of physical perceptions — *to see, to hear, to observe, to perceive, to watch*, c) *to make, to let*, d) *had better, would rather*, etc. [25; 189].

In Ukrainian the infinitive is characterized by the following typical stem-building morphemes: suffixes *-ти (-ть)* (*плакати, робить*),

-ну, -ува (-юва), -а, -и, -і (і) + -ти (стукнути, мандрувати, гостювати, читати, бачити, уміти).

A very peculiar phenomenon of the Ukrainian language are the forms of the infinitive with the diminutive meaning (значення пестливості), formed with the help of suffixes, common also for nouns, for example: спатоньки, їстоньки, питоньки, спатусі and others: їстоньки не їм, і питоньки не п'ю та виглядаю все Зозуленьку мою (Є. Глібов) [5; 97].

3. The grammatical categories of voice, aspect (see the paradigm below) in English.

The Paradigm of the English Infinitive

Aspect	Voice	
	Active	Passive
non-perfect, non-continuous	<i>to write</i>	<i>to be written</i>
non-perfect, continuous	<i>to be writing</i>	—
perfect, non-continuous	<i>to have written</i>	<i>to have been written</i>
perfect, continuous	<i>to have been writing</i>	—

There are no passive forms of the English infinitive of the continuous aspect. Each of six forms of the infinitive is as if the generalizing forms on the basis of which the corresponding personal aspect-tense forms are built.

The paradigm of the Ukrainian infinitive is characterized by the general verb categories of transitivity — intransitivity, aspect and voice (стояти — стати, укривати — укрити, умивати — умиватися, побороти — поборотися, будувати — бути збудованим, написати — бути написаним) [16; 170–171].

The peculiarity of the English infinitive is the fact that it has the category of tense. The tense is expressed at that not absolutely but relatively. The tense of the infinitive is not independent; it is subordinated to the tense meaning of the finite verb form, performing the function of the predicate in the sentence. Thus the forms of the in-

finitive of the common and continuous aspects can render the action simultaneous with the action of the verb-predicate, e.g.: *I am glad to see (to be speaking to him)*. Я радий, що бачу його (що говорю з ним). The perfect form of the infinitive points towards the fact that the action denoted by it is prior to the action expressed by the verb-predicate, e.g.: *I am glad to have seen him*. Я радий, що побачив його (побачився з ним). The perfect continuous form of the infinitive underlines the duration of the action, which began earlier than the action expressed by the predicate and continued up to the moment of speaking.

From this whole system of forms only two forms of the active and passive state of the common aspect have their correspondences in Ukrainian: *to ask* — *питати*, *to be asked* — *бути запитаним*. Other forms of the infinitive do not have their correspondences in Ukrainian and are mainly rendered with the help of subordinate sentences. At that the infinitive of the passive state is rarely used in Ukrainian and is mainly substituted by the subordinate sentence, compare: *They want to be invited there*. Вони хочуть, щоб їх туди запросили (і бути запрошеними туди).

The aspect and voice meanings of the infinitive are the same as in the finites [5; 97–98].

4. Its peculiar combinability resembling that of the verb, and partly that of the noun.

Like a finite verb the infinitive is associated:

- a) with adverbs in both languages, e.g. *to speak fluently*; *говорити вільно*.
- b) with nouns and pronouns denoting the doer or the object of some action in English, e.g.: *We expected you to bring the book*.

Like a noun the infinitive may be associated with a finite verb in both languages, e.g.: *To land seemed impossible*. *I promised to come*. Я пообіцяв прийти.

5. The syntactical functions of subject, predicative, object, attribute, adverbial modifier, etc. in English. In Ukrainian the infinitive

can function usually as a part of both simple and compound verbal predicates, e.g.: *Нинішній фестиваль буде проходити під девізом: "Світ милосердя". У листі лікар пропонував відмовитись від примусового характеру лікувально-профілактичних заходів [16; 171].*

Apart from different morphological characteristics there are a lot of peculiarities in the syntactic usage of infinitives in both languages. For example, in Ukrainian the infinitive is widely used in the function of the imperative mood (*Мовчати! — Silence!*), in the meaning of appealing to action (*Достроково виконати це завдання!*) and others.

In English the infinitive has the following characteristic features:

- 1) English infinitive can be used in the function of the attribute of modal character. This attribute by its meaning equals to the subordinate sentence, the predicate of which expresses the action that should take place in the future, e.g.: *the conference to open (конференція, яка повинна початися/відбутися), the sum to be paid (сума, яку треба виплатити).*
- 2) It has the ability to enter a number of syntactic constructions: the so called "complex object", "complex subject", where it performs, e.g., the function of the secondary predicate, as well as the verbal compound predicate where it performs the function of the predicative and others.
- 3) English infinitive can be easily used as the nominal (predicative) member of the compound nominal predicate after the linking verb "to be". In Ukrainian the infinitive cannot be used after the linking verb "бути", compare: *The task of the boy was to open the door. Завдання хлопця полягало у тому, щоб відчинити двері. To see her was to love her. Бачити її означало любити її. To read books is to learn. Читати книжки — означає (це значить) учитися.*
- 4) In English the passive and the perfect forms of the infinitive are widely used after the verbs of the incomplete predication (дієслова неповної предикації), e.g.: *He only asked to be alone. Він тільки просив, щоб його залишили на самоті. He must have come to the station. Він, мабуть, уже дійшов до станції.*

- In Ukrainian in corresponding cases the subordinate sentence is used, or the personal form of the verb in the simple sentence with the parenthetical words (вставні слова) *мабуть, напевно*;
- 5) In English the infinitive can render predicate relations to some names, bound with it in the sentence, e.g.: *He is a man to do it. — Він — людина, яка зробить (повинна зробити) це. I want him to come first. Я хочу, щоб він прийшов перший.* As it is obvious from these sentences it is characteristic to use subordinate sentences in these cases in Ukrainian.
 - 6) On the other hand, in Ukrainian the noun or the pronoun which denote the doer of the action, can be used before the infinitive or can be absent, e.g.: *Я наказав (йому) зачинити вікно. Вона попросила (сина) принести склянку води.* In English in both cases mentioning of the doer is obligatory: *I told him to close the window. She asked her son to bring a glass of water.*
 - 7) In colloquial English the infinitive can sometimes be used in the function of the predicate without the linking verb, e.g.: *I, do it! Never!* In Ukrainian we use other constructions in such cases: *Щоб я це зробив! Ніколи!* [5; 98–99].

One more peculiar feature of the infinitive in both contrasted languages is its ability to build analytical forms like *shall bring, will bring, should bring, would bring, буду нусати*, etc.

The infinitive representing an action in its most general form is often treated as the initial or indefinite form of the verb. The infinitive is in both languages one of the main forms of the verb which can be used independently in the sentence and can also be the basis for other verb forms to be created.

3. The English participle versus Ukrainian дієприкметник and дієприслівник

Participle as the English verbal form combines both the features of adjective and adverb. Being used in the attributive meaning, it

corresponds to Ukrainian дієприкметник, but when it is used in the circumstantial meaning, it corresponds to our дієприслівник. So, we should constantly bear in mind, that the term “дієприкметник”, which is usually used regarding the English Participle in grammars and textbooks of the English language published to be used in Ukrainian schools, is rather incorrect and conventional one.

Complex forms of the English Participle are built with the help of the same auxiliary verbs as the corresponding personal verb forms. Together with verb forms they enter the general system of conjugation. Ukrainian дієприкметник and дієприслівник stand separately from the personal forms of the verb and have their peculiar characteristic features. The Ukrainian дієприкметник combines in itself the categories of the verb and the adjective, and that is why it is often called the verb-noun form (дієслівно-іменна форма), that is the intermediate form between the verb and the adjective. Such features of Ukrainian дієприслівник as its morphological unchangability (незмінність) and the typical syntactic function of the circumstantial word, also witness about the fact that it is by itself the intermediate lexical-grammatical category, transitive from the verb to the adverb [5; 99].

The English Participle. The English Participle is characterized by a rather complex system of forms, in particular: **Participle I** or Present Participle in active and in passive states (*finishing, being finished*), **Participle II** or Past Participle (*finished*) and **Perfect Participle** (according to Yu.O. Zhluktenko Participle III) in active and in passive states (*having finished, having been finished*) [5; 99].

The active Participle I (*swimming*) can have the attributive and the circumstantial meanings, so it can correspond to the Ukrainian дієприкметник of the present tense (*плаваючий*) or to the verbal descriptive attributive construction (*той, хто (який) плаває*) or to дієприслівник (*плаваючи*).

The passive Participle I (*being asked*) has more often a circumstantial than the attributive meaning, it corresponds usually to the Ukrainian verbal descriptive construction (*коли мене запитали*), more seldom to дієприслівник (*будучи запитаним*).

The Participle II has only an attributive meaning, that is why it mainly corresponds to the Ukrainian passive дієприкметник: *finished* — *закінчений, закінчуваний*.

The Perfect Participle is used only with the circumstantial meaning. It corresponds mainly to the Ukrainian дієприслівник of the past tense, or to the verbal descriptive construction, e.g.: *having finished* (*закінчивши; коли/після того як я ... він закінчив*); *having been finished* (*бувши закінченим/коли (після того, як) його ... її закінчили*). This English participle cannot be used, when we should render the continuity of the action sequence (безперервність слідування дій), whereas the Ukrainian дієприслівник of the past tense (*зробивши, приїхавши, сказавши*) can express both the antecedence of the action (передуюння дії) as well as continuity of the action succession (безперервність слідування дій).

Having the present and perfect forms the English participle expresses the category of tense. But being constantly used in the function of the secondary, subordinated part of the sentence, it is seldom used with the independent tense meaning. Almost always its tense meaning is a dependent one and is determined by its correlation with the predicate or the circumstance of time. Participle I mainly stresses the simultaneous character of the action denoted by it action with the action denoted by the predicate, whereas the Perfect Participle shows the action which was prior to the action of the predicate and was finished till the beginning of another action.

The category of aspect is revealed by the English participle inconsistently and in a limited way (непослідовно і обмежено). The aspect meaning of its forms is usually subordinated to their tense meaning and is not always expressed clearly. Participle I in the attributive function has mainly the aspect processual (процесуальний) meaning (*the man smoking ... людина, яка зараз курить ...*), in its circumstantial usage it usually does not have the clear aspect meaning. Past and Perfect Participles have the aspect meaning of the action completeness: *done, having done* (*зроблений, зробивши*).

The English participle has also the forms of the active and the passive states.

Unlike the Ukrainian participle, the English participle does not have any of noun categories — gender, number, case. It is widely used for building of analytical tense-aspect personal verb forms and can enter as a constituent part specific English syntactic constructions, in particular, the so called “Absolute Participial Construction”, “Complex Object with Participle” and others [5; 99–100].

Ukrainian дієприкметник/participle. Since the Ukrainian participle bears the meaning of two parts of speech — the verb and the attribute, it has some categories of the verbal character and other categories of the attributive character.

Each participle belongs to the same aspect as the verb from which it is created. Correspondingly the tense form is built: participles formed from the verbs of the imperfective aspect have the tense forms of the past and the present tense, and participles formed from the verbs of the perfective aspect have only the forms of the past tense.

Ukrainian participles also have the category of state. Active participles render the characteristic feature caused by their carrier himself / herself, that is the feature, which is directly bound with the modified object or is caused by the activity of its carrier, e.g.: *сяюче обличчя, працюючий робітник, посивіле волосся*. They can have the meaning of the present tense of the imperfective aspect (*зростаючий, пануючий, виконуючий*) or the meaning of the past tense of the perfective aspect (*пожовклий, навислий, зблідлий*).

In modern Ukrainian active participles of the present tense with suffixes *-уч-* (*-юч-*) and *-ач-* (*-яч-*): *ростучий, виконуючий, правлячий* are used rather rarely, at that according to their meaning they are close to normal adjectives of the type *лежачий, сидячий*. In corresponding cases more often the attributive construction of the type: *той, що (який, хто) росте (виконує, править)* is used. In English these participles as well as the attributive construction have as their correspondences the Participle I of the active state (*growing, fulfilling, ruling*).

Active participles of the past tense of the perfective aspect are formed with the help of the suffix *-л-*: *осиротілий, зітлілий, скам'янілий, помертвілий, схудлий, пожовклий*. They are formed only from prefixal intransitive verbs, which render the state, and have the limited

sphere of usage. Instead of them as well as with non-prefixal intransitive and transitive verbs the attributive verbal constructions of the type *той, що схуднув (який) схуд/писав, розбив* are more often used. In English the mentioned participles and constructions are rendered by the descriptive constructions of the type: *who became thin, who wrote (was writing, has written)*.

Passive participles of the present tense are not formed in modern Ukrainian. In their meaning the reconsidered forms of passive participles of the past tense, formed from transitive verbs of the imperfective aspect, are used very often: *обговорюване питання, вживаний засіб* and others. Here the participle of the past tense begins to acquire the meaning of the present tense, e.g.: the phrase *вживаний ними засіб*, which earlier has the meaning “*засіб, який вони вживали*”, is now used with the meaning “*засіб, який вони зараз вживають*”. In parallel the verbal descriptive constructions are widely used: *який (що його) обговорюють (вживають)*.

Passive participles of the past tense are formed with the help of suffixes *-т-, -н-, -ен-, (-єн-)* from the verbs of the perfective aspect: *написаний, згаданий, вжитий*.

In English Ukrainian participles of the present tense have as their correspondences: a) Participle I of the passive state — if the action is happening at the given moment of speaking (*being discussed, being used*); b) Participle II — if the common or the repeated action is rendered (*discussed, used*). Passive participles of the past tense have as their correspondence Participle II (*written, mentioned, used*).

Expressing similarly to adjective the characteristic feature of some object, Ukrainian participle is declined according to genders, numbers and cases. All participles are declined in the same way as normal adjectives of the hard group [5; 100–102].

Following is the contrastive analysis of participles' main features in English and Ukrainian languages. So, the participle is a verbid characterized by the following properties:

1. The dual lexico-grammatical meaning of “qualifying action”.
2. Typical stem-building elements. Special suffixes: *-ing* (Participle I), *-ed, -t, -en* (Participle II) in English. Participle II is sometimes

characterized by an internal inflexion (*written*) or by a zero suffix (*put*). Suffixes *-ач* (*яч*), *-уч* (*-юч*) for active participles and *-н*, *-ен* (*-єн*), *-т* for passive participles in Ukrainian.

3. The grammatical category of voice (see the paradigm below) in English.

The Paradigm of Participle

Participle I		Participle II
Voice		<i>written</i>
Active	Passive	
<i>writing</i>	<i>being written</i>	
<i>having written</i>	<i>having been written</i>	

In Ukrainian participles similar to verbs have the categories of tense, aspect and voice. The participle retains the aspect of the verb from which it is built (*виконувати — виконуючий, написати — написаний*). Similar to adjectives it has the categories of gender and case and is coordinated in the form with the noun it precedes regarding its gender, number and case.

Taking into consideration their aspectual character Ukrainian participles are subdivided into active and passive ones. Each of these groups has the present and the past tense (participles do not have the future tense).

Active participles point towards the character of some acting object. In the present tense they render the simultaneous character of the action with the action of the finite verb (*У темніючому небі яскраво сяяла вечірня зірка*). They are formed from the stems of the present tense of transitive and intransitive verbs of imperfective aspect by adding suffixes *-ач* (*яч*), *-уч* (*-юч*) and adjectival endings (*правити —правлячий, відпочивати — відпочиваючий*).

Passive participles render the quality of the action upon which the action is directed (*На лісовій галявині стояла хата **крита** очеретом*). Passive participles in Ukrainian have only the form of the past tense and they are formed from the base of the infinitive by add-

ing suffixes: -н (*писати* — *писаний*), -ен (-ен) (*веліти* — *велений*), -т (*мити* — *митий*) [16; 188–189].

4. Its peculiar combinability partly resembling that of the verb (the participle is associated with adverbs, with nouns and pronouns denoting the object of the action), and partly that of the adjective (it modifies nouns) and of the adverb (it modifies verbs) [25; 190].

As it has already been mentioned, the adjectival and the adverbial features of the participle are connected with its combinability.

English Participle II is mostly used with nouns, e.g.: *my forgotten friend*

As to Participle I, the combinability of different grammemes is different.

The non-perfect active participle may modify both nouns and verbs, e.g.: *his smiling eyes; smiling slyly, he stretched out his hand*.

The non-perfect passive participle usually modifies verbs, but occasionally nouns, e.g.: *Not being invited there I chose to stay at home*.

The other grammemes are used only to modify verbs, e.g.: *Having been detained by the flood, he came late*.

English participles like those of Ukrainian and other languages may sometimes develop into adjectives, the idea of quality gradually overshadowing that of action, as in *standing water* — *стояча вода*, *a charming woman* — *чаруюча жінка*. They may develop into nouns, the idea of substance outweighing that of action — *the wounded* — *поранений*, *the accused* — *обвинувачений*. Both adjectivization and substantivation involve the change of combinability and function, that is they are cases of conversion.

The peculiarity of the English participle is its ability to build analytical forms like *is asking, is asked, has asked, is being asked*, etc. As to the verbal features of English Participle I they do not differ essentially from those of the infinitive and the gerund. Whereas the grammeme traditionally called “past participle” (Participle II) stands somewhat apart. It possesses a number of peculiar features which are worth considering in detail.

Subjective verbs such as *to exist, to die, to lie (лежати)*, etc. which, as a rule, are not used in a passive voice, have no Participles II used independently (that is, they cannot be parts of analytical words). There are but a few exceptions to this principle such as: *runaway, fallen, couched, collapsed, vanished, gone, come, faded, withered, retired*, e.g.: *a fallen idol, vanished civilizations, dream come true*, etc. [25; 190].

5. Its most characteristic syntactical functions of attribute, adverbial complement, etc.

Український дієприслівник. Дієприслівник (or in transliteration “diyepryslivnyk”) is the peculiar Ukrainian verbid combining the features of the verb and the adverb. It points towards some additional action and explains the main one, expressed by the finite verb (*Він ішов собі, похнюпившись, тихо відміряючи крок за кроком*) [16; 191]. Thus, it is characterized by the following features:

1. Its lexico-grammatical meaning of the “character or quality of some action”.
2. Its typical stem-building elements depend upon the type of diyepryslivnyk.

Diyepryslivnyks of the imperfective aspect (of the “present tense”) are formed from the base of the present tense of verbs of the imperfective aspect with the help of suffixes *-учи(сь), -ючи(сь), -ачи(сь), -ячи(сь)*, e.g.: *пишучи, несучись, співаючи, вживаючись, лежачи, ніжачись, стоячи, ставлячись*. In English they mainly have Participle I of the active state as their equivalent: *writing, singing*. Diyepryslivnyks with the suffix *-ся* are rendered sometimes by the same participle of the passive state: *being used*.

Diyepryslivnyks of the perfective aspect (of the “past tense”) are formed directly from the form of the masculine gender singular of the past tense of the perfective aspect with the help of suffixes *-ши(сь), -вши*, e.g.: *приніс — принісши, прочитав — прочитавши, умився — умившись, прийшов — прийшовши*.

In English these diyepryslivnyks have as their correspondences different verb forms:

1) Perfect Participle of the active state, e.g.:

Закінчивши роботу, ми пішли додому. — *Having finished our work, we went home.*

2) Participle I of the active state, e.g.:

Він стояв, прихилившись до стіни. — *He stood leaning against the wall.*

3) Gerund with the preposition, e.g.:

Виконавши завдання, він повернувся додому. — *After fulfilling the task he returned home* [5; 102–103].

3. Diyepryslivnyk is the indeclinable word similar to adverb. It has common with the verb grammatical categories of tense, aspect and state.

Aspect characteristics are expressed very distinctly, where diyepryslivnyks of the imperfective aspect correlate with verb forms of the present tense, compare: *друкують* — *друкуючи*, *сміються* — *сміючись*, *сидять* — *сидячи*, and the forms of the perfective aspect correlate with the verb forms of the past tense, compare: *відмовив* — *відмовивши*, *пообіцяв* — *пообіцявши*, *приїхав* — *приїхавши*. That is why diyepryslivnyks of the imperfective aspect are very often called diyepryslivnyks of the “present tense” though they do not necessarily render the present action, but usually have the task to show the simultaneous character of the action with the action of predicate. Diyepryslivnyks of the perfective aspect are in the same way called diyepryslivnyks of the “past tense”, though they do not render the past action, but mainly point towards the fact that the action happened earlier than the action expressed by the predicate. So, the tense in diyepryslivnyks is expressed as the relative one, dependent, that is such which is perceived not in accordance to the time of speaking, but in accordance to the action expressed by the predicate. Compare: English participles also express the category of tense relatively, not absolutely.

Some diyepryslivnyks can lose the verb features and transfer into adverbs. This process is called adverbialization. Compare the diyepryslivnyk and the adverbialized diyepryslivnyk: *Лягаючи і встаючи, за кого молитесь? Чайка скиглить літаючи, мов за дітьми плаче* (Т. Шевченко) [16; 192–193] .

4. The English gerund

The gerund is a verbid characterized by the following features:

1. Its dual lexico-grammatical meaning of “an action partially viewed as a substance”.
2. The typical group morpheme *-ing*.
3. The grammatical category of voice (see the paradigm below).

The Paradigm of the Gerund

Voice	
Active	Passive
<i>writing</i>	<i>being written</i>
<i>having written</i>	<i>having been written</i>

The gerund has the category of tense (the present and the perfect forms), which is expressed relatively: the present form of the gerund shows the simultaneous character of the action with the predicate action, whereas the perfect form expresses the action prior to the action, expressed by predicate. The priority of the action can be also expressed by the gerund present form in combination with prepositions *on (upon)* or *after*.

The category of aspect of gerund forms is connected with the category of tense and is subordinated to this category. Whereas the category of state is expressed very distinctly: both tense forms of gerund have passive forms: *reading — being read, having read — having been read*.

4. The combinability resembling that of the verb (the gerund is associated with adverbs, with nouns or pronouns, denoting the object of the action) and that of the noun (the gerund is associated with prepositions, with possessive pronouns, nouns in the possessive case), e.g.: *The district is justified in blindly ignoring the federal land*.

The characteristic feature of the gerund is its usage in collocation with the noun (in possessive case) or with the possessive pronoun,

which denote the subject of the action expressed by the gerund, e.g.: *The student's (his) knowing English will help him.* — *Те, що студент (він) знає англійську, допоможе йому.* Very often the role of the gerund subject is fulfilled by the noun in the common case or by the demonstrative or indefinite pronoun altogether indeclinable, e.g.: *We insisted on the contract being signed.* *Ми наполягали на тому, щоб угода була підписана.*

The gerund, like the infinitive, combines verbal and noun features, yet the gerund is more of a noun than the infinitive, which is to some extent explained by the fact that the gerund became part of the verb system much later than the infinitive.

The combinability of the gerund differs considerably from that of the infinitive. Thus, the gerund may be preceded by a preposition, as in *She thought of going there.* *We insisted on staying here.* *The wisdom of living is greater than the wisdom of the book.*

In contrast to the infinitive, the gerund is often accompanied by a noun in the possessive case or a possessive pronoun. Sometimes the action denoted by the gerund is not associated with any doer, any producer of the action, as in *Living is striving.*

Very often the doer is not clear, as in *I like singing* (it is not clear whether *I myself like to sing* or *I like other people's singing*). This is much rarer with the infinitive, which mostly denotes an action whose subject is represented by some word in a sentence. Compare: *I like singing* and *I like to sing* (in the latter sentence the doer of the action denoted by *to sing* is represented by *I*).

In addition, the infinitive possesses a peculiar modal force not observed in the gerund, as in *article to be translated* (= which must be translated) [5; 103–104].

5. Typical syntactic functions of the gerund are those of subject, complement, attribute, etc., e.g.: *His returning so soon surprised his family.* *I remember meeting him in London.*

The gerund, which is a peculiarity of the English language, is very extensively used as the center of complexes (nexuses) synonymous with subordinate clauses. Compare: *I know of his having gone to Kyiv.* *I know that he has gone to Kyiv.*

Together with its subject and other dependent on it words the gerund can form different peculiar syntactic constructions, the so called gerundial constructions. In their connections with other parts of the sentence these constructions are treated as one whole, whereas the relations between the words inside of such a construction remind of the relations between sentence parts (we mean here the predicate relations, the circumstantial relations and others), e.g.: *His having gone to Kyiv was strange*. Compare this example with its transformed versions, where the predicate relations become obvious: *It was strange that he had gone to Kyiv* and *The fact that he had gone to Kyiv was strange*.

Being used in the sentence as a separate word, the gerund fulfills syntactic functions more characteristic of a noun than of the verb: functions of the subject, the object, the prepositional circumstances and attributes, e.g.: *Seeing is believing*.

In Ukrainian usually the infinitive can be the name of the action, that is why it is often seen as the correspondence of the English gerund, e.g.: *I like reading*. *Я люблю читати*. More seldom Ukrainian nouns or *diyepryslivnyks* are the equivalents of the English gerund.

In cases when the gerund is used in the construction having the predicate relations the only equivalent in Ukrainian can be the subordinate sentence with the verb predicate: *There is no hope of our seeing him this year*. *Немає надії, що ми побачимось з ним у цьому році* [5; 104].

The corresponding verb form is absent in the majority of Indo-European languages, including Ukrainian. Somehow close in its meaning to the English gerund is the Ukrainian verbal noun (віддієслівний іменник), but there is a big difference between them. The verbal noun in both languages expresses the objectness (предметність), whereas the gerund expresses the processuality. The verbal noun, being created, has the stable character, whereas the English gerund, being the verb form, is created only for a particular case. For example, if we had the gerund in Ukrainian, then it would be possible to create from the verb the forms of the type **співання* (compare with the verbal noun *спів, співу*).

In the English language though there is a clear distinction between the gerund and the verbal noun. It is revealed by a number of formal

differences between these two notions: verbal nouns are used with articles, demonstrative pronouns and indefinite pronouns; it is not the case with the gerund. The gerund can take the non-prepositional object and be modified by circumstances as every verb form, whereas the verbal noun does not possess such characteristics.

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. Describe the general characteristics of non-finite verb forms. State their difference with finite forms of the verb.
2. Show the difference in the systems of Ukrainian and English non-finite forms of the verb or verbals.
3. Present the contrastive analysis of the infinitive in English and Ukrainian languages.
4. Dwell upon the difference of the grammatical paradigm of the English infinitive in comparison with its Ukrainian counterpart.
5. Describe the English participle versus Ukrainian “дієприкметник” and “дієприслівник”.
6. Present the examples of allomorphic and isomorphic features of the English Participle in comparison with the Ukrainian Participle.
7. Describe the nature of the Ukrainian “дієприслівник”. What are the ways of its rendering into English?
8. Present the characteristics of the allomorphic non-finite form of the verb — the English gerund. What are the ways of its rendering into Ukrainian? Provide examples.

II. Underline all verb phrases (finite and non-finite) in the conversation below. Identify the aspect (simple, perfect, and progressive) of each verb phrase and the tense characteristics (if possible):

Conversation

A: I bet there's a lot of stories. There are probably a lot of things that you know that Sara doesn't.

B: Well, like yesterday I told Sara that she used to take us to Dunkin' Donuts all the time when we were little and Sara goes, really? I've always had this warm feeling about Dunkin' Donuts that it was a place to go in and sit on the stool.

A: There's a lot of things that you guys have just talked about as far as your mom, but I can see in you there's something remains warm and nurturing.

B: She used to bake a lot, that was another thing that we did, there was a lot of cooking and baking and she still likes to do that. There can be horrendous qualities about a person, but I think usually there's a few good ones.

C: Well, I went to visit her last winter and I really had a great time for about half of the day because she's drinking more heavily right now. So she'd get up until six thirty or something and she'd be cooking and cleaning the house and then by noon she would sort of slip into a stupor.

*The material is taken from "Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook" by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 42-43.

III. Underline all verb phrases (finite and non-finite) in the sentences below. Identify the voice of each transitive verb phrase: active or passive. If a verb is not transitive, identify it as intransitive or copular.

1. They said the Linkoln Bedroom was used only sporadically for family members and close friends (newspaper writing).
2. In Burma these days, wild elephants are captured and used for forced labor (newspaper writing).
3. As is shown in Figure 15, a considerable amount of waste crosses State lines (academic writing).
4. I flew from New York to Uganda, where I settled among black people with the same assumptions of welcome and kindness I had taken for granted in Georgia. I was taken on rides down the Nile as a matter of course, and accepted all invitations to dinner,

where the best local dishes were superbly prepared in my honor. I became, in fact, a lost relative of the people, whose ancestors had foolishly strayed, long ago, to America. (fiction writing).

5. Currently, assistance can only be resumed when the president certifies that the country has returned to a democratically elected government (newspaper writing).

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 43.

IV. Underline all verb phrases (finite and non-finite) in the piece of academic writing below. Identify the aspect (perfective, imperfective) of each verb phrase, the voice (active or passive) and the tense characteristics (if possible):

Казка поєднує дорослого й дитину. Мова казки, звісно, зближує. Казка інформативніша, ніж звичайна стисла мова. Вона не видає свої положення за щось серйозніше, ніж символи, метафори чи аналогії.

Казка розвиває уяву дитини, а дорослого повертає у дитинство. Чому саме казка?

У чотирирічному віці в дитини починається активний процес образного мислення. Мозок дитини реагує на світ лише емоційно! Емоція у перекладі з латини — вражаю, хвилюю. Справді, вона схожа на хвилю — пробігла тілом, викликала приємні чи неприємні відчуття і зникла. Упродовж розвитку мозок маляти вже здатний запам'ятати вплив різних джерел. Емоції, які мозок запам'ятовує і може по пам'яті відтворити, називаються почуттям. Викликавши в пам'яті почуття, закріплює його у вигляді образу. Останній може бути описаний різними способами. Головне, що будь-яке його відтворення, по суті є творчістю.

Мета казкотерапії — перетворити негативні образи на позитивні. Спокійний стан нервової системи повертає людині здоров'я.

У казках пацієнти бачать не реальний світ, а те враження, яке він на них справляє. Тобто свій внутрішній стан. Щоб описати

його, вони шукають у зовнішньому світі аналогії і, оперуючи ними, створюють образи, повідомляючи при цьому про свій внутрішній стан. Це називається метафорою. Саме мовою метафор говорить наша психіка, а точніше — права півкуля головного мозку. Вчені вважають, що ця частина мозку відповідає і за наше здоров'я.

*The material is taken from the article “Роз Світлана. Цілющі властивості казки відомі віддавна” // Урок Української. — № 11–12, 2005. — Р. 47.

V. Create from the given infinitives a) “diyeprykmetnyks” (participles), b) “diyepryslivnyks”. Identify the types of created verbals (e.g., *контрольований* — passive participle of the imperfective aspect). Think of the ways of rendering them into the English language.

- a) лежати, засохнути, застосовувати, одягати, посміхатися, змарніти, опастися, мерзнути, промокнути, квітнути, співати, зітхати, писати, посіяти, розпиляти, загоювати, роздрукувати, сформулювати, узгодити, змусити, заспокоїти, вловити, купити, зробити, пороти, колоти, стиснути, замкнути, розчервонітися, зажуритися;
- b) вітати, говорити, казати, просити, грюкати, приносити, прочитати, подумати, оглянути, підбігти, думати, терпіти, гуркотати, задивлятися, посміхатися.

CHAPTER 7

Adverb as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

1. Adverb as a part of speech: general characteristics

Adverbs denote the quality of the action, certain characteristic, state or some property or point out towards the fact under which circumstance this or that action or state is taking place. In both languages adverbs are modifiers of verbs and adjectives, in English they are also modifiers of the words of the category of state (also called “statives” or “adlinks”).

Adverb as a part of speech is characterized by the following features:

1. Lexico-grammatical meaning of “qualitative, quantitative or circumstantial characteristics of actions, states or qualities”.
2. Typical stem-building affixes, as in *quick-ly, side-ways, clock-wise, back-wards, a-shore*, etc. in the English language.

In Ukrainian adverbs are often formed by adding the preposition *по-* (written hyphenated) (*по-доброму, по-батьківськи, по-вашому, по-перше*); particles *-то, -от, -таки, -будь, -небудь, казна-, хтозна-* (*десь-то, як-от, коли-небудь, казна-куди, хтозна-як, будь-де, etc.* written hyphenated). Particles *аби-, ані-, чи-, що-, не-, ні-* becoming prefixes are written with adverbs together (*абикуди, абиж, аніколи, чимало, неспокійно, нікуди, щодень, несхвально, etc.*).

3. The grammatical category of the degrees of comparison.
4. Its unilateral combinability with verbs, adjectives, adverbs, less regularly with adlinks and nouns speaking of English adverbs.

In Ukrainian adverbs usually modify verbs, showing different circumstances under which actions take place.

5. The syntactic function of adverbial complement or adverbial modifier, sometimes other functions.

As the definition of the lexico-grammatical meaning shows, English adverbs may be divided into three lexico-grammatical subclasses: **qualitative**, **quantitative** and **circumstantial**.

Qualitative adverbs like *loudly, quickly, brightly*, etc. usually modify verbs, less often adlinks. They show the quality of an action or state much in the same way as a qualitative adjective shows the quality of some substance. Compare: *speak loudly* and *loud speech*, *walks quickly* and *a quick walk*.

The connection between qualitative adverbs and adjectives is obvious. In most cases the adverb is derived from the adjective with the help of the most productive adverb-forming suffix *-ly*. Like the corresponding adjectives qualitative adverbs usually have opposites of the comparative and superlative degrees.

Quantitative adverbs like *very, rather, too, nearly, greatly, fully, hardly, quite, utterly, twofold*, etc. show the degree, measure, quantity of an action, quality, state, etc.

The combinability of this subclass is more extensive than that of the qualitative adverbs. Besides verbs and adlinks quantitative adverbs modify adjectives, adverbs, numerals, modals, even nouns. E.g.:

*You have **quite** hurt him.*

***Rather** disconsolate she wandered out into the cathedral.*

*She knew it only **too** well.*

*He had become **fully** aware of it.*

*It was **nearly** ten.*

*He is **wholly** master of the situation.*

***Very** probably he won't interfere.*

Circumstantial adverbs serve to denote various circumstances (mostly local and temporal) attending an action. Accordingly they fall into two subclasses:

- a) adverbs of time and frequency (*yesterday, tomorrow, before, often, again, twice, etc.*);
- b) adverbs of place and direction (*upstairs, inside, behind, home-wards, etc.*).

Circumstantial adverbs are not inwardly connected with the verbs they are said to modify. They do not characterize the action itself but name certain circumstances attending the action described in the sentence and usually referring to the situation as a whole. Therefore a circumstantial adverb can be used in a sentence in which the only verb is a link verb, i.e. where no action is described. E.g.:

He will be ten tomorrow.

This accounts for the fact that, unlike qualitative and quantitative adverbs, circumstantial adverbs are not necessarily placed near the verb, they may occupy different places in the sentence. E.g.:

It was't any too warm yesterday. Yesterday they went there quite alone.

When Henry Sweet speaks of adverbs, as showing "almost last remains of normal free order in Modern English", it concerns mostly circumstantial adverbs.

Only a small group of circumstantial adverbs denoting indefinite time and place (*soon, late, often, near, far*) have opposites of comparison. Most adverbs of this subclass form no opposeemes of any grammatical category [25; 86–92].

In Ukrainian the subclasses of adverbs are presented in a slightly different way. The semantics of Ukrainian adverbs varies, that is why according to their meaning they can be subdivided into defining and circumstantial (означальні та обставинні).

Defining adverbs are divided further in their turn into qualitative, quantitative and adverbs of manner (якісні, кількісні і способу дії):

- a) qualitative — *добре зробив, щільно зачинена, весело заспівали;*
- b) quantitative — *дуже весела людина, досить пристойно, особливо активно;*
- c) adverbs of manner — *крутився колесом, поведився по-дитячому, їхати верхи.*

Circumstantial adverbs include adverbs that denote different outside space and time circumstances (*вгорі, знизу, надворі, зверху, увечері, згодом*), circumstances caused by some inner reason and aim (*спересердя, спросоння, зоналу, навмисне, на щастя*).

According to their origin and the way of formation Ukrainian adverbs are subdivided into primary and secondary (первинні та вторинні).

Primary adverbs are those that were created so long ago and changed so much that it is difficult to define their primary form (*тут, там, завжди, де, тоді, куди, доки*, etc.). They are rather few in number.

Secondary adverbs make up the main part of Ukrainian adverbs. They are formed by rather productive ways of word formation, that is suffixation and prefixation. For example, such adverbs as *добре, гаряче* are formed in a syntactic-morphological way, whereas adverbs *по-латині, весело, по-ударному* belong to the morphological way of formation [16; 194–199].

When comparing English and Ukrainian adverbs as parts of speech, one may say that they differ but slightly. Their lexico-grammatical meanings, morphological categories, combinability and syntactical functions are fundamentally the same.

Nevertheless, certain distinctions are worth noting.

1. The stem-building lexico-grammatical morphemes of Ukrainian adverbs are somewhat more numerous and varied.
2. Among the adverb building morphemes we find several suffixes of subjective appraisal *-еньк-, -ісіньк-, -есеньк:* *швиденько, давненько, смачненько, точнісінько, тихесенько*, which are absolutely alien to English. Under the influence of such forms in the Ukrainian colloquial language there are also used such adverbs as *недалечко, малечку, осьдечки* and others, without the meaning of diminutiveness. In English the following meanings are usually rendered in a descriptive way.
3. The adverbialization of substantival and adjectival grammemes (e.g. *кроком, стрілою, весною*) is a productive way of forming adverbs in Ukrainian, whereas in English it is less common.

4. The peculiarity of the English language is the presence of a rather large quantity of adverbs that are homonymous with nouns and adjectives, at that their meanings become obvious only in context. Compare: *south* — *південь, на південь, fast* — *швидко, швидкий* etc. Some simple adverbs of place and direction, for example, *away, down, in, off, over, up* coincide with the verbal postpositive attachment (дієслівні постпозитивні приставки/післялоги). Adverbs differ from postpositive attachments in a way that being the notional part of speech they have the independent meaning and are used in the function of a certain part of the sentence, whereas postpositive attachments take part only in the word formation process of the verb (словотворення дієслова).
5. The peculiar feature of English circumstantial adverbs is their ability to render the place of some action or its direction depending on the context, compare: *here* — *тут, сюди; there* — *там, туди; where* — *де, куди; inside* — *всередині, всередину; outside* — *зовні, назовні; nowhere* — *ніде, нікуди* etc. In Ukrainian meanings of the action location or direction are rendered, as a rule, by different adverbs: *дома* — *додому, збоку* — *вбік*.
6. Among English qualitative adverbs there is a rather large and specific group of words of this category, formed with the help of the adverbial suffix *-ly* from the Participle I (*imploring* — *imploringly, mocking* — *mockingly*). This way of formation is a very productive one in English. Stemming from the verb, these adverbs modify the main action in a way that they point out as its characteristic feature towards another simultaneous action going in parallel with it (compare: *He looked imploringly at his bother.* — *Він благально (або з благанням) подивився на свого брата.*)
7. The peculiar feature of the Ukrainian language is the group of adverbs, denoting manner, which are called sometimes “adverbs expressing comparison and similarity” (порівняльно-уподібнювальні). They are formed with the help of prefix *по-*: *по-дитячому, по-вовчому, по-нашому, по-козацьки*, also

without the prefix from the instrumental case of nouns: *Дим валить стовном*. In English the corresponding meaning is usually rendered with the help of word combinations, e.g.: *like a child, like a wolf*.

Despite all the differences there can be differentiated the following isomorphic groups of adverbs in both languages — qualitative, quantitative and circumstantial adverbs (якісні, кількісні й обставинні прислівники) [5; 106–107].

2. Degrees of comparison of adverbs

The category of the degrees of comparison of adverbs is similar to that of adjectives. It is a system of three-member opposemes (*soon — sooner — soonest; actively — more actively — most actively; швидко — швидше — найшвидше; активно — більш активно/активніше — найактивніше*) showing whether the characteristic the adverb expresses is absolute or relative. The “comparative” and “superlative” members of the opposeme are built up either synthetically (by means of affixation or suppletivity) or analytically (by means of word-morphemes).

Degrees of comparison are characteristic in both languages of all the qualitative as well as some circumstantial adverbs (among the latter ones: *late, soon, near, far, often* and some others).

In English the synthetic way of degrees formation is characteristic only of one-syllable adverbs (*fast, hard, late, soon*) and some two-syllable ones (*early, often, quickly, slowly*). The majority of adverbs form their degrees of comparison analytically (*clearly — more clearly — most clearly*). In Ukrainian the synthetic way of degrees formation is prevailing.

In both languages there is a suppletive way of degrees formation: *добре (гарно) — краще — найкраще, погано — гірше — найгірше; well — better — best, badly — worse — worst, much — more — most; little — less — least* etc.

With regard to the category of the degrees of comparison adverbs (like adjectives) fall into **comparables** and **non-comparables**. The number of non-comparables is much greater among adverbs than among adjectives. In other words, there are many adverbs whose lexemes contain but one word (*yesterday, always, northward, upstairs, etc.*).

Though this category is not pertaining to all adverbs, it still plays an important role for this class of words. Therefore, there exists the view that it is not correct to define adverb as an unchangeable part of speech.

3. Words of the category of state (statives or adlinks)

In Modern English there exists a certain class of words such as *asleep, alive, afloat*, which is characterized by:

1. The lexico-grammatical meaning of “state”. *He is asleep = He is in a state of sleep.*
2. The productive prefix *a-*: *swim — aswim, shiver — ashiver, etc.*
3. Peculiar combinability: words of this class are associated almost exclusively with link-verbs: *to be alive, to fall asleep, to be adrift, etc.*
4. The main syntactic function of a predicative complement.

Therefore, in the sentence they are used in the function of the predicative member of the compound nominal predicate (предикативный член складеного іменного присудка), the objective predicative member, as well as a postpositive attribute. These words are never used as pre-positive attributes.

As we know, a class of words united by such features may be regarded as a separate part of speech. B.O. Ilyish has called it “a category of state” by analogy with a similar class of words in the Russian language. Compare: *мне было приятно, грустно, обидно*, where the last three words ending in *-o* denote different states and are associated with link-verbs. V.V. Vinogradov, for example, calls them “words of the category of state”, though many linguists object to their being considered a separate part of speech. Other Russian linguists B. Khaimovich and

B. Rogovskaya use a handier term “adlinks” by analogy with adverbs. English adlinks do not have grammatical categories [25; 199–202].

The peculiar feature of the Ukrainian language concerning the state expression is the fact that here the state is represented as something closer to the action and is rendered with the help of words, meant to express the action, that is verbs. It becomes obvious if we compare the following examples [5; 104–105]:

<i>The air was agleam with diamonds.</i>	<i>Повітря сяяло діамантами.</i>
<i>She was astir.</i>	<i>Вона заворушилася.</i>
<i>He was asleep.</i>	<i>Він спав.</i>
<i>He is unaware of that.</i>	<i>Він не знає про це.</i>

The question of singling out the category of state as a separate part of speech has not been finally solved yet by Ukrainian grammarians. For example, B.M. Kulyk treats positively the issue concerning singling out of the category of state in Ukrainian and includes into this class the following groups of words:

- a) words expressing the mental and physical states of a person or of any living creature altogether, e.g.: *боязко, приємно, досадно, страшно, тривожно, чутно, жаль, охота, шкода* and others;
- b) words denoting the nature state: *темно, зелено, барвисто*;
- c) words expressing the state of the surrounding or its evaluation: *гарно, пусто, тихо, рано, пізно*;
- d) words expressing the state with some modal connotation: *треба, слід, необхідно, доцільно, можна, не можна* and others.

According to B.M. Kulyk, the category of state in Ukrainian is all the time renewed, especially with the help of adverbs ending in *-о*, *-е*.

The abovementioned groups of words, referred by B.M.Kulyk to the category of state, differ from the English words of the category of state by such features:

- 1) they are used mainly in impersonal sentences, whereas English words of the category of state are used in personal sentences;

- 2) they do not explain any words in the sentence, whereas English words of the category of state can be used in the role of the post-positive attribute and the objective predicative member;
- 3) Ukrainian words of the category of state in -о, -е can have the forms of comparison degrees (*весело — веселіше, легко — легше*). English words of the category of state are altogether unchangeable [5; 105–106].

There is another hypothesis about the Ukrainian “statives” which is also worth considering. It is presented in the textbook “The Modern Ukrainian Language”, edited by the Ukrainian linguist O.D. Ponomariv. According to this point of view, in Ukrainian there is a separate group of words called “words of the category of state” (*слова категорії стану*). These are unchangeable words of the adverbial or substantival origin which render the state and perform the function of the main member of the sentence in impersonal sentences. They are rather few in number.

According to their meaning Ukrainian words of the category of state can be subdivided into the following groups:

- a) words expressing the physical and the psychic state of a person: *важко, легко, боляче, страх, досадно, шкода, боязко*;
- b) words denoting the state of nature: *тихо, темно, видно, холодно, тепло, вітряно*;
- c) words expressing different modal meanings of possibility, impossibility, necessity: *можна, слід, потрібно, треба, необхідно*.

The majority of Ukrainian linguists do not consider this class of words to be a separate part of speech and refer them to adverbs [16; 199–200].

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. Mention the groups, into which adverbs are subdivided as a class of lexemes, taking into account their grammatical and

- semantic characteristics. Provide examples in both contrasted languages.
2. Mention the allomorphic groups of adverbs in both contrasted languages.
 3. Characterize adverb as a part of speech (think of the number of grammatical categories, typical stem-building elements, combinability, syntactic functions). Do these characteristics differ in the contrasted languages?
 4. Describe the grammatical categories of adverb as a part of speech. Does their number differ in the contrasted languages?
 5. Define the category of the degrees of comparison of adverbs as a grammatical phenomenon. State the basic similarities and differences in its manifestation English and Ukrainian languages.
 6. Characterize English statives (words of the category of state as a part of speech).
 7. Dwell upon the controversial points of differentiating Ukrainian words of the category of state into a separate part of speech.

II. Underline all adjectives and circle all adverbs in the sentences below. Classify each adjective as either attributive or predicative, and each adverb as either a modifier in a phrase or an adverbial.

1. They were cute invitations, weren't they? (conversation)
2. That looks pretty good (conversation).
3. [From a discussion of the meaning of "wild boar"] Can it be farmed intensively or should it be reared extensively? (newspaper writing).
4. Here there are eight shared electrons; therefore methane is uncharged (academic writing).
5. The initial objective is to identify areas within cities which exhibit distinctive characteristics and which can be shown to be relatively homogeneous (academic writing).
6. The Russian airline was also interested in starting a transatlantic service (newspaper writing).

7. The drive that motivates distinctive individual behavioral patterns (personality) is to a considerable degree subconscious (academic writing).

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P.48.

III. The passage below describes a fictional train journey. Use it to find examples of the following forms of adverb (some forms will have more than one example):

- a) a compound adverb;
- b) an adverb derived from an adjective;
- c) an adverb like an adverbial particle (e.g. *off*);
- d) a fixed phrase functioning as an adverb;
- e) a simple adverb (excluding type c above);
- f) any other form of adverb.

Neither in the train to Kirkuk, nor in the Rest House at Mosul, nor last night on the train had she slept properly. Now, weary of lying wakeful in the hot stuffiness of her overheated compartment, she got up and peered out. Nothing to see, of course. Just a long, poor-lighted platform with loud altercations in Arabic going on somewhere. The train, with a terrific jerk, moved slowly forward (fiction writing).

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 49–50.

IV. Match each of the underlined adverbs to the correct description of its syntactic role. Use each description only once:

- a) adverb modifying an adjective;
- b) adverb modifying a noun phrase;
- c) adverb modifying a predeterminer;
- d) adverb modifying a prepositional phrase;
- e) adverb as a complement of a preposition;

- f) **adverb standing alone;**
- g) **adverb modifying a measurement expression other than a numeral;**
- h) **adverb modifying another adverb;**
- i) **adverb modifying a pronoun;**
- j) **adverb modifying a particle of a phrasal verb;**
- k) **adverb modifying a numeral;**
- l) **adverb functioning as an adverbial.**

1. You had the objectives right in front of you (conversation).
2. We have taken this event extremely seriously (newspaper writing).
3. It did not seem odd to him that the subway held more compelling things than the famous city above (other writing).
4. Practically everyone knows the line, "Play it again, Sam" (newspaper writing).
5. Well, I think coming to the meeting is a pretty general requirement (conversation).
6. A: You can visit?
B: Absolutely (conversation).
7. For almost 200 years geologists have supported various theories of mountain building, volcanism, and other major phenomena of earth (academic writing).
8. It [an answering machine] cut me right off (conversation).
9. Each of its workers gets a basic monthly wage of 360 pesos, almost twice the average pay (newspaper writing).
10. So we'll give you a call later on or drop by and say hello. Until then, ciao! (conversation).
11. "Is he often angry?" I asked (fiction writing).
12. Similar data are available for the approximately one-fourth of Shang characters that have been deciphered to date (academic writing).

*The material is taken from "Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook" by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 52.

V. Underline each adverb in the sentences below and identify its semantic category: place, degree (amplifier/intensifier, diminisher/downtoner), time, addition, restriction, manner, stance, linking, or other. If you think an adverb combines two or more categories, or fits in an “other” category, explain why.

1. They embraced lightly and carefully while Gwen made another set of little sounds (fiction writing).
2. It didn't really matter: everyone was insured when he bought a ticket, automatically (fiction writing).
3. Of course he understands perfectly well but wears that uncomprehending and pained look to establish he's not to blame (fiction writing).
4. Sometimes other people in the village glanced at him curiously, as though they could not quite place him (fiction writing).
5. The bank is so crowded nowadays that many people are moving away altogether (fiction writing).
6. We don't go there very much (fiction writing).
7. He tried to be offhand and not too obviously interested, but the fat boy hurried after him (fiction writing).
8. He too felt a mounting excitement (fiction writing).
9. Only the frightless gulls wheeled and soared and mewed their plaint over the place where it had been (fiction writing).
10. Hardly were we out of earshot, however, when Markus said: "I'm afraid I can't come with you this afternoon" (fiction writing).
11. I felt he had some inner reserve of strength which no reverse, however serious, would break down (fiction writing).

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 53.

VI. Underline each adverb in the text below and identify its semantic category (qualitative, quantitative, circumstantial, or some other type).

Їй здалось, що це саме з України подув вітерець. Інколи їй вчувалися пахощі м'яти, любистку. Іноді вона начебто чула

кування зозулі ... Чийсь рідні голоси ... Тоді наказувала вертати. Якнайшвидше.

Вогонь скаженів ... Повітря навколо ставало нестерпно гарячим. А з неба палило сонце, падав на людей гарячий попіл, снопи розліталися навсібіч ... Гнав вогонь прямо на житла. І щогодини сотні людей залишалися без домівок ...

На ранок на замиленому коні примчав з Білої Церкви сам Петро Конашевич-Сагайдачний. Гетьман швидко оглянув пожарисько і повелів ламати, зносити будівлі навколо місця пожежі, рубати дерева, утворювати навколо своерідну мертву смугу. Це був єдиний спосіб зупинити пожежу.

*The material is taken from the article “Верготи Лідія. Перевіряти і теорію, і практику” // Урок Української. — № 2–3, 2007. — Р.44.

VII. Form from the given below adverbs comparative and superlative degrees of comparison. Render the given adverbs into English and answer the question whether they also are able to form degrees of comparison.

Чисто, виразно, близько, дорого, високо, швидко, гарно, погано.

VIII. Form adverbs from the following word combinations. Think of their English equivalents.

Турецькою мовою, попереднього дня, у п'ять разів, в окремих місцях, два рази, дуже давно, з молодих літ, на дві частини, в будь-який час, від нинішнього дня, у правий бік, другий раз, дуже рідко, два дні тому.

*The material is taken from the article “Нове в програмі та методиці” // Урок Української. — № 9–10, 2005. — Р.45.

CHAPTER 8

Functional parts of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

1. Preposition as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

The preposition is a part of speech characterized by the following features:

1. Its lexico-grammatical meaning of “relations (of substances)”.

Ukrainian prepositions are considered to be the functional part of speech which together with cases expresses dependence of one notional word on the other in a word group or in a sentence and at that prepositions render the relations of objects, actions, states and qualities denoted by these words. Ukrainian prepositions possess both lexical and grammatical meanings. The lexical meaning is more vivid in the recently created derivative prepositions (*коло, близько, неподалік*) and it is shadowed in primary prepositions. Besides prepositions possess the categorial (or grammatical) meaning which is understood as the property of prepositions to point out towards syntactic relations between words (that is relations of subordination) [16; 200].

2. Its bilateral combinability with a right-hand noun (or noun-equivalent) and a left-hand combinability with a word belonging to almost any part of speech.
3. Its syntactic function of a linking word.

Prepositions are not characterized by any grammatical categories or typical stem-building elements.

As far as their structure is concerned English prepositions, like other parts of speech, fall into the following groups:

1. Simple or primitive, e.g. *at, in, of, by, with, for*, etc.
2. Derivative, e.g. *below, beside, along*, etc.
3. Compound, e.g. *inside, within, into, throughout*, etc.
4. Composite, e.g. *instead of, in accordance with, owing to, in front of*, etc.

Many prepositions are homonymous with adverbs (*about, before, below, down, since*, etc.), conjunctions (*before, since*, etc.), particles (*regarding, concerning*, etc.), lexico-grammatical word-morphemes (*in, on, up*, etc.).

Similar to other parts of speech the lexico-grammatical meaning of prepositions is an abstraction from their individual lexical meanings. Let us compare the following combinations of words:

the book in the bag,
the book on the bag,
the book under the bag,
the book near the bag.

In all of them the preposition shows the relation of one noun to another, which reflects the relations of the corresponding substances in the world of reality. This meaning of “relations (of substances)” common to all prepositions is their lexico-grammatical meaning. But each preposition in the expressions above shows a different relation revealing thus its individual lexical meaning.

It is much more difficult to define lexical meaning of a preposition than that of a noun or an adjective, because prepositions usually have very general, abstract meanings.

It is necessary to make some remarks regarding the classification of prepositions according to their meaning into those of place, direction, time, etc. When we say that the prepositions *at* or *by* have local meanings in *at window, by the window*, and temporal meanings in *at 6 o'clock, by 6 o'clock* we simply add the meanings of the neighbouring words to those of prepositions. Originally, a preposition like *in* is supposed to

have had a concrete local meaning. But at present *in* is used with such a variety of words that it has a very vague and general meaning, something like “inside some sphere”. That sphere may be local as *in Kyiv*, temporal, as *in January*, abstract as *in love*, *in thought*, etc.

Prepositions like *in*, *at*, *on*, *by*, etc. are used with all kinds of nouns, so that the local, temporal and other meanings of the prepositional construction do not depend on the preposition, but on the noun. Such prepositions may be called **general**. There are some other prepositions which may be called **special**. They are used chiefly with nouns of certain meaning. For instance, the preposition *till* can be used with nouns like *midnight*, *dawn*, *time*, but not with *window*, *town*, *place* and the like. That shows that *till* has acquired a temporal meaning. The causal meaning of the special preposition *because of* is so strong that it determines the meaning of the prepositional construction irrespective of the noun. Compare: *because of the time (place, love, John)*.

The combinability of a preposition is rather peculiar. As a rule, it is followed by a noun or a noun equivalent which it is closely connected with. At the same time it is associated with some preceding notional word belonging to nearly any part of speech. We may speak of stable right-hand connections and variable left-hand connections.

Parts of speech	Preposition	Noun (or noun equivalent)
verb <i>think</i>	<i>of</i>	<i>John</i>
adj. <i>clever</i>	<i>of</i>	<i>him</i>
adlink <i>afraid</i>	<i>of</i>	<i>going</i>
num. <i>three</i>	<i>of</i>	<i>us</i>
pron. <i>many</i>	<i>of</i>	<i>them</i>
noun <i>leg</i>	<i>of</i>	<i>mutton</i>
adv. <i>west</i>	<i>of</i>	<i>it</i>

Bilateral combinability is typical not only of prepositions but of other linking words as well: conjunctions, link-verbs, and modal verbs. But combinability of prepositions differs from that of all of them. As stated above, prepositions have stable right-hand and variable left-hand connections. Conjunctions and link-verbs have both connections variable (Compare: *He is a student, afraid of being late*). Modal verbs have

both connections stable: the subject on the left and the infinitive on the right [25; 206–208].

Prepositions of modern Ukrainian language create a complex system. According to their origin they are subdivided into primary (original) and secondary (derivative) (первинні чи первісні і вторинні чи похідні). Primary prepositions are rather few in number: *на, у, в, за, од, від, без, для, з, між, крізь, під, по, при, про, ради, через, о (об)*. They differ from the secondary ones by a greater degree of abstraction and generalization of their meaning.

Secondary prepositions have been created from different notional parts of speech quite recently. The biggest number make up prepositions formed from adverbs (*навколо, близько, згідно, кругом, поблизу, поруч, etc.*). The smaller number is formed by the substantival prepositions (*край, кінець, протягом, коло, etc.*) and verbal ones (*завдяки, виключаючи*).

According to their structural properties and morphological characteristics Ukrainian prepositions are subdivided into simple — with one root stem (*за, перед, на, коло, між, etc.*); compound (складні) — formed from two or more simple prepositions (*поверх, заради, поза, щодо, з-поміж, etc.*); composite (складені) created from different categories of notional words and prepositions (*у напрямі до, незважаючи на, услід за, згідно з, etc.*).

Prepositions are differentiated according to their semantics. The biggest group is made up of prepositions possessing the meaning of space relations (значення просторовості). The general quantity of Ukrainian prepositions is above 220, with 137 being prepositions denoting spatial relations [16; 200–202].

Though the lexico-grammatical meaning, the combinability and function of English prepositions are similar to those of the Ukrainian counterparts, the role of prepositions in the two languages is different. This difference, however, depends not on the very prepositions, but on the nouns they introduce.

The lexico-grammatical meaning of prepositions, being the one of “relations (of substances)”, approximates to the grammatical meaning of case.

In the Ukrainian language with its six-case (or seven-case) system the relations of substances are mostly denoted by case morphemes. Prepositions are but a secondary means of specifying these relations. In English the only positive case morpheme -'s shows but a very limited number of relations. So, prepositions become a primary means of denoting relations of substances. Their role, as we see, is determined by the grammatical system of the language.

In Ukrainian the two means of expressing relations are interdependent. Certain prepositions go with certain cases (*до столу, від стола, над столом*, etc.). So, the preposition is closely connected with the noun it precedes. It cannot be used without the noun [16; 206–211]. In English the preposition is much more independent. It can be separated from the noun, as in *The house I speak of*. Several prepositions may refer to one noun in the sentence, as in *He played with and read to the children*. A preposition may refer not only to a word, but also to a word-combination (*That is for you to decide*) or a clause (*It all depends on how he will act*).

2. Conjunction as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

The conjunction is a part of speech characterized by the following features:

1. Its lexico-grammatical meaning of “relations between substances, actions, properties, situations”, etc.
2. Its peculiar combinability. As a rule, a conjunction connects two similar units: words of a similar type or clauses.
3. Its syntactic function of a linking word.

Conjunctions are not characterized by any grammatical categories or typical stem-building elements. As to their stem structure English conjunctions are, as usual, divided into simple (*and, but, or, that, till, if*, etc.), derivative (*until, unless, because, provided*, etc.), compound (*although, whereas*, etc.) and composite (*as if, in order that, as soon as, either ...or, neither ... nor*, etc.).

A variety of English composite conjunctions is the group of the so called correlative conjunctions which go in pairs: *both ... and, either ... or, no sooner ... than*, etc.

Many conjunctions are homonymous with adverbs and prepositions (*after, since, before*), pronouns (*that, neither*), particles (*supposing, provided*).

The lexico-grammatical meaning of conjunctions is an abstraction from their lexical meanings. The latter are also very general, abstract and rather weak. Therefore conjunctions can be treated as semi-notional words.

Regarding the nature of relations they serve to express, conjunctions are usually divided into two subclasses: **coordinating** (*and, or, both ... and*, etc.) and **subordinating** (*if, that, as soon as*, etc.).

The former connect syntactical units which are equal in rank. The latter are used to show the dependence of one unit on another.

This is quite clear and the government admits it.

If they did so, their complete fare would be refunded.

The division of conjunctions into coordinating and subordinating ones is chiefly based on their lexical meanings and the types of units they connect.

According to their meanings coordinating conjunctions are divided into:

- a) copulative (*and, both ... and, neither ... nor, not only ... but also, as well as*, etc.) denoting addition, combination, interdependence;
- b) adversative (*but, still, yet, however, nevertheless*, etc.) denoting contradiction;
- c) disjunctive (*or, either ... or*) denoting separation, choice.

In different situations and speech environments conjunctions may acquire various shades of meaning. The conjunction *and*, for instance, connotes "consequence" in *The rain was beating and he walked on* and "contrast" in *She is the beauty of the family and I am quite plain* [25; 211–214].

Ukrainian conjunctions are also subdivided into subtypes. According to their origin there can be non-derivative (непохідні: *і, а, бо*,

ні, та, чи, etc.) and derivative conjunctions (похідні) formed from different parts of speech: a) from verbs (*хоч, лише, незважаючи на те що*), b) partially from pronouns (*щоб, якщо, тим-то*), c) from adverbs (*буцім, де, коли, куди, однак, дарма що*).

According to their structure there are differentiated three types of conjunctions: 1. simple which are non-derivative; 2. compound (*також, якщо, нібито, причому, проте, etc.*); 3. complex (*тому що, лиш тільки, у зв'язку з тим що, etc.*).

Ukrainian conjunctions are also subdivided into **coordinating** and **subordinating** (сполучники підрядності і сурядності) conjunctions depending on the character of syntactic relations they express between words or sentences. Coordinating conjunctions are as well in their turn subdivided into: a) copulative (єднальні: *і, й, та, також*); b) adversative (протиставні: *а, але, проте*) and c) disjunctive (розділові: *або, то ... то, чи ... чи*).

Subordinating conjunctions (*котрий, що, як*) cannot be classified into distinct separate classes [16; 208–210].

3. Particle as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

The particle as a part of speech is characterized by the following features:

1. Its lexico-grammatical meaning of “emphatic specification”.
2. Its unilateral combinability with words of different classes, groups of words, even clauses.
3. Its function of a specifier.

Particles possess neither grammatical categories, nor typical stem-building elements.

As far as their structure is concerned, English particles may be simple (*just, still, yet, even, else*), derivative (*merely, simply, alone*), compound (*also*).

Very few English particles (*else, merely, solely*) are not homonymous

with other words. Most of them are identical in form with adverbs (*exactly, precisely, simply, never, still*), adjectives (*even, right, just, only*), pronouns (*all, either*), conjunctions (*but*), articles (*the*) [25; 217–218].

Ukrainian particles are subdivided into two types according to their mode of functioning: 1) phrase particles and 2) word-building and form-building particles (фразові та слово- і формотворчі).

Phrase particles arrange a certain type of a sentence rendering the speaker's attitude to the content of the whole sentence or modify one of its components (*ось, справді, лише*, etc.).

Word-building particles function in connection with other words. Unlike phrase particles they can change their place in the word structure or can be separated altogether at declination (*будь-, казна-, де-, -ж*, etc.). With their help pronouns, adverbs and conjunctions are formed.

Form-building particles are used to create different grammatical forms, e.g. particles *би, б* help to form conditional mood.

Unlike conjunctions and prepositions English and Ukrainian particles do not serve to express syntactic relations [16; 213–217].

4. Modal words as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

The class of words called “modal words” or “modals” includes the unchangeable words which reveal the attitude of the speaker towards the idea he/she is expressing. These words usually perform the function of parenthetic part of the sentence (вставний член речення). According to their meaning they express assumption, suggestion or subjective evaluation of the utterance content as desirable or non-desirable, e.g.: *certainly, of course* — *звичайно*; *no doubt* — *безперечно*; *surely* — *безсумнівно*; *perhaps, maybe* — *можливо*; *probably* — *напевно*; *happily* — *на щастя*; *unhappily* — *на нещастя* and others.

As a part of speech English and Ukrainian modals are characterized by the following features:

1. Their lexico-grammatical meaning of “modality”.
2. Their negative combinability.

3. Their syntactic functions of parenthetical elements and sentence-words.

“Modality” as a linguistic term denotes the relation of the contents of speech to reality as viewed by the speaker. When describing the meaning of “modality” in reference to the small group of modal verbs we are in fact dealing with “lexical modality”. Modality of the indicative, conditional and imperative moods is “grammatical modality”. Now we are dealing with the meaning of “modality” uniting a part of speech. This is “lexico-grammatical modality”.

Modal words indicate whether the speaker is sure that the contents of his/her utterance corresponds to reality, or he/she doubts it, or he/she regards it as something possible, probable, desirable, etc. Accordingly, modal words can be divided into several groups. Thus, English modal words include words denoting:

- a) various shades of **certainty**: *certainly, surely, of course, no doubt, undoubtedly, indeed, etc.*;
- b) various degrees of **probability**: *maybe, perhaps, possibly, probably, etc.*;
- c) different shades of **desirability (undesirability)**: *happily, luckily, fortunately, unhappily, etc.*

Functioning as a parenthetical element of a sentence, a modal word is usually connected with the sentence as a whole, e.g.;

Apparently, they were fully prepared for the coming of visitors.

But sometimes it may be connected with a part of a sentence only, e.g.:

We worked that land for maybe a hundred years [25; 202–204].

In Ukrainian modal words are not viewed as a separate part of speech by some linguists. For example, in the book “Modern Ukrainian language”, edited by O.D. Ponomariv modal words are considered not as a phenomenon of morphology but a phenomenon of syntax. Thus, O.D. Ponomariv distinguishes parenthetic constructions (вставні конструкції) which are subdivided into three kinds: parenthetic words, word combinations and sentences. According to O.D. Ponomariv the role of parenthetic words is often performed by

modal words (*мабуть, певно, безперечно, безсумнівно*, etc.). The majority of them correlate with adverbs (*звичайно, нарешті, власне, імовірно, взагалі, навпаки*, etc.). Very often the role of parenthetical words is performed by adverbs (*по-моєму, по-перше, зрештою, наприклад, без сумніву*, etc.) [16; 297–298].

What is in common concerning English and Ukrainian modal words is the fact that the majority of modal words have developed from the adverbs of manner and have retained their formal characteristics — in English the suffix *-ly*, in Ukrainian — the ending *-о*. Some of them have been formed by the way of lexicalization of word combinations, for example: *of course, indeed; на щастя, на нещастя, без сумніву* and others.

Among the modal words in Ukrainian there are words of verbal origin: *здається, кажуть, може* and others. In English there are very few modal words that have developed from verbs, compare: *maybe* [5; 108].

5. Interjection as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

Interjections are words that express but do not name feelings and will-determination of the speaking person (це слова, які виражають, але не називають почуття і волевиявлення того, хто говорить).

The interjection is a part of speech characterized by the following features in English and Ukrainian:

1. It expresses emotions or will without naming them.
2. It has no grammatical categories, no stem-building elements of its own and practically negative combinability.
3. It functions as a sentence-word or as a parenthetical element.

Interjections, like other parts of speech, may be simple (*hallo!, come!, dear!*), derivative (*goodness!*), and composite (*hang it!, dear me!*) [25; 205–206].

According to their structure interjections in both languages are divided into:

- a) Primary (первинні), e.g. in English: *ah!, eh!, hey!, hi!, hallo!, hush!, het!* and others and in Ukrainian: *a!, o!, i!, y!, e!, zey, ой!, ox!, na!, nu!, ozo!* and others (primary (первинні) are common for all Slavonic languages (*a!, o!, ax!, ox!, ozo!*) [16; 217–218]).
- b) Secondary (вторинні) that have originated from notional parts of speech or from word combinations that have lost the function of naming and have been transformed into expressers of feelings and will-determination, for example: in English *there!, come!, well!, why!, Dear me!*; in Ukrainian *годі!, шабаш!, цить! Добридень!*

According to their meaning interjections in both languages are subdivided into the following groups:

- 1) emotional, e.g.: *oh!, ah!, hurrah!, bosh!, alas!; ax!, ай!. ух!, а!, ура! ой лишенько! горенько мое!* and others. Some of them are polysemantic, for example, the Ukrainian *ex!* can express reproach, sadness or delight.
- 2) imperative, which render the inducement towards the action, some kind of appeal or will-determination, e.g.: *hush!, well!, hallo!, ahoу!, come come!; годі!, досить!, геть!, цить!* and others;
- 3) expressing greetings and other expressive interjections, e.g.: *hallo!, good-bye!, how do you do!, thanks, please; добридень, спасибі, до побачення, прошу, пробачте, дякую* and others;
- 4) sound-imitating, e.g.: *cock-a-doodle-doo, bang, miaow; кукурику, гав-гав, дінь, бац, хлюп.*

A peculiar feature of Ukrainian interjections *геть!* and *цить!* is their ability to build the forms of the imperative mood of the second person plural: *цитьте, гетьте.*

In both languages interjections, especially primary ones, serve as a basis to form other notional parts of speech, especially verbs. In Ukrainian the suffixation is used for this purpose, e.g.: *охати, ахати, уха-ти, ойкати, шабашити, гавкати*, in English conversion is used: *hush* (*мовчати, мовчання*), *to pshaw* (*виявляти зневагу*), *to rooh-*

рош (ставитися зневажливо до чогось), *to shoо* (проганяти), *to halloа* (вітатися) [5; 108–109].

6. The English article

The article is also considered to be a semi-notional (or functional) part of speech. The two English words *a* (*an*), *the* form a separate group or class characterized by:

1. the lexico-grammatical meaning of “definiteness/indefiniteness”;
2. the right-hand combinability with nouns;
3. the function of noun specifiers [25; 214].

Unlike Ukrainian in which there is no article as well as in the majority of other Slavonic languages, the English language has the definite article (*the*) and the indefinite article (*a, an*). The article is the most widely used determiner of the English noun.

A special feature of the English noun is the fact that it is less independent than the noun in Ukrainian. The English noun almost cannot function in the sentence without being strengthened by some determiners. Except for articles, such determiners in some cases can be possessive pronouns, indefinite pronouns (*some, any*), etc.

In such languages of the Germanic family, as, for example, the German language, the article can express the gender, the number and the case of the noun. In the English language the article does not have any of these categories; it is altogether unchangeable.

The grammatical nature of the English article, and its “linguistic nature” have not been still finally determined. The question concerning the place of article in the system of lexical-grammatical classes of words is still a disputable one. A lot of grammars treat article as a special part of speech though we can notice a striking difference of the article both from notional words (повнозначні слова), such as nouns, pronouns, etc, and from functional words (preposition, conjunction) which express syntactic relations between words or sentences.

Yu.O. Zhluktenko agrees with the English philologist B.O. Ilyish that the English article is on the border between the word and the morpheme. Though the article in the German language is undoubtedly a separate word, since it changes according to gender, number and cases [5; 48].

All functions of the English article are directed towards either determining the meaning of the noun or its grammatical relations. Its semantic function is considered to be its ability to point out the generalization or specification (узагальненість або конкретність) of some notion, expressed by the noun. Its morphological function is to serve the index (служувати показником) of the noun as a part of speech (compare: *rich* (багатий) and *the rich* (багачі)). Its syntactic function is to separate the noun group with its attribute from other parts of the sentence. So, the English article is the auxiliary word-morpheme which functions in the sphere of one part of speech — the noun, serving as its formal index. (Це допоміжне слово-морфема, яка функціонує у сфері однієї частини мови — іменника, обслуговуючи її як формальний показник).

In reality, the article does not have a lexical-grammatical meaning, as true words, but only a grammatical-functional meaning, which is realized, like by morphemes, by its connection with the noun and is the component part of the common meaning of this combination.

The research highlighted in some linguistic works opposes the theory of existence of three articles in the English language. According to this theory the English language possesses besides the definite and the indefinite article also the so-called “zero article” (that is the meaningful absence of the article before the noun). In reality some special meaning is acquired in some special cases by the noun itself which can be easily proved by the example of the proper names noun class that are used without articles.

The cases of article usage in the English language are very different. Beside the distinct grammar function of the article, we can also observe in many word groups a lot of such cases when the article has a purely lexical meaning, that is it, in fact, has become the constituent part of the word and its usage is practically unmotivated (for example, the

usage of the article with river names or in such names as *the Crimea*, *the Hague*).

The main functions of the definite article in English are to determine and to generalize (визначальна та узагальнювальна).

When the function of the article is to determine, it shows that the object, the person or the phenomenon, denoted by a noun, has some individual features that separate it from other objects, persons or phenomena of the same class, for example: *The boy is holding a little flag.* ((Цей) хлопчик тримає прапорець).

Being used in the function to generalize, the definite article gives to the noun in the singular form the meaning of the generalized notion — of the whole class of such subjects (persons, phenomena), e.g.: *the pine does not grow here/ сосна тут не росте.*

The main function of the indefinite article is to classify (класифікаційна). The indefinite article singles out a separate object (person) from the class which it belongs to, not ascribing to it any individual features in comparison with other objects (persons) of this class. The object is considered not from the point of view of its individual peculiarities, but as one of the objects that make up the following class: *a book* — “книжка взагалі або якась книжка” на відміну від зошита, газети, журналу тощо.

The absence of the article in Ukrainian does not mean that similar notions cannot be expressed in it with the help of other means. Such means are usually word order, intonation and different lexical means. Very often those functions, performed in English with the help of definite and indefinite articles, are expressed by the word order in Ukrainian. In particular, when we mention some object or person in the classifying meaning for the first time, this noun is usually put at the end of the sentence, e.g.:

Вас чекає хлопчик. (Compare: *A boy is waiting for you*).

When the name of the object or person is used in the same sentence with the individualized meaning, then it is placed at the beginning of the sentence, e.g.:

Хлопчик чекає на вас. (Compare: *The boy is waiting for you*).

The same with sentences: Там зупинилася машина. Машина

дуже красива.

(Compare: *A car has stopped there. The car is very beautiful.*)

In all these cases the noun is correspondingly singled out with intonation.

Besides the word order and intonation the Ukrainian language possesses a number of words — pronouns of different types — that are used similarly as the English article is used. Ukrainian demonstrative pronouns (вказівні займенники — *той, цей*) are used in the function similar to the function of the English definite article; the function close to the function of the English indefinite article is performed by Ukrainian pronouns *якийсь, який-небудь, один, кожен, будь-який*. Compare:

Have you an interesting book? — *Є у вас (якась) цікава книжка?*

I've bought a very interesting book. — *Я купив (одну) дуже цікаву книжку.*

A child can understand that. — *(Будь-яка, кожна) дитина зможе це зрозуміти.*

Here is the book you want to read. — *Ось (та) книжка, яку ви хочете читати.*

The boy ran home. — *(Цей) хлопець побіг додому.*

The difference lies in the fact that in English the presence of the article is obligatory in the mentioned cases, whereas in Ukrainian the usage of the mentioned pronouns is optional. The meaning of the sentence does not change whether they are present before the noun or not.

Sometimes the Ukrainian sentence sounds better if before a noun there is a pronoun, equivalent to the English article: *Хто це приніс?* — *Якийсь маленький хлопчик*. Compare: *Маленький хлопчик*.

In many cases the presence of such pronouns before nouns is felt as unnecessary, though possible according to the sense of the sentence, and makes the Ukrainian sentence less common. Compare: *Коли я йшов додому, я зустрів якусь жінку. Ця жінка несла якусь велику корзину. Ця корзина була, мабуть, дуже важка ...* It would be more natural to say: *Коли я йшов додому, я зустрів жінку. Жінка несла велику корзину. Корзина була, мабуть, дуже важка ...*

When the usage of some of the pronouns *цей, той, якийсь, який-небудь, будь-який, кожен, один* before the noun is obligatory, that is

it cannot be omitted without changing the meaning of the sentence, then the corresponding English sentence will not contain an article but one of pronouns *this, that, any, every, each* or the numeral *one* in this place. Compare, e.g.:

Ви можете взяти будь-яку книжку. — You may take any book.

Thus, the mentioned above Ukrainian determiners of a noun have a more independent meaning regarding it than the article regarding the noun in the English language.

While in Ukrainian the meaning of definiteness or indefiniteness is rendered in such cases beyond the boundaries of a separate word but within the boundaries of a word combination, in English this shade of meaning is brought in by an article, a word-morpheme, into the meaning of a separate word. (Тоді як в українській мові значення означеності або неозначеності в подібних випадках передається поза межами окремого слова в межах словосполучення, в англійській мові цей відтінок вноситься артиклем, тобто словом-морфемою, в значення окремого слова.) [5; 48–51].

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. Characterize prepositions as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages. What type of relations do they express?
2. What are the groups of prepositions differentiated according to their structure in the English language?
3. What types of Ukrainian prepositions can be singled out according to their origin?
4. Characterize conjunctions as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages. What type of relations do they express?
5. What types of conjunctions can be differentiated in English and Ukrainian languages?
6. Describe particles as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages.

7. Dwell upon the types of particles in two contrasted languages. Point out towards similarities and differences in distinguishing groups of particles.
8. Characterize “modal words” as a part of speech. What type of modality do they express?
9. What are the groups of modal words differentiated in the English language?
10. Dwell upon the problems of differentiating “modal words” into a separate part of speech in Ukrainian.
11. Characterize interjections as a part of speech.
12. What is the difference between “primary” and “secondary” interjections in English and Ukrainian languages?
13. Present the classification of interjections based on the semantic principle. Provide examples in both languages.
14. Characterize the English article as a part of speech. Dwell upon the problems of its grammatical nature description in the English language in comparison with other Germanic languages.
15. What are the means of rendering the English article into the Ukrainian language?

II. Underline prepositions in the sentences/passages below. Comment upon the types of found prepositions.

a) in the English language:

1. Eleven fifty with the tip (conversation).
2. And she is in the new situation (conversation).
3. She’s still on the phone (conversation).
4. He’ll go with one of the kids (conversation).
5. Late one morning in June, in the thirty first year of his life, a message was brought to Michael K as he raked leaves in the De Waal Park (fiction writing).
6. You can’t, you can’t rely on any of that information (conversation).
7. She confided in him above all others (fiction writing).

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 28–29.

b) in the Ukrainian language:

Прийменник. Прийменник — частина мови, на перший погляд неважлива.

І справді, яким чином можуть дрібненькі слова впливати на зміст довжелезних, закручених, сповнених високого змісту речень?

Але ж маємо визнати, що така, здавалося б, непомітна частина мови відіграє далеко не останню роль у сприйнятті вилитих на папір думок. Більше того, неправильне вживання прийменників може призвести до цілковитого спотворення змісту написаного (або вимовленого). “Над” чи “під”, “до” чи “після” — ось вони, слова, яким притаманна особлива цінність. Позбавлені будь-якої емоційної забарвленості, експресивності, здатності викликати яскраві образи, вони виявляються не просто ультра-функціональними, а й зручними у застосуванні.

До речі, недарма під час вивчення іноземних мов вживанню прийменників завжди приділяють увагу, яку невтаємничені називають надмірною.

Отже, не варто недооцінювати значення прийменників, коли йдеться про непересічний процес оформлення потоку думок у вишукані речення.

Пам’ятаймо про прийменники! (Євгенія Афіногорова)

*The material is taken from the article “Цікава морфологія” // Урок Української. — № 5–6, 2006. — P. 54.

III. Underline conjunctions in the sentences/passages below. Comment upon the types of found conjunctions.

a) in the English language:

1. Mother and I saw it (conversation).
2. I don’t want to speak too soon, but I think I have been fairly consistent this season (newspaper writing).

3. Is this necessarily good or bad? (academic writing).
4. The donkeys did not come back, nor did the eleven men, nor did the helicopter (fiction writing).
5. The couple were both shoved and jostled (conversation).
6. It's yes or no, isn't it? Either you agree with it or you don't agree with it (newspaper writing).
7. We used not only the colors reflected from mineral surfaces but also the colors transmitted through minerals in microscopic thin sections (academic writing).
8. Neither Zack nor Jane had slept that night, but they looked happy anyway (fiction writing).
9. You can hold her if you want (conversation).
10. As they watched, a flash of fire appeared (fiction writing).

*The material is taken from “Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English” by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 30–31.

b) in the Ukrainian language:

Словідь ... сполучника. Неподобство! Куди поділася справедливість? Завжди вона десь вештається, коли треба втішити ображену душу. Кожна з частин мови має назву, що значною мірою віддзеркалює її сутність. Дієслово — тут і некуку зрозуміло: слово дії, руху, зміни, у ньому криються динаміка і статика, мінливість та спокій. Іменник — це ім'я, назва. Вказівка на предмет, а прикметник — ознака, його характерна риса. Числівник — кількість, а вигук — і пояснювати соромно. Чому ж тоді сполучник є сполучником? Хіба це вичерпна характеристика його різнобічної діяльності? Ну. Гаразд, ніде правди діти, поєднав кілька разів самотні серця, себто слова, примирив друзів. Що посварилися, познайомив новеньких. Іншим разом навіть клонуватися довелось, щоб зібрати цілий гурт однодумців (однорідних членів речення, хто не зрозумів). Навіть на поступки йшов: то вигукував дзвінко “і”, якщо поряд видніється привітний приголосний, то переходив на таємничий “й”, коли помічав неподалік голос-

ного. Але ж це — лише один із образів, у які втілюється сполучник. Хіба можна залишити без уваги його чудернацьку звичку протиставляти одне поняття іншому, знаходячи в одного з них певну перевагу й не ображаючи при цьому іншого? І знову ж, зверніть увагу: як блискавично він виплутується з тенет тавтології. *Але, та, проте, зате, однак* — протиставляйте на здоров'я, від цього вишуканість вашої мови ніскільки не постраждає. А хто прийде на допомогу, коли треба розборонити розбишак, які, немов молоді півники, готові атакувати одне одного?

Коли, зрештою, автор перебуває у стані глибокого сумніву і прагне підкреслити це вишуканим слівцем? *Чи то ... чи то, не то ... не то, або ... або, чи ... чи* — на будь-який смак! Та ці уміння становлять лише мізерну частину того, на що спроможна така, здавалося б, непомітна частина мови. Хто, як не вона, майстерно порівняє явища шляхом їх зіставлення? Сполучник, більше нікому. А за потреби він може так змінитися, що й годі упізнати: *не тільки ... а й, не лише ... але й, як ... так і...* ось вам і “непомітний” (такий його різновид називається градаційним).

Чому ж ми зупиняємось на слові “сполучник”? Так само він може іменуватися єднальником, зіставником, а то і геть незвично — градаційником. Хоча ... напевно, з усіх названих функцій єднання є найважливішою, адже сила наша — в єдності (Анна Руденко).

*The material is taken from the article “Цікава морфологія” // Урок Української. — № 5–6, 2006. — Р. 53–54.

IV. Underline particles in the given sentences and analyze them according to their meaning: 1) particles, expressing different shades of meaning of words, word combinations or sentences (частки, що виражають різні змістові відтінки значення слів, словосполучень або речень: а) вказівні (*ось, он, онде*); б) означальні (*саме, якраз, точно*), в) видільні (*навіть, тільки, лише*); 2) particles, expressing different shades of modal meanings (частки, що виражають модальні і модально-вольові відтінки значень: а) власне модальні (**мовляв, мабуть, ніби**); б) стверджувальні (*так, еге, атож*); в) заперечні (*не, ні, ані*); г) питальні (*чи, хіба*,

невже); 3) emotion expressing or emotion-strengthening particles (емоційно-експресивні та експресивно-підсилювальні частки (як, що за, адже)). **Make up your own sentences with different types of particles in Ukrainian and think of their equivalents in English.**

1. От сонечко вже за синю гору запало, от уже й вечір (Марко Вовчок).
2. Сиділи ми в садку, там саме зацвітало і сипався з каштанів білий цвіт (Леся Українка).
3. Прийди хоч уві сні і нахились до мене (В. Сосюра).
4. Навряд чи десь по інших країнах співають так гарно й голосисто, як у нас на Україні (О. Довженко).
5. — По-твоєму, то всі б то люди готові поїсти одні других? — Атож! Авжеж готові! (І. Нечуй-Левицький).
6. Тихо, любо жилося дитині, і ніщо не сушило серденька (Леся Українка).
7. Невже справжній смак свободи можна відчутти лише в обмеженнях її? (О. Гончар).
8. Яке се щастя! Я можу зараз волю ту вволити, бо вілла та моя! (Леся Українка).

*The material is taken from the text-book: Сучасна українська мова: Підручник / За ред. О.Д. Пономарева. — К. : Либідь, 2001. — Р. 214–216.

V. Underline parenthetic words and word-combinations in the sentences below. Analyze them according to the modal meaning they express in the sentence.

1. Цей рух доречний, може, тільки в танці (Л. Костенко).
2. Це, може, навіть і не вірші, а квіти, кинуті тобі! (Л. Костенко).
3. Коли люди помирають, про них, певна річ, думаєш краще, ніж вони були насправді (Ф. Карр).
4. Можливо б, їм пізнати інші злети не там, де стало серце на причал (Л. Забашта).

5. Мабуть, найбільше диво на землі — звичайна жінка з іменем дружина (В. Дарда).

*The material is taken from the article “Головецька Наталія. Може бути і вставним, і реченням” // Урок Української. — № 2–3, 2007. — Р. 39.

VI. Make up sentences of your own with the following parenthetical words/ word combinations. Render these sentences into English. Analyze the ways of rendering Ukrainian parenthetical words/word combinations into English.

Безумовно, на радість, як водиться, по-перше, з погляду, що-правда, без сумніву, як навмисне, на думку, крім того, безперечно, як на біду, навпаки, по-твоєму, а втім, нівроку, навдивовижу, будь ласка, пам’ятаю, між іншим, зрештою.

VII. Underline interjections in the sentences given below. Analyze them according to the meaning they express. Render these English sentences into Ukrainian. Compare English interjections with their Ukrainian equivalents.

1. Oh how awful! How absolutely naff!
2. A: Nicky got that for him.
B: Oh, did she?
A: Yeah? I think so.
3. A: They’re chocolates.
B: Ah isn’t that nice.
4. Oh wow, they really did that tree nice. Wow. (AmE) <admiring decorations>
5. A: How big was it?
B: Four pounds.
A: Ooh, that’s little. <talking of a premature birth>
6. Whoops, easy Chester. Chester down. Thank you. <talking to a dog>
7. A: She burnt popcorn back there.
B: Ugh it reeks.

8. Ow! I've got the stomach ache.
9. Ouch my neck hurts.
10. A: Hi Margaret.
B: Hi.
11. A: Hello, Joyce.
B: Good morning, Bob.
12. A: Okay. Bye. Butch.
B: Bye Butch, bye Marc.
13. A: Oh. Goodbye Robin.
B: See you later. Thank you for a lift. Love you lots.

*The material is taken from "Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English" by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 450.

VIII. Underline all the articles in the following piece of writing. Describe their function from the grammatical point of view. Render this passage into Ukrainian. Analyze means of rendering English articles into Ukrainian.

A 12-year-old boy got mad at his parents Friday night because they refused to let him go fishing on to the Colorado River with relatives. So, while his parents were distracted during a barbecue with eight adult friends, he slipped away from his sister and three brothers, snatched the keys to a Volkswagen Beetle and drove off in one of his parent's four cars, prompting fears that he had been kidnapped. <...> El Cajon police sent teletype descriptions of the curly haired, 90-pound sixth-grader to law enforcement agencies throughout Southern California and the Arizona border area. The boy was found unharmed — but scared and sleepy — at about noon yesterday by San Diego County sheriff's deputies (newspaper writing).

*The material is taken from "Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English" by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 68.

CHAPTER 9

Syntax: introduction into basic notions

1. Sentence as the basic unit of syntax

The basic unit of syntax is the sentence. There exist many definitions of the sentence, but none of them is generally accepted. But in the majority of cases speakers actually experience no difficulty in separating one sentence from another in their native tongue. This is reflected in writing, where the graphic form of each sentence is separated by punctuation marks (?!) from its neighbours.

Though a sentence contains words, it is not merely a group of words (or other units), but something integral, a structural unity built in accordance with one of the patterns existing in a given language. All the sounds of a sentence are united by typical intonation. All the meanings are interlaced according to some pattern to make one communication.

A communication is a directed thought. Much in the same way as the position of a point or the direction of a line in space is fixed with the help of a system of coordinates, there exists a system of coordinates to fix the position or direction of a thought in speech. Naturally, only phenomena present at every act of speech can serve as the axes of coordinates. They are: a) the act of speech, b) the speaker (or the writer); c) reality (as viewed by the speaker).

The act of speech is the event with which all other events mentioned in the sentence are correlated in time. This correlation is fixed in English and other languages grammatically in the category of tense and lexically in such words as *now, yesterday, tomorrow*, etc.

The speaker is the person with whom other persons and things mentioned in the sentence are correlated. This correlation is fixed grammatically in the category of person of the verb and lexico-grammatically in such words as *I, you, he, she, it, they, student, river*, etc.

Reality is either accepted as the speaker sees it, or an attempt is made to change it, or some irrealty is fancied. Compare: *The door is shut. Shut the door. If the door were shut ...* The attitude towards reality is fixed grammatically in the category of mood and lexically or lexico-grammatically in words like *must, may, probably*, etc.

The three relations — to the act of speech, to the speaker and to reality — can be summarized as the relation to the **situation of speech**. Now the relation of the thought of a sentence to the situation of speech is called **predicativity** (предикативність — відношення змісту речення до дійсності). This is the name of the system of coordinates directing the thought of a sentence and distinguishing a sentence from any group of words. **Predicativity** is an essential part of the **content** of the sentence. The **sentence** can thus be defined as a *communication unit made up of words (and word-morphemes) in conformity with their combinability, united by predicativity and intonation* [25; 220–224].

In the same way as the word serves to name certain objects of extra-linguistic reality, the sentence serves to name situations involving these objects. No object is static. Objects interact, being in constant change, movement. Thus, the relations between objects, events happening to them create the situation reflected in every act of speech.

Much in the same way as the word has its form and content, the sentence also has its form and its content, being a bilateral sign. The content of the sentence is called in other words its *deep structure*, its outer form (the string of words/word-forms, united in conformity with grammatical rules and combinability patterns) — *the surface structure*. One and the same deep structure can be expressed with the help of different surface structures, nevertheless being related by transformational rules. For example, to express the situation, where the “boy” (the doer of the action) “throws” (the action itself) the “ball” (the object upon which the action is directed) there are at least two surface structures: 1) the sentence in the active voice: *The boy throws the ball*, and

2) the sentence in the passive voice: *The ball is thrown by the boy.*

Within a sentence, the word or combination of words containing the meaning of predicativity may be called the **predication**, the grammatical employment of predicativity (предикація — граматичне втілення предикативності).

In the sentence *He considered it for a minute* the predication is *he considered*. *He* indicates the person, *considered* — the tense and mood components of predicativity.

In the sentence *Tell me something* there is one-word predication *tell* containing the mood component of predicativity. The person component is only implied. As we know, imperative mood grammemes have the lexico-grammatical meaning of the “second person”.

The main parts of the sentence (головні члени речення) are those whose function is to make the predication. They are the subject and the predicate of the sentence.

The subject tells us whether the predication involves the speaker (*I, we ...*), his interlocutor (*you ...*) or some other person or thing (*he, John, the forest, ...*). The predicate may also tell us something about the person, but it usually does not supply any new information, neither does the predicate add information as to the number of persons or things involved. In this sense we say that the predicate depends on the subject. But in expressing the tense and mood components of predicativity the predicate is independent.

Since a person or thing denoted by any noun or noun equivalent (except *I, we* and *you*) is the “third person” and a sentence may contain several nouns, there must be something in the sentence to show which of the nouns is the subject of the predication. The Indo-European languages use the following devices:

- a) the nominative case (*Зустрів зайця ведмідь*);
- b) grammatical combinability (*Квіти сонце люблять. Квіти сонце любить*);
- c) the position of the noun (*Буття визначає свідомість. Свідомість визначає буття*).

In English the nominative case has been preserved only with six pronouns. Grammatical combinability is important but it plays a much

smaller role than in Ukrainian. It is not observed, for instance, in cases like *I (he, she, they, John, the students) spoke ...*. So the position of the noun or noun-equivalent is of the greatest importance. E.g.: *John showed Peter a book of his.*

When position and combinability clash/coincide, position is usually decisive, as in the sentence *George's is the brilliant idea. George's are brilliant ideas.* The subject is *George's*, though the predicates agree in number with the nouns *idea, ideas.*

2. The expression of syntactic relations

The character of formal means of rendering the syntactic relations is a determining one for the language structure. That is why in this respect the Ukrainian language as a flexional language differs strongly from the English language as an analytical one.

In Ukrainian the syntactic relations, that is relations between sentences and their members, are expressed with the help of flexions, auxiliary and pronoun words, the word order and intonation.

The most widespread means of expression of word relations in the Ukrainian language is the flexion. Prepositions are also widely used for this purpose. They are combined with the forms of indirect cases of nouns or pronouns (as well as numerals) since exactly in this function the mentioned parts of speech can perform functions of dependent (coordinated) sentence members. Word order in Ukrainian has mainly an auxiliary meaning.

Within grammar pairs the most widespread types of syntactic means in Ukrainian are: **agreement** (узгодження) [5; 118], for example: *наступного дня, усім трьом, на першому поверсі*; **government** (керування), for example: *корисний усім, усіх розважав, усміхнувся від задоволення*; and **adjoinment** (прилягання), for example: *досконало перевірити, його задум, рушив услід*. In English these types of relations between the elements of a subordinate word-group are also present: agreement (*this book*), adjoinment (*to go quickly*), government (*to be fond of smth.*). In **agreement** the subordinate

element gets the same grammatical meaning as the kernel one. In English 24% of word-groups are joined this way, whereas in Ukrainian — 53%. When the grammatical meaning of the kernel element demands from the subordinate element one particular grammatical meaning we speak of the **government**. In English 39% of word-groups have this way of connection and in Ukrainian — 32%. As for **adjoinment** — the elements are joined without changing their forms. Such groups are spread in English (37%), whereas in Ukrainian they present a minority — 15% [12; 197–198].

For the English language of great importance is the word order. The word order is crucial for differentiating the subject and the predicate, the subject and the object etc. Such a heavy grammatical load of the word order leads to the idea that its possibilities to be used not for grammar purposes are very limited ones. For example, in Ukrainian in order to make the story narration more vivid and lively or vice versa to give it a smooth character there is a possibility to move words. In English it is not possible since you can destroy the syntactic relations between words. For example, the sentence *Петро читає книжки* at changing the word order can have six variants whereas in English it has the only possible variant *Peter reads books*.

The specific way to express word relations in English is the so-called **enclosurement** (замикання). It is characteristic to this or that extent of all Germanic languages. In English it is mainly found in attributive word groups, the first member of which is the article or some other determiner of the noun. At enclosurement the border members of the word groups are drawn apart creating as if the frame for attributes belonging to this word combination: *his long new coat*.

3. The classification of sentences as to their structure

Sentences with only one predication are called **simple** sentences. Those with more than one predication usually have the name of **composite** sentences. In a composite sentence each predication together with the words attached is called a **clause**.

Composite sentences with coordinated clauses are **compound** sentences, e.g.: *She is a very faithful creature and I trust her.*

Composite sentences containing subordinated clauses are **complex** sentences, e.g.: *If I let this chance slip, I am a fool.*

In a complex sentence we distinguish the principal clause (*I am a fool*) and the subordinate clause (*If I let this chance slip*) or clauses.

There may be several degrees of subordination in a complex sentence, e.g.: *It was almost nine o'clock before he reached the club, where he found his friend sitting alone.* The clause *where he found his friend sitting alone* is subordinated to the subordinate clause *before he reached the club* and is therefore of the second degree of subordination.

The clauses of a composite sentence may be joined with the help of connective words (**syndetically**) or directly, without connectives (**asyndetically**). E.g.:

Mike acted as though nothing had happened. You are modern; I am old-fashioned.

A simple sentence or a clause containing some words besides the predication is called **extended**. An **unextended** sentence (clause) contains no other parts but the subject and the predicate.

A sentence (clause) with several subjects to one predicate or several predicates to one subject is called a **contracted** one (скорочений, стягнений). E.g.: *Dianna crossed to the window and stood there with her back to Dan.*

The dominating type of sentence (clause), with full predication, i.e. containing both the subject and the predicate, is called a **two-member** sentence (clause). All other types are usually called one-member sentences (clauses). Here are some examples of **one-member** sentences, e.g.: *A cup of tea! Thanks!* [25; 240–241].

4. One-member sentences (однокладні речення)

In both languages two-member sentences are most widely used. These are sentences that have two main parts of the sentence: the subject and the predicate. One-member sentences, which have only one main part

of the sentence, are used in English more rarely. In Ukrainian this type of the sentence is more spread and more diverse.

Common for both languages are the following types of one-member sentences:

- 1) Nominative sentences (називні), e.g.: *Thomas, Sir. A man of facts and calculations. Вечір. Ніч.*
- 2) Imperative sentences (наказові), e.g.: *Come here at once. Іди сюди негайно.*
- 3) Infinitive sentences (інфінітивні), e.g.: *To be lonely and to grow older and older.* Especially widespread is this kind of sentences in Ukrainian where the infinitive by its function in the sentence has become similar to the personal form of the verb. E.g.: *Що робити? За людьми іти ... Оце й робити!*

Besides, in Ukrainian there are widely used other types of one-member sentences which have as their correspondences two-member sentences in English, in particular:

- 1) Impersonal sentences (безособові): *Сутеніє. It is getting dark.*
- 2) Indefinite-personal sentences (неозначено-особові): *Кажуть, що його немає. They say he is out.*
- 3) Generalizing-personal (узагальнено-особові): *Дарованим конем не наїздишся. You mustn't change horses in the mid-stream.*
- 4) Sentences with unchangeable predicate-words (речення з незмінними присудковими словами): *можна, шкода, треба, слід* та ін.: *Треба йти додому. It is necessary to go home (I must go home).*
- 5) Sentences with adverbs of the type (речення з прислівниками): *Йому весело зараз. He is rather jolly now.*
- 6) Sentences with unchangeable verbal predicate forms in -но, -то (речення з незмінними дієслівними присудковими формами на *-но, -то*): *Під білими березами козаченька вбито. Under white birches a Cossack was killed.*
- 7) Different types of sentences with the subject which is not named or is avoided to be named (різні типи речень з усуненим або

не названим підметом): *I більше його там не бачили. And he wasn't seen there any more. Кажє, приходь. They say, you can come* [5; 121–122].

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. Define the sentence as the basic unit of syntax.
2. What are the phenomena, present at every act of speech?
3. What is the relation between such notions as “predicativity” and “predication”?
4. Dwell upon the expression of syntactic relations in both contrasted languages.
5. How are sentences classified as to their structure?
6. What is meant by the “clause”? What is the difference between syndetically and asyndetically connected clauses?
7. Describe the difference between “one-member” and “two-member sentences”.
8. Dwell upon the types of one-member sentences in both contrasted languages.

II. Find the head-word and the word/words subordinate to it; analyze the following word-combinations as to the type of syntactic relations expressed by them: 1) predicative relations; 2) objective relations; 3) attributive relations; 4) various adverbial relations. Render these word combinations into Ukrainian; compare the types of relations expressed by English word-combinations and their Ukrainian equivalents.

Cane sugar production, the House of Commons debate, you British, the way out, the wish to win, no go, yes man, the then trial, reading quickly, busy doing sums, red from anger, black all over, quick to answer, heavy for me to lift, simply awful, typically English, least of all, much older than he, the first to read, the three there, two to one, three fifths, the last ones, rather well, high up in the sky, quite alike, afraid

of being asked first, not ashamed to answer, the child ashamed, the book there, nobody to report, the one ahead, twice as many, more than necessary, extremely cold, being home, by going westwards.

*The material is taken from the text-book: Корунець І.В. Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов. Навч. посібник. — Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2003. — Р. 451.

III. Define the type of connection between the head-word and the subordinated word in the following word combinations as: 1) agreement (узгодження); 2) government (керування); 3) adjoinment (прилягання). Render these Ukrainian word-combinations into English; analyze the type of connections between words in English equivalents.

1. Зустрілися біля театру.
2. Червоний від хвилювання.
3. Моє захоплення.
4. Їхня участь.
5. На протилежному боці.
6. Обережніше кладіть.
7. Найдоступніший з усіх.
8. Ключі від помешкання.
9. Трохи поспішає.
10. Лігши на диван.
11. Бажання знати.
12. За п'ять місяців.
13. Пригорнув до себе.
14. Казкові мрії.
15. Занадто добре.
16. У глибині сцени.
17. Невгамовне серце.
18. З кожним ударом.
19. Переповівши почуте.
20. Ішов не поспішаючи.

*The material is taken from the text-book: Терлак З. Українська мова: Збірник вправ із синтаксису та пунктуації. — Львів: Світ, 1999. — Р. 11.

IV. Define the type of the Ukrainian one-member sentence as: 1) definite-personal (означено-особове); 2) indefinite-personal (неозначено-особове); 3) generalizing personal (узагальнено-особове); 4) impersonal (безособове); 5) nominative (називне). Render these sentences into English and define which types are similarly rendered as one-member sentences.

1. Сміливо ж, браття, до праці ставайте! (Б. Грінченко).
2. Як тихо й любо навкруги! (Олександр Олесь).
3. На головніших київських вулицях починали засвічувати ліхтарі (О. Кониський).
4. Невже ж нема на цьому світі місця поривам нездійсненим та палким? (Б.-І. Антонович).
5. Поле. Шляхи. Могили і чебреці, чебреці (М. Хвильовий).
6. Мені вас не судити (Леся Українка).
7. Вірю в пам'ять і серце людське (Б. Олійник).
8. Старого горобця на полові не обдуриш (Н. тв.).
9. Довіку не буде із мене раба (В. Стус).
10. Блакить і білява. Сопілок перемови. Вітровіння (Б. І. Антонович).

*The material is taken from the text-book: Терлак З. Українська мова: Збірник вправ із синтаксису та пунктуації. — Львів: Світ, 1999. — Р. 60.

CHAPTER 10

The simple sentence. Parts of the sentence

Traditionally the subject and the predicate are regarded as the primary or principal parts of the sentence and the attribute, the object and the adverbial modifier — as the secondary parts of the sentence. This opposition primary — secondary is justified by the difference in function. While the subject and the predicate make the predication and thus constitute the sentence, the secondary parts serve to expand it by being added to the words of the predication in accordance with their combinability as words. Thus the sentence combines syntactical or morphological relations.

So the chief criterion for the division of all words of a sentence into parts of the sentence is their combinability. Thus combinability is the property that correlates parts of speech and parts of the sentence as well as the functions of notional and semi-notional words.

Those notional words in a sentence which are adjuncts of certain head-words will be divided in accordance with their head-words into **attributes, complements and extensions**.

Those semi-notional words which serve to connect two words or clauses (prepositions, conjunctions) will be regarded as a separate part of the sentence, **connectives**.

Those semi-notional words that are used to specify various words or word combinations (articles, particles) will be called **specifiers**.

Finally, words in a sentence, with zero connections, referring to the sentence as a whole and known as **parenthetical elements**, are a distinct part of the sentence [25; 249–251].

1. The subject

The subject is the independent member of a two-member predication, containing the person component of predicativity. Both members of the predication *he sleeps* contain the meaning of “person”. But in *sleeps* this meaning depends on that of *he* and is due to grammatical combinability. This accounts for the fact that *sleeps* cannot make a sentence alone, though it contains all the components of predicativity. *Sleeps* likewise depends on *he* as far as the meaning of “number” is concerned. The meanings of “person” and “number” in *he* are lexicogrammatical and independent.

The subject is usually defined as a word or a group of words denoting the thing we speak about. This traditional definition is rather logical than grammatical. The subject of a simple sentence can be a word, a syntactical word-morpheme (in English — *there, it*) or a complex. As a word it can belong to different parts of speech, but it is mostly a noun or a pronoun, e.g.:

Fame is the thirst of youth (G. Byron).

Nothing endures but personal qualities (W. Whitman).

To see is to believe [25; 251–252].

In Ukrainian the subject is most frequently expressed by the nominative case of the noun or personal pronoun. Other parts of speech can be used in the function of the subject only when they are substantivized. The function of the compound subject is performed in Ukrainian usually by the combination of the cardinal numeral with the noun or by the combination of two nouns, joined either by a conjunction or the preposition “з”. At this the cardinal numeral is used in the form of the nominative predicate: *Їхало двоє молодих хлопців*.

In English the nominative case is pertaining only to personal and some interrogative or relative pronouns. This nominative case is more specialized than the corresponding form of the noun in Ukrainian. It is gradually being eliminated from the compound predicate. Compare: *It's me* instead of *It's I* and its meaning is narrowed to the meaning of the subject function.

Subjectless sentences (apart from imperative sentences) are practically not used in the English sentence. The peculiarity of the English language is the existence of the formal subject alongside the notional one. It is expressed by the word deprived of its lexical meaning and is necessary only to form the sentence from the structural point of view. The notional subject (повнозначний підмет) always expresses a certain acting person (or object) and is used in personal sentences. The formal subject (формальний або службовий підмет) does not express any acting person or object. It is always used in impersonal sentences.

In Ukrainian subjectless sentences are widely used. Especially often the subject is missing in negative sentences where the center of the construction becomes the word *немає*, e.g.: *Тут немає стола*. Almost all Ukrainian subjectless sentences correspond to English sentences with the subject. Compare: *Кажуть*. *They say*. *Сутеніє*. *It is getting dark*.

In English the formal subject *it* is widely used in sentences with predicates that have the following meaning:

- 1) With the simple or compound predicate that points out towards the nature phenomenon: *It was cold*. *Було холодно*.
- 2) With the compound predicate that has modal or evaluating meaning: *It was difficult*. *It was evident*. *Було важко*. *Було очевидно*.
- 3) With the compound predicate pointing out towards the time or space: *It was nine*. *It was five miles to the town*. *Була дев'ята година*. *До міста було п'ять миль*.
- 4) with the simple predicate, expressed by the passive form of the verb, which points towards the fact that the content of the sentence is some general idea: *It is said ... Кажуть ...* [5; 122–125].

In the majority of cases the subject in English and Ukrainian sentences is expressed by similar parts of speech. But the peculiarities of the English language in this respect are the following:

- 1) The role of the subject can be widely performed by the non-verbal part of speech — gerund, e.g.: *Smoking is bad for health*.

In Ukrainian there are no such verb forms and in these cases subordinate sentences are widely used;

- 2) The role of the subject can be performed by the gerundial construction, e.g.: *John's coming here will spoil everything.*

To conclude, if we compare the subject in English with that in Ukrainian we shall find the following differences between them.

1. In modern Ukrainian the subject is as a rule characterized by a distinct morphological feature — the nominative case, whereas in English it is for the most part (unless it is expressed by a personal pronoun or the pronoun *who* in the nominative case) indicated by the position it occupies in the sentence.
2. In modern Ukrainian the subject is much less obligatory as a part of the sentence than in English. One-member sentences are numerous and of various types, among them sentences like *Прійди. Нуше.* In English a finite verb (except the 'imperative mood' forms) does not, as a rule, make a sentence without a subject.
3. In English the subject may be a syntactical word-morpheme, a gerund or a complex, which is naturally alien to Ukrainian.

2. The predicate

2.1. The simple predicate

The predicate is the member of predication containing the mood and tense (or only mood) components of predicativity. E.g.: *I would hate to make you cry.*

The predicate can be a word or a syntactical word-morpheme (in English — *does, will*).

When a predicate is a semi-notional verb or a syntactical word-morpheme, it is only a structural predicate and is usually connected with a notional word which makes the notional predicate, e.g.: *He was strong enough for that. Does anyone know about it but me?* [25; 254–255].

Since the conjugation of the English verb has a lot of analytical forms the characteristic feature of the English simple predicate is the fact that it can be expressed in many cases by analytical verb forms. In Ukrainian it happens rather rarely since the availability of analytical verb forms is not numerous here.

The simple predicate of the English sentence includes as well predicates expressed by the verb with the postpositive attachment of the type *stand up*, as well as idiomatic word combinations, which have the meaning of the common verbal lexeme, e.g.: *give way* — *поступається*, *take courage* — *зважитися*, *have a smoke* — *покурити* etc. In connection with this the analytical expression of the predicate is still more widespread in English.

In both languages the predicate reveals its syntactic connection with the subject by means of the grammatical agreement with it (узгодження). But since the English verb has much fewer categorical forms (in particular the form of person, gender and number) the possibilities of coordination between the subject and the predicate are much fewer.

The predicate in the English sentence always has its certain place depending on the type of the sentence. In the affirmative sentence it stands after the subject, e.g.: *He came here in the morning*. In interrogative sentences the simple predicate is mainly expressed analytically, where the help verb is placed before the subject, whereas its notional part stands after it: *Did he come here in the morning?*

By this fact the English language differs not only from the Ukrainian, but also from a lot of other languages: Russian, French, German and others. While in these languages at questioning only the intonation and the word order is changed, in English the form of the verb itself is changed: instead of the synthetic form the analytical one is used: *You know him. Do you know him?* [5; 125–126].

When comparing the predicates in English and in Ukrainian, we must first of all note the absence of syntactical word-morphemes used as predicates and the scarcity of word-morphemes in Ukrainian. So the division into structural and notional (parts of) predicates is not as essential in Ukrainian as it is in English.

Secondly, there are many more sentences without finite verbs in Ukrainian than in English. *Він студент. Вона красуня. Кому їхати?*

Thirdly, Ukrainian predication contains a predicate without a subject much more often than in English.

2.2. The compound nominal predicate (складений іменний присудок).

The peculiarity of all eastern-Slavonic languages, including Ukrainian, is the fact that they mostly do not use the linking verb *бути* in the present tense: *Скромність — його характерна риса*. In English the linking verb *be* is never omitted since it is caused by the necessity of finishing the sentence structurally.

Among linking verbs of the Ukrainian language the linking verb *бути* has the smallest lexical load. The rest of linking verbs point towards the character of the realization of some characteristics of the subject expressed by the nominal part of the predicate, that is predicative.

According to their meaning Ukrainian linking verbs are subdivided into such main groups:

- 1) Linking verbs showing the availability of a certain characteristic or state or the name of some object: *бути, значити, зватися, називатися*: *Вона була вдовою*.
- 2) Linking verbs showing that the object characteristic is the process of formation and is new to it: *стати, ставати, робитися, зробитися, опинитися*: *Дуже ти став розумний*.
- 3) Linking verbs showing the preservation of the previous state: *лишатися, зостатися*: *Лице його зоставалося спокійне*.
- 4) Linking verbs showing the characteristic feature as unreal or ascribed: *здаватися, вважатися, уявлятися*: *Він здавався мені хоробрим* [5; 126–127].

The peculiarity of English linking verbs is the availability of such of them that are maximally expressing only the grammar meaning, not a lexical one: *be, become, grow*.

The classification of English linking verbs is in many ways similar to the mentioned Ukrainian one:

- 1) Linking verbs of “existence” (“буття”) showing the availability of a certain characteristic, its belonging to a certain class: *be, feel, go, come, stand: The boy felt cold.*
- 2) Linking verbs of “retaining” (“збереження”) of a certain characteristic: *remain, keep, hold, stay, rest, continue: They hold strong in spite of difficulties.*
- 3) Linking verbs of “becoming” (“становлення”): *become, turn, get, grow, come, go, make (and others): Becoming aware of the approaching danger she turned pale.*

2.3. The compound verbal predicate (складений дієслівний присудок).

This type of compound predicate also consists of two parts: the auxiliary part expressed by the verb in the personal form and the notional part expressed by the infinitive (sometimes gerund) of another verb rendering the action of the subject.

In both languages the compound verbal predicate can usually be of three kinds:

- 1) Modal, formed by combining of the modal verbs with the infinitive: *We can speak English. Ми можемо відпочити.*
- 2) Aspect, in which the auxiliary part points towards the beginning, end, continuation, repetition or becoming of some action performed by the subject: *She began singing. Сонце почало підніматися.*
- 3) Nominal-verbal modal predicate, in which the infinitive is attached to the compound nominal predicate, the nominal part of which is expressed by adjective or participle and points towards relation to the action expressed by the infinitive: *I am obliged to do my best. Необхідно рушати вперед [5; 128–129].*

3. The object

In both contrasted languages there can be distinguished the following types of objects: 1) according to the type of connection with a verb or some other governing word — prepositional object and non-prepositional object (прийменниковий та безприйменниковий додатки); 2) according to the grammatical meaning — direct and indirect objects (прямий та непрямий додатки).

3.1. The direct object

In Ukrainian the direct object is as a rule expressed by the form of the accusative case of the noun, pronoun or some other substantivized part of speech. It is used without a preposition and depends directly on the transitive verb, for example: *Я бачив дивний сон* (І. Франко).

The peculiarity of the Ukrainian language is the fact that in negative sentences (similar to the Russian language) the direct object can be expressed in the form of the genitive case, for example: *Він не читав газет*. The object is expressed via the same form when the action, expressed by the transitive verb, is directed not at the whole object, but only at its part, for example: *Я дав йому води. Ми купили меду*.

The specific features of the Ukrainian language are:

1. The parallel use of two forms in plural in order to define the names of living beings (except people's names). While the direct object, used to define the names of people, has the form of the accusative case, common with the form of the genitive case, to define the names of animals, it is used both in the form common with the genitive case, and in the form common with the accusative case: *виховую дітей*, but *доглядаю овець (вівці), кіз (кози)*.
2. The usage of the direct object in the form of the genitive case singular to define the temporary ceasation of the action directed at the object or sometimes altogether without any special features: *взяв ножа, попросив олівець, одержав листа*.

The usage of the direct object in the form of the genitive case is met at defining inanimate objects in plural: *співали веселих пісень* (in parallel with *співали пісні*).

In English the direct object can be expressed by the noun only in the common case or the pronoun in the objective case. It is one of the subtypes of non-prepositional objects.

In English there are a lot of verbs that have either a very indistinct meaning or a lot of different meanings, which because of the mentioned fact require the obligatory use of some object. Such are the verbs *take, make, give, hold, know, have, find, introduce, put on, take off* etc. In case when an object is absent there should be used a formal object expressed by the pronoun *it*, for example: *I find it strange that he did not come.*

The formal object of such a type is also used after the verbs, formed by the way of conversion from nouns, and that is why they cannot be perceived without an object in their new function. Compare: ... *we would sleep out on fine nights and hotel it, and inn it, and pub it ... when it was wet* (Jerome K. Jerome).

The direct object always occupies a certain position in the sentence. If there are no other objects besides it, the direct object is, as a rule, situated immediately after the verb. The separation of the direct object from the verb is witnessed when there is an indirect object before a direct one or when there is some stylistic purpose because of which secondary parts of the sentence cannot be separated from the predicate (compare: *She took out of her bag an envelope*).

The English direct object reveals such a peculiarity that it can be complex. The complex object of such a type is as a rule expressed by the predicative construction with the infinitive, for example: *I saw him go home* (*Я бачив, як він пішов додому*). Besides, there are complex objects expressed by predicative constructions with the participle or the gerund, for example: *We watched her going away. My lady assures him of his being worth no complaint from her* (Ch. Dickens) [5; 131–133].

3.2. The indirect object

In Ukrainian the indirect object is used in the form of any indirect case either with the preposition or without it (except the accusative case without the preposition, which serves to express the direct object):
Електростанція буде нам посилати енергію по проводах.

While the direct object depends only on the verb, the indirect object can be dependent also on the noun or the adjective, for example: *близький нам, керівник гуртка, найкращий з усіх, гірший над усе.* Most often these are nouns or adjectives that have the base common with the verb, besides them these are also adjectives in the comparative and superlative degrees.

In English the indirect object does not differ formally from the direct object: both of them are expressed by the form of the common case (in pronouns — by the objective case). That is why the grammatical means of expressing the indirect object are the position of a word in a sentence as well as the structural completeness of a word-group. First of all, the indirect object is used only in a three-member word-group, that is at the obligatory presence of the direct object and it is necessarily positioned before the direct object: *I give him a letter.* As a rule the indirect object denotes a person to whom some action is addressed or because of whom the action takes place.

The interesting peculiarity of the English language is the fact that here the object with the preposition can serve as an equivalent of the subject of some passive construction, for example: *He was laughed at.*

Generally speaking, in English prepositional objects are especially widely used. Among them the most characteristic are objects with the prepositions *by*, *to* and *with*. The object with the preposition *by* denotes not the object of the action, but the doer himself/herself, and is used with the passive predicate (or with the passive participle). The preposition in this case is almost fully grammaticalized and devoid of lexical meaning. This cannot be said about the preposition *with*, which alongside the instrumental meaning (*with a knife — ножом*) can have the meaning of commonness (*with my friend — з моїм другом*). The object with the preposition *to* is sometimes equaled to the indirect

object. In reality it has a wider meaning than the indirect object and that is why it cannot be always used instead of it. Besides, these two kinds of objects occupy a different position in the sentence.

Objects with prepositions are, as a rule, placed after direct and indirect ones. In the first position in a sentence they can be met only in case when there is an emphasis (the expressive strengthening of the meaning) connected with it, for example: *From her we've never got any letters* [5; 133–134].

4. The attribute

In Ukrainian there are distinguished two types of attributes — agreed and non-agreed (узгоджені та неузгоджені означення). This is the main difference of the Ukrainian attribute from the English one, which is altogether not agreed with a word it modifies (the only exception are the attributes expressed with the help of demonstrative pronouns *this* and *that*, which are agreed with the word they modify in number, compare: *this book* — *these books*).

The agreed attribute can be expressed by an adjective, a participle, a pronoun, an ordinal numeral, as well as by a detached participial construction. With the modified word it is agreed in case and in number, and in singular — as well in gender, for example: *у рідну країну, малий хлопець, чудна дівчинка*.

The function of the non-agreed attribute is most often performed by a noun (*хата без дверей, люди доброї волі*), a pronoun of the third person with the possessive meaning (*його зошит, її посмішка*), an infinitive (*бажання вчитися, вміння любити*), an adverb (*читання вголос, кохання всупереч*), a participle (*відповідь сидячи, байдики лежачи*).

In both languages the attribute can be positioned either before the modified word or after it, but this position is, as a rule, attached to certain types of attributes.

The specific feature of the Ukrainian language is a wide usage of agreed attributes, expressed by possessive adjectives, for example: *дідусів кожух, пастушкова сопілка*.

The attribute in the English language is expressed mostly by the same parts of speech as in Ukrainian. The characteristic feature of the English language in this respect is the possibility to use a noun in the common case in the function of an attribute: *a stone house* (кам'яний будинок). The function of such a noun in the sentence is established only by its position before the modified noun, compare: *export oil* (експортна нафта) and *oil export* (експорт нафти). The function of an attribute can be fulfilled by two or more nouns, for example: *a steam engine cylinder* (циліндр парового двигуна).

The attribute expressed by a noun in the form of a possessive case is put in English unlike in Ukrainian before a modified noun (compare: *my father's room* — кімната мого батька).

In both languages there is spread such a type of attribute as an apposition (прикладка). There are no special differences in the expression of an apposition, not taking into account the following two types spread in the English language:

a) A special type of an apposition, pointing towards the name of an object. It is expressed with the help of a prepositional word combination with the preposition *of*, for example: *the continent of Europe, the city of London, the name of Lincoln* and so on. In Ukrainian in such cases the apposition is attached to the modified noun: *місто Львів, село Іванівка, ім'я Лінкольн*.

b) Similar to it is the word combination with the preposition *of*, where the main noun renders the characteristic of some notion, expressed by the subordinated noun. Such attributive word combinations correspond in Ukrainian to negative comparisons of the type *не ..., а ...*. Compare: *a brute of a man* — не людина, а звір; *a jewel of a picture* — не картина, а перл [5; 135–136].

5. The adverbial modifier

According to their meaning adverbial modifiers are subdivided into many types, which are basically similar in English and in Ukrainian. These are adverbial modifiers of: place (місця), time (часу),

manner (способу дії), measure and degree (ступеня й міри), reason (причини), purpose (мети), result (наслідку), condition (умови), concession (допусту). Besides in English there is one more type of adverbial modifier — the adverbial modifier of attending circumstances (обставина супровідних умов).

In Ukrainian adverbial modifiers are not attached to any particular position in a sentence, whereas in English adverbial modifiers have their certain position in a sentence. For example, the adverbial modifier of place is most often placed at the end of the sentence, but if there is a necessity to point out towards the connection with the previous sentence it is placed at the beginning of the sentence: *Here we began making fire. He made notes in a little book.* The adverbial modifier of time is not so tightly connected with the predicate as the adverbial modifier of place that is why it can be easier put at the beginning of the sentence. Nevertheless it also usually stands at the end of the sentence: *He came home in the morning.* Adverbial words, denoting time as a very general characteristic, for example: *never* (ніколи), *ever* (коли-небудь), *always* (завжди), *often* (часто) etc., are put before the simple predicate, and in the analytical form of the verb — inside this form: *I never laugh at anybody. We have never laughed at him.*

Widely used are adverbial modifiers expressed by English gerundial constructions, for example: *He passed without speaking to anybody. On his entering the room, the light went out.* Their equivalents in Ukrainian are subordinate sentences.

Unlike English in Ukrainian there are widely used adverbial modifiers, expressed by different case forms of a noun without a preposition. The main of them are the following:

- 1) The instrumental case for the adverbial modifier of place, for example: *Дивлюся: так буцім сова летить лугами, берегами, та нетрями, та глибокими ярами, та широкими степами та байраками* (Т. Шевченко).
- 2) The accusative case for the adverbial modifier of place, for example: *Їдуть вони поле, їдуть і друге. Дунай-море плисти, три річеньки брести.*

- 3) The genitive case for the adverbial modifier of time, for example: *одного вечора, наступного дня, пізньої ночі.*
- 4) The instrumental case for the adverbial modifier of time, for example: *весною, літом, вечорами, ночами, ранками.*
- 5) The accusative case for the adverbial modifier of time, for example: *Чи буде та чорнобривка сей рік молодиця?* (Т. Шевченко). *Ітимуть всю ніч ...* (О. Гончар).
- 6) The instrumental case for the adverbial modifier of manner, for example: *Іду я тихою ходю* (Т. Шевченко). ... *Стали похід нею величезним гомінким табором* (О. Гончар).
- 7) The instrumental case for the adverbial modifier of comparison, for example: *Він сидить, згорнувшись бубликом над апаратом* (О. Гончар).

All the mentioned Ukrainian adverbial modifiers have as their equivalents in English prepositional constructions (except the adverbial modifier of time with attributes *this, next, last* as well as the adverbial modifier of measure of the type *We walked miles. It weighs a pound.*).

The main peculiarity of the English language as compared with Ukrainian is the availability of complex adverbial modifiers, expressed with the help of predicative constructions. Here belong:

- a) The adverbial modifier of attending circumstances, expressed by the participial construction with the preposition *with*: *We saw a thick forest, with the red sun hanging low over it.*
- b) The detached adverbial modifier of reason, time or attending circumstances, expressed with the help of the so called “absolute participial construction”: *The lesson being over, I decided to speak to the professor* [5; 136–138].

6. Complex parts of the sentence

In both contrasted languages parts of the sentence are of similar types. But one of the peculiarities of the English syntax is the existence of the so called “complex” parts of the sentence. Each part of the modern English sentence can be simple or complex. The simple part of the

sentence can be expressed not only by a separate word but also by a group of words that make up the lexical and grammatical unity. Unlike this the complex part of the sentence (e.g., the Complex Subject, the Complex Object) are always the combination of two parts of the sentence, one of which points towards the person or the object, and the second — towards the action performed by this person or object. Thus two members of the sentence that enter this complex are in predicate relations. Compare: *I hate him to go away. Our arrival having been noted, we had a lot of guests.*

The predicate relation between the elements of such a complex part of the sentence is not formed in a grammatical way; from the morphological point of view they do not create the word combination but enter into a word combination with the part of the sentence on which they together depend.

Most frequently complex parts of the English sentence are expressed by predicative word combinations with non-finite forms of the verb, performing the syntactic function of the secondary predicate. According to its meaning such a complex part of the sentence can be compared with a subordinate sentence or a simple sentence. In Ukrainian there are no similar complex parts of the sentence and similar relations are rendered with the help of subordinate sentences.

Thus, the mentioned complex parts of the English sentence are usually expressed with the help of predicative word groups, known in traditional grammars as:

- 1) Complex Object (with the Infinitive, Participle I, Participle II, Gerund, non-Verbal), e.g.:
She wants him to study better.
- 2) Complex Subject (with the Infinitive, Participle I, Participle II, non-Verbal), e.g.:
The delegation was reported to have already arrived.
- 3) For-to-Infinitive Construction, e.g.:
For you to do this is of the utmost importance.
- 4) Absolute Constructions/Prepositional Constructions (with Participle I, Participle II, Infinitive, non-Verbal), e.g.:
She was staring at him, her hands trembling with fear.

5) Gerundial Predicative Construction, e.g.:

He was aware of her being constantly late for her job.

According to their structure all the mentioned constructions are quite different and can hardly be put into one group, taking into account their traditional names. Thus, for example, Complex Object and Complex Subject are predicative word groups called according to the syntactic function they perform in a sentence, whereas Absolute Participial Construction, For-to-Infinitive Construction and Gerundial Predicative Construction have got their names rather according to the constituents they are made of. Besides, For-to-Infinitive Construction can perform different syntactic functions in the sentence and therefore be called Complex Subject, Complex Object, Complex Adverbial Modifier, etc. The same is true concerning the Gerundial Predicative Construction. As to Absolute Constructions, since their main syntactic function is to modify, they may be called Complex Adverbial Modifiers. Nevertheless, what unites all these constructions is that they constitute word combinations made of the constituent parts resembling the subject and the predicate. Since these constructions are never used independently, entering the sentence which already has its predication center, the subject-like and the predicate-like constituents of these constructions obtain the status of secondary ones, and therefore are called the “secondary subject” and the “secondary predicate”. As a result, the mentioned predicative word-groups can be called — structures of secondary predication (структури вторинної предикації — СВІІ).

Their unification into one group of “structures of secondary predication” (further SSP) is made on the basis of the following characteristics:

- SSP function only within the sentence at the availability of the primary predication and in the formal sense are subjugated to the structures of primary predication (SPP);
- sentences, containing SSP are semantically and formally complicated and poly-predicative phenomena;

- SSP are semantically equivalent to the subordinate sentence;
- in their surface structure there is a violation of coordination of subject-predicate relations and their deep structure contains subject-predicate relations equivalent to those of the simple sentence;
- SSP are structures that consist of the secondary subject and the secondary predicate; the secondary predicate can be expressed both by a verbal (that is Infinitive, Participle I and II, Gerund) and by a non-verbal part of speech.

Since each structure of secondary predication (SSP) functions only within the limits of the sentence, that is at the availability of the structure of primary predication (SPP), — the most general model of the sentence containing SSP will be the following:

$S^1 + P^1 + S^2 + P^2$ (+ **complements**), where

S^1 — is the primary subject of the sentence;

P^1 — is the primary predicate of the sentence.

The SSP in its turn consists of $S^2 + P^2$ (+ **complements**), where

S^2 — is the secondary subject that can be expressed by a pronoun (most often by the pronoun in the objective case), by a noun (a common noun or less often by a proper name), by a noun group;

P^2 — the secondary predicate which is most often expressed by verbals: Infinitive (with the marker “to” or without it), Participle I, Gerund, Participle II and the non-Verbal (e.g., noun, adjective);

complement(s) — very often after the secondary predicate there can be a complement or the object of this verb, which is “demanded” by the semantics of the given verb and helps to reveal its meaning.

Since Secondary Predication Structures are dependent ones and enter the sentence performing different syntactic functions, they can be classified according to the type of the syntactic structure they enter in the sentence. Before presenting this type of classification the types of syntactic structures should be mentioned.

Considering the syntactic structure of the simple sentence, the Ukrainian linguist A.K. Korsakov (А.К. Корсаков) distinguished 4 types of syntactic structures: the structure of predication (структура предикації), the structure of complementation (структура комплементации), the structure of modification (структура модифікації) and the structure of coordination (структура координації). In foreign linguistics the notion of the syntactic structure and its four types was introduced by W. Francies in 1958 within the frames of the structural approach towards language study. The views of W. Francies were in their turn based on the ideas of Otto Jespersen and L. Bloomfield.

A. K. Korsakov additionally distinguished two types of the structure of predication — the primary predication (consisting of the subject and the predicate) and the secondary predication (consisting of the secondary subject and the secondary predicate). Within the structure of complementation (consisting of the head-word and its complement) he distinguished the following types of complements:

- 1) The subjective complement or the predicative that characterizes the content of the substance-subject, e.g.: *He is a student.*
- 2) The objective complement, or the object-substance, which is in certain relations with the substance-subject expressed by the verb-predicate, e.g.: *He studies languages.*
- 3) The adverbial complement pointing towards certain characteristics of the verb-predicate, e.g.: *He lives in Lviv.*
- 4) The verbal complement which is the second verb component of the predicate, e.g.: *He must study well.*

Types of complements are distinguished by A.K. Korsakov taking into consideration their semantic character.

The structure of modification (consisting of the head-word and its modifier) has two types of modifiers: the attributive modifier (*He is a quick runner.*) and the adverbial modifier (*He runs quickly.*). Of importance is also distinguishing adverbial complements (which cannot be omitted from the sentence without breaking its sense) and adverbial modifiers (that bring in additional information, explaining some other

parts of the sentence, and thus, can be omitted from the sentence) that makes both structural and semantic sentence analysis more distinct.

Finally, the structure of coordination (consisting of two components of equal value) is usually represented by two homogeneous members of the sentence that can perform different syntactic functions, e.g.: *Peter and Ann rushed downstairs immediately.* or *He could sing and dance equally well.*

Structures of secondary predication (SSP) (структури вторинної предикації), the peculiar phenomenon of the English language (absent in Ukrainian), consisting of the secondary subject and the secondary predicate (e.g.: *They (S1) wanted (P1) him (S2) to perform (P2) this task*) can themselves enter structures of predication, complementation and modification. The type of syntactic structure they enter depends on the syntactic function the structure of secondary predication performs in the sentence. Taking this into account, SSP can be classified in the following way:

I. SSP being the component of only one syntactic structure

(СВП, що виступають компонентом лише одного типу синтаксичної структури).

I.1. SSP entering the structure of complementation performing the function of the object

(СВП, що входять до структури комплементації, виконуючи функцію додатка.)

I.1.1. SSP with the infinitive, e.g.:

I made them let me out of the hospital! (Rendell Ruth).

I.1.2. SSP with Participle I, e.g.:

She left him standing there (Grisham John).

I.1.3. SSP with Participle II, e.g.:

She felt her gaze drawn to meet the pair of eyes that looked down at her from lean strong face... (Loring Jenny).

I.1.4. SSP with the non-verbal part of speech, e.g.:

Well, don't get too happy, I prefer you thin (Archer Jeffrey).

I.2. SSP entering the structure of predication performing the function of the subject

(СВП, що входять до структури предикації, виконуючи функцію підмета.)

I.2.1. SSP with the infinitive, e.g.:

And what proof was there that she hadn't reached the cliffs until ten o'clock, half an hour after Hilary Robarts was thought to have died? (P.D. James).

I.2.2. SSP with Participle I, e.g.:

Rumour said that on certain nights of the year ghostly lights might be seen passing from window to window of the upper storey, for the house was supposed to be haunted ... (Thompson Flora).

I.2.3. SSP with Participle II, e.g.:

At the far end of the corridor, almost in front of the large window, at that moment filled with grey light and rain, my father's figure could be seen frozen in a posture that suggested he was taking part in some ceremonial ritual (Kazuo Ishiguro).

I.2.4. SSP with the non-verbal part of speech, e.g.:

In conservative circles in the state, Luke was considered a murderer and a crackpot (Conroy Pat).

I.3. SSP entering the **structure of modification** in the function of the adverbial modifier (СВП, що входять до структури модифікації, виконуючи функцію обставини.)

I.3.1. SSP with the infinitive, e.g.:

... when Penelope emerged from the kitchen, after clearing the meal away and washing up the dishes she found him waiting for her, already dressed for outdoor activity, with a worn corduroy jacket to protect his old bones from the nippy breeze, and a scarlet muffler wound round his neck (Pilcher Rosamunde).

I.3.2. SSP with Participle I, e.g.:

Then, eyes on Jacaue's serious profile — he was eating a millefeuille with his fingers, forks being the only thing he had forgotten — she realized that no such thought would occur to him (Huth Angela).

I.3.3. SSP with Participle II, e.g.:

Ricards wasn't there but the message given, he rang off (P. D. James).

I.3.4. SSP with the non-verbal part of speech, e.g.:

The article complete, I spent more time analysing and transcribing Joao and Aldas field notes (Boyd William).

II. SSP being the component of different syntactic structures
(СВП, що виступають компонентами різних типів синтаксичних структур.)

II.1. SSP with the infinitive introduced by the preposition “for”
(СВП з інфінітивом, що вводиться в речення прийменником “for”, e.g.):

I was out, but Mrs Cooper took it down and left it for me to find
(Pilcher Rosamunde).

II.2. SSP with gerund, e.g.:

He shouted about my being English (Kazuo Ishiguro) [9].

Structures of secondary predication are the allomorphic feature of the English language. They are rendered into Ukrainian with the help of subordinate clauses as parts of complex sentences, where their poly-predicative nature is revealed, e.g: *He heard her playing the piano.* — *Він чув, як вона грає на піаніно.*

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. Describe the nature of a simple sentence. What parts of the sentence are usually enough to make a simple sentence?
2. State the difference between the principal parts of the sentence and the secondary parts of the sentence.
3. Define the subject of the sentence. Are there any differences in the subject expression in English and Ukrainian languages?
4. What are subjectless sentences?
5. Define the predicate of the sentence. Are there any differences in the predicate expression in English and Ukrainian languages?
6. Describe the types of predicates in both contrasted languages.
7. Define the object of the sentence. What is the difference between the direct and indirect objects, between the prepositional and non-prepositional objects?

8. Define the attribute of the sentence. What types of attributes in both contrasted languages can be mentioned?
9. Define the adverbial modifier as the part of the sentence. Do the types of adverbial modifiers coincide in English and Ukrainian languages?
10. What are complex parts of the sentence? Describe their types and constituent parts.
11. State the difference between the syntactic structures of predication, complementation, modification and coordination. Provide examples in both contrasted languages.
12. What are the structures of secondary predication? State the difference between the primary predication structures and secondary predication structures.
13. Dwell upon the problems of secondary predication structures classification.

II. Define subjects and predicates (types of predicates) in the given sentences. Characterize the means of their expression. Render these Ukrainian sentences into English, comparing the ways of subject and predicate expression in both contrasted languages.

1. Сто друзів — це мало, один ворог — це багато (М. Стельмах).
2. Ми з тобою йдемо стежкою в саду (М. Рильський).
3. Чисте, свіже повітря насичене було пахощами липового цвіту та жасмину (І. Франко).
4. Пливе овець отара в білім молоці своєї вовни (Б. І. Антонович).
5. Тяжко-важко умирати у чужому краю! (Т. Шевченко).
6. Найчистіша душа незрадлива (В. Симоненко).
7. Ах, скільки струн в душі дзвенить! (Олександр Олесь).
8. Я любив зустрічати вечірні перельоти на цьому озері (М. Хвильовий).
9. А раптом все моє життя до цього було лиш передмовою життя? (Б. Олійник).
10. Тарас Григорович Шевченко невіддільний від української культури (О. Гончар).

*The material is taken from the text-book: Терлак З. Українська мова: Збірник вправ із синтаксису та пунктуації. — Львів: Світ, 1999. — P. 35.

III. Define what parts of the sentence are expressed by the numbered words:

- 1 — agreed attribute;
- 2 — non-agreed attribute;
- 3 — direct object;
- 4 — indirect object;
- 5 — adverbial modifier of place;
- 6 — adverbial modifier of time;
- 7 — adverbial modifier of cause;
- 8 — adverbial modifier of purpose;
- 9 — adverbial modifier of manner;
- 10 — adverbial modifier of measure and degree;
- 11 — adverbial modifier of condition;
- 12 — adverbial modifier of concession.

Render these sentences into English; state the differences and similarities in the expression of parts of the sentence in both languages.

- a) 1. Пахощі з *липи* (1) і *квіток* (1) носилися в *повітрі* (2) і розвівалися широкими *хвилями* (3) далеко навкрути (Панас Мирний).
2. В очереті біліла срібною *стрічкою* (4) *Расава* (І. Нечуй-Левицький).
3. Сріблистий місяць *тихо* (5) чарівне світло лив на сонну *землю* (6) (І. Франко).
4. Як розбещує людину сама можливість *принижувати* (7) інших, *топтати* (7), *розстрілювати* (7) безкарно! (О. Гончар).
5. Сяють блакиттю на *сонці* (8) води *Дніпра* (9) (Н. Рибак).
6. Плавав лебідь *білокрилий*(10) *по* глибокому *ставу* (11) (Я. Щоголів).
7. Дорогими для мене (12) стали схили *Дніпра* (13) (А. Малишко).

8. Говори *мало* (14), слухай *багато* (14), а думай ще *більше* (14) (Н. тв.)
 9. Везе Марко *Катерині* (15) *сукна* (16) дорогого (Т. Шевченко).
 10. *В далечинь* (19) *холодну без жалю за літом* (20) *синьоока осінь* іде навмання (В. Сосюра).
- б) 1. *Не знайшовши броду* (1), *не лізь у воду* (Н. тв.).
2. *Вночі* (2) *земля дубіла від морозу* (3) (В. Козаченко).
 3. *Хмари котилися одна за одною* (4), *одна за одною* (4) *безконечним караваном* (Г. Хоткевич).
 4. *Любові* (5) *й віри* (5) *невмирущі зерна поет посіяв на лану своїм* (М. Рильський).
 5. *Людина без національного заземлення* (6) — *перекотиполе* або *й пил на вітрах історії* (7) ... (В. Яворівський).
 6. *Знову* (8) *біблія літа розкрила сторінки* (9) *заколотених піль* (10) (Є. Маланюк).
 7. *Не шукай красоти* (11), а *шукай доброти* (Н. тв.).
 8. *Од вітрових ударів* (12) *тільки важко* (13) *поскрипують снасті* та *зростають навкруги світло-сині снігові дюни* (І. Кириленко).
 9. *Виходить дівчина із хати* (14) *води* (15) *з криниці набирати* (16) (А. Малишко).
 10. *Трохи вірить серце в забобони* (17), *логікам* (18) *усім наперекір* (М. Рильський).
 11. *На небі зорі синьооки, і лебідь* (19) — *місяць на хмарках* (Олександр Олесь).
 12. *І невидимі в пущі солов'ї жагу солодку в звуки* (20) *вилівають* (М. Рильський).

*The material is taken from the text-book: Терлак З. Українська мова: Збірник вправ із синтаксису та пунктуації. — Львів: Світ, 1999. — Р. 50–51.

IV. Analyze the following sentences according to the type of syntactic structures they contain, that is structures of: 1) predication,

2) complementation; 3) modification and 4) coordination. Translate these sentences into Ukrainian and compare the types of structures in original sentences and their equivalents.

1. She smoothed her satin dress nervously (fiction writing).
2. The plan also earmarks 20 million pounds of capital investment for safety measures (newspaper writing).
3. In Anchorage we saw killer whales (conversation).
4. The latest market research confirms that consumers now put safety at the top of their list of desirable features in a car (newspaper writing).
5. The most central sites will be more attractive than others for all types of land users (academic prose).
6. EEG recording is technically difficult and fraught with potential artifacts due to muscle movement (academic prose).
7. There was in the sky more than a hint of summer lightning (fiction writing).
8. Mosses made the way soft and held many scents of marsh orchids (fiction writing).
9. Analysts have attributed the general weakness in the construction industry to high interest rates (newspaper writing).
10. I just talked to Don Jones you know our former board member (conversation).

*The material is taken from "Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook" by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 65–66.

V. Analyze the following sentences according to the type of secondary predication constructions they contain, known traditionally as: 1) Complex Object; 2) Complex Subject; 3) Absolute Construction/ Prepositional Construction (with or without participle); 4) For-to-Infinitive Construction, 5) Gerundial Predicative Construction. Define the type of syntactic structure (predication, complementation, modification or coordination) they enter in the sentence.

Suggest the ways of rendering the English sentences with secondary predication structures into Ukrainian.

1. She could hear the wasp singing a love song to her as he flew above the trees (Pat Conroy).
2. [...] we could be found discussing every aspect of our vocation (Kazuo Ishiguro).
3. For a moment Christoff appeared badly shaken (Kazuo Ishiguro).
4. Now she seemed infected with anxiety (P.D. James).
5. [...] I'll get it started (John Grisham).
6. Your father would go through the roof if he heard you asked for a sport coat now (Pat Conroy).
7. Determined not to repeat my earlier mistake of prevaricating, I leaned forward decisively, my intention to cut Inge off with a bold announcement of who I was [...] (Kazuo Ishiguro).
8. The northerners were moving at a faster pace than usual, almost a lope, in rough Indian file, with Darius leading (William Boyd).
9. So they repeat certain things to themselves, and after a while, they begin to believe themselves authorities (Kazuo Ishiguro).
10. But you are not making it clear to me (Pat Conroy).
11. [...] and there were times when he still felt he was doing the only thing a man of his instincts could be expected to do (Pat Conroy).
12. Workmen were expected to turn their hands to anything within the limits of their trade [...] (Flora Thompson).
13. A door to a neighbouring room had been left ajar through which several female voices could be heard chattering away (Kazuo Ishiguro).
14. Candleford seemed a very large and grand place to Laura [...] (Flora Thompson).
15. We let her float by herself but she seemed unbalanced and unsure of herself (Pat Conroy).
16. Privately, with no one to jeer at her weakness, she allowed the tears to fall unchecked (Rosamunde Pilcher).

17. Her cycle of poems “Considering Manhattan” was completed in one feverish three-month period when she felt her powers return (Pat Conroy).
18. Waiting for someone to answer the call, she found herself undecided [...] (Rosamunde Pilcher).
19. She insists on me doing it alone (John Grisham).
20. “I’m sorry I’m not a heart surgeon or a white-shirt banker, Lila”, my father said, “but it’s about time you quit being ashamed of me being a shrimper” (Pat Conroy).
21. I don’t get paid to have people scream at me (Pat Conroy).
22. Luke had maneuvered the boat up beside us and I could hear it idling [...] (Pat Conroy).
23. His eyes took it all in, his children gaily savoring those fresh glands as an act of defiance against the man of the house (Pat Conroy).
24. [...] even the truck driver had surrendered to whatever mass hysteria had possessed the rest of us and he stood with his arm cocked [...] (Pat Conroy).
25. Boris shrugged, his attention fixed on the waitress, now in the process of extricating an elaborate confection from out of the display cabinet (Kazuo Ishiguro).
26. Savannah and I stayed behind with our mother as Luke left the house and walked the back road through the swamp, the wind at his back (Pat Conroy).
27. “Since we’re practically paupers, it must have been damn creative, Henry,” my mother said, her mouth a thin line across her face like a knife-cut on a piece of fruit (Pat Conroy).
28. I was out, but Mrs Cooper took it down and left it for me to find (Rosamunde Pilcher).
29. I’ve arranged for a car to take me to the concert hall, it should be waiting for me (Kazuo Ishiguro).
30. No doubt the fact of our being so close to its actual setting had made irresistible the prospect of going through it all again (Kazuo Ishiguro).

CHAPTER 11

The composite sentence. The compound sentence

1. The composite sentence

A composite sentence (складне речення) in English and Ukrainian, like in all other languages, contains two or more primary predication centers mostly represented by as many corresponding clauses. Structural types of the composite sentence are identified on the ground of the syntactic reflection (and connection) of its predicate parts which are not always distinctly identified. Thus, common in the syntactic systems of English and Ukrainian are sentences that are semantically intermediate between simple extended on the one hand and composite sentences on the other. These are the so called semi-compound and semi-complex sentences. For example, the sentence “*One doesn’t give up a god easily and so with White Fang*” (J. London) cannot be treated as a simple extended one. Neither can it be identified as a composite sentence since the second part in it (and “*so with White Fang*”) contains no subject and no predicate and wholly depends on the predicative center of the first clause, though the implicitly perceivable subject is the demonstrative pronoun “*it*” which logically requires the predicate verb “*be*”. Compare: *One doesn’t give up a god easily, and so (it is/ it was) with White Fang*. In Ukrainian equivalents are as follows:

- 1) *Не так легко відмовитися від свого власника — бога, саме так і в Білозубця.*
- 2) *Не так легко відмовитися від свого власника — бога, саме так (було це) і в Білозубця.*

Similarly with English extended sentences containing the secondary predication constructions or complexes, as they are traditionally called, that represent semi-complex sentences as well. They mostly correspond to Ukrainian complex sentences. Compare: *White Fang felt fear mounting in him again* (J. London). Білозубець відчув, що "ним опановує страх". The construction *fear mounting in him* becomes an object clause: *White Fang felt/ how/that fear was mounting in him*.

Present-day Ukrainian has only some similar constructions of this nature. Compare: *Він застав двері відчиненими. = Він застав двері (вони були) відчиненими*.

The absence of the secondary predication constructions in Ukrainian makes it impossible to obtain direct correlative transforms of some simple and composite sentences. Hence, English compound sentences containing secondary predication constructions may have complex sentences for their equivalents in Ukrainian. Compare:

He leaned far out of the window and he saw the first light spread (J. Galsworthy). –

Він висунувся далеко з вікна і помітив, що починають пробиватися перші промені.

Because of the Objective-with-the-Infinitive construction in the second English clause of the compound sentence above the Ukrainian equivalent of it can be only an object subordinate clause.

Nevertheless, the nature of the composite sentence is quite similar in English and Ukrainian. Similarity is observed first of all in the nomenclature of the major syntax units represented by the compound and complex sentences [10; 388–389].

2. The compound sentence with conjunctions

There are several types of the compound sentence depending on the meaning of the conjunction in English and in Ukrainian: copulative (єднальні), disjunctive (розділові), adversative (протиставні), as well as compound sentences with causative and consecutive interrela-

tions between clauses (складносурядні речення з причинно-наслідковими відношеннями між складовими частинами речення).

2.1. The copulative compound sentence

In the English language the copulative sentences are joined by conjunctions *and, neither ... nor, now ... now, not ... but*. In Ukrainian the typical conjunctions in this type of the sentence are: *i (ї), та, та й, і ... і ..., ні ... ні ..., ані ... ані ...* and others.

The most widespread of them are the English conjunction “*and*” and the Ukrainian conjunction “*i (ї)*”. They render a variety of relations between sentences.

The peculiarity of the Ukrainian conjunction *i* is the fact that it has its phonetic variant *ї* with which it alternates depending on the phonetic syllable of the closest to it surrounding words. Sometimes the conjunction *ї* has also a semantic difference, pointing towards the closer connection in comparison to the conjunction *i*.

The main shades of meaning of the Ukrainian conjunction *i* and the English *and* coincide. They render first of all the following meanings:

- a) The proper copulative meaning (власно-еднальне значення) when there is a connection of very close according to their content sentences. Compare: *Гриміло потьмарене море здаля, і жаром чадила зруділа земля* (М. Бажан). *I heard a click, and a little glow lamp came into being* (H. Wells).
- b) The adjoining meaning (приєднувальне значення) when the first sentence is accompanied by the second sentence for the completion or development of the idea expressed by the first sentence. In English grammars this meaning is also sometimes called a copulative-relative meaning (еднально-відносне значення). Compare: *Мені чомусь здавалось, що треба йти додому, і це було єдиним мотивом, який змусив мене піти. I had a vague idea of going on to my own house, and that was as much motive as I had* (H. Wells).
- c) The meaning of recounting (перелічувальне значення). Compare: *I тіло в них міцне, і плечі в них широкі, і мисль*

оформила опуклі їх лоби (М. Бажан). *The sun set, the window-shutters were closed, and the street was empty.*

- d) The meaning of consequence (наслідкове значення), when the second sentence is the result or consequence from the idea expressed in the first sentence. *У мене дуже мало часу, і я ніяк не можу сказати вам про все* (Ю. Корнійчук). *But he was sick and weary; and he soon felt sound asleep* (Ch. Dickens).

Unlike Ukrainian *і* (*ї*) the English conjunction *and* is also widely used with the copulative-adversative meaning (в єднально-протиставному значенні) which mostly corresponds to the Ukrainian conjunction *а*. Compare: *You have your opinion, and I have mine. У тебе своя думка, а у мене своя.*

The Ukrainian conjunction *та й* is used less frequently in the Ukrainian language than the conjunction *і* (*ї*) though it can render the same shades of connection.

The composite conjunction (складений сполучник) *та й* is used mainly in the copulative function, denoting the transfer to some action which either finishes the development of events or intervenes in it. For example: *Ото дививсь Івасик, дививсь, та й заболіла голова* (П. Тичина).

The copulative-negative meaning (єднально-заперечний зв'язок) is formed in the English language with the help of negative conjunctions *neither, nor, not only ... but*; in Ukrainian — *ні ..., ні ...; ані ..., ані ...; не тільки ..., а (але) і (ї)*. Compare:

Mrs. Septimus small let fall no word, neither did she question June about him (J. Galsworthy).

She would not put him off; nor would she make a scene in public (J. Galsworthy).

Ніде ні собака не гавкне, ні вартових немає (Ю. Янковський).

Ані шелесту не було чути, ані колихання не було помітно (Марко Вовчок).

The Ukrainian conjunction *не тільки ..., а (але) і (ї)* has as its correspondence close in the meaning the English conjunction *not only ... but*, which shows that the action in the second sentence

goes in parallel with the first sentence and does not contradict it. Compare:

Не тільки жайворонки нас, мене й товаришів, вітали, але й гречки в той само час рожевим гомоном співали (М. Рильський).

And Germany had not only violated the Treaty of London, but she had seized a British ship on the Kiel Canal (H. Wells).

The negative conjunctions in English **neither ... nor** and in Ukrainian **ні ...ні, ані ...ані** are antonyms to the English conjunction **both ... and** and the Ukrainian conjunction **як ..., так і**, which in both languages are more widely used in a simple sentence with homogeneous members (однорідними членами) but sometimes also join parts of the compound sentence, for example: *Як ти чоловік, так і я чоловік* (А. Тесленко) *Both he will come there, and I will call on them* [5; 138–139].

2.2. The disjunctive compound sentence

The disjunctive compound sentences are joined in English with the help of the conjunctions **or, either ... or**, and in Ukrainian — **або; або ...або; чи; чи ...чи; то ...то; не то ... не то; чи то ... чи то** and others. In both languages the connection between parts of such a sentence is very close; if there is omitted one part of such a sentence, the other will lose its sense, e.g.:

The boy's wife might have died; or he might have come back and said, «Father, I have sinned» (W. Thackeray).

Чи підпалено, чи може самі необережними були (М. Коцюбинський).

In Ukrainian the number of disjunctive conjunctions is a bigger one than in English, but the most spread of them are the conjunctions **або** and **чи**. The conjunction **або** has the most general meaning, pointing towards the separation of things or ideas, whereas the conjunction **чи** is derived from the interrogative particle and that is why it retains the interrogative shade of meaning. Compare: *Раптом хурчав автомобільний мотор, або сурмив клаксон* (Ю. Смолич). *Часом качка в повітрі дзвенить, чи кажан проти місяця грає* (М. Рильський).

The double conjunctions *або ...або; чи ...чи; то ...то; не то ... не то; чи то ... чи то* denote the separation in the facts alternation (*То ми до них ходили, то вони до нас. —* (Ю. Корнійчук)). The conjunction *не то ... не то* renders simultaneously doubt and hesitation: *Не то осінні води шуміли, збігаючи в Дунай, не то вітер бився в заламах провалля* (М. Коцюбинський) [5; 139–140].

2.3. The adversative compound sentence

This type of sentence connection is rendered with the help of conjunctions *а, але, та (але), так, зате, проте, однак, все ж* and others in Ukrainian; *but, while, whereas*, or as well as with the help of connective adverbs (сполучні прислівники) *yet, still, nevertheless, however, otherwise* in English.

The main expression of such relations between sentences is performed in English by the conjunction *but*. In Ukrainian it has as its correspondence the conjunction *але*. Both these conjunctions are used in the following main meanings:

- a) The limiting meaning (обмежувальне значення), when the idea expressed in the second part of the compound sentence limits the possibility of happening of some event expressed by the first part of the sentence, or altogether interrupts this action. Compare: *He said he would stay quiet in the hall, but he simply couldn't any more* (J. Galsworthy). *Він міг би залишитися, але йому не вистачало мужності.*
- b) The concessive meaning (допустове значення), when in the second part of the sentence the expressed idea is opposite to what is expected on the basis of mentioned in the first part ideas. Compare: *Twilight gave place to night, but he didn't turn on the light* (H. Wells). *Стемніло, але він не засвітив лампи.*
- c) The relative meaning (відносне значення), when the second part explains one of members of the first part or the whole of it. Compare: *Some people likened him to a direction post ..., but these were his enemies* (Ch. Dickens). *Противник кинувся до апаратів, але вони мовчали.*

In Ukrainian besides *але* there is also widely used the adversative conjunction *а*. It has more shades of meaning than the conjunction *але*, e.g.:

- contrasting (протиставлення): *І на оновленій землі врага не буде, суностата, а буде син, і буде мати, і будуть люди на землі* (Т. Шевченко).
- sequence of events (послідовність подій): *Він ішов попереду, а я позаду.*
- separate fulfilling of events (роздільність дій за характером виконання): *Ти молотом дзвени, працюю, а ти, поете, співай, завжди співай* (В. Сосюра).
- conclusion (висновок): *От і станція Соколгорна, а у грудях вже серцю тісно* (М. Нагнибіда) and others.

The English conjunction *while* has the meaning of opposing, similar to some meanings of the Ukrainian adversative conjunction *а*. Compare:

Jos went into a collapsed state to an inn, while Dobbin escorted the ladies (W. Thackeray). *Він пішов додому, а я лишився в клубі.*

Somehow similar in their meaning are the English conjunction *or* and the Ukrainian conjunction *а то*. Compare: *It's lucky they took off their boots, or we should fill the place with clatter* (H. Wells). *Добре, що вони роззулися, а то нарobili б шуму.*

The English conjunction *otherwise* also has the meaning close to it, e.g.: *You have no documents — otherwise you would have handed them to the Colonel* (Heym). *Нема в тебе документів, а то (інакше) б ти показав їх полковнику.*

English connective adverbs *yet, still, nevertheless* have the adversative meaning with the shade of concession, which corresponds to some meanings of the Ukrainian adversative conjunction *та*. Compare: *That train would bear her away from him; yet he could not help fidgeting at the thought that they would lose it* (J. Galsworthy) ... *Ще клевета на нас не замовкає, — та стоїмо ми табором одним ...* (М. Рильський).

The characteristic feature of Ukrainian adversative sentences is the close connection and cooperation between conjunctions and modal

words and particles. For example, the word *проте* functions both as a conjunction and as a modal word. The particles *тільки, лише, таки* can also function as coordinating conjunctions (сурядні сполучники) with the general adversative meaning, e.g.: *Ніч була темна, тільки на небі ясно блищали зорі* (І. Нечуй-Левицький) [5; 140–141].

2.4. The causative-consecutive compound sentences

The causative and consecutive connection in compound sentences is rendered in Ukrainian with the help of the conjunctions *і, а* and in English — *so (that), for*, and the connective adverb *therefore*. At such a connection the second sentence expresses explanation, confirmation, conclusion or consequence of the idea expressed in the first part of the compound sentence. The coordination (сурядність) in such a case renders the relations more characteristic of complex sentences (властиві підрядним реченням). Each part of such a sentence retains the meaning of an independent unit, though connected with the other one.

The consecutive connection is rendered in English with the help of the conjunction *so* (less often *therefore*), in Ukrainian — with the help of the conjunction *а*, e.g.:

She hasn't much strength in her, so I easily kept her quiet (Ch. Dickens).

Повернувся козак Нечай на лівее плече, а вже з ляшків, вражих синів. Кров ріками тече (Нар. пісня).

The causative connection in the compound sentence is rendered with the help of the English conjunction *for* and the Ukrainian conjunction *і*, e.g.:

It was not yet daylight, for the candle was burning (Ch. Dickens).

Андрій почув у руці одрізані пальці, і злість туманом піднялась йому до мозку (М. Коцюбинський) [5; 142].

2.5. Compound sentences with the meaning of suddenness (складносурядне речення із значенням раптовості)

The peculiarity of the Ukrainian syntax is a wide usage of compound sentences with the meaning of suddenness. They are formed most

often with the help of the conjunctions *аж*, *коли*, *як* and are used in the emotionally coloured speech. Such sentences usually render the action and its sudden character. Compare:

Ой пішла я у яр за водою, аж там милий гуляє з другою (Т. Шевченко).

Сьогодні вранці я спокійно сиджу вдома, коли дзвонить твій секретар (Ю. Корнійчук).

Widely spread in modern Ukrainian is a subtype of such sentences, where in the first part the verbs of physical perception are used (*дивитися*, *глянути*, *бачити*, *слухати*, *чути* and others), and the second part starts with the conjunctions *аж*, *коли*, e.g.:

Дивлюсь — аж он передо мною неначе дива виринають (Т. Шевченко).

Коли гляне — попереду старший їде (Т. Шевченко).

Similar connection is also rendered with the help of asyndetic (безсполучниковий) connection. Compare: *Бачить — ліс чорніє* (Т. Шевченко) [5; 142–143].

3. Compound sentences with asyndetically joined clauses (складносурядні речення без сполучників)

Basic means of expression of grammar relations between parts of the compound sentence when they are not joined with the help of conjunction is their adjoining and corresponding intonation (зіставлення та відповідна інтонація). In comparison with compound sentences joined by conjunctions, compound sentences with the asyndetic type of connection have a more independent character of their constituent parts.

With the help of asyndetic connection the compound sentences are able to render the same type of relations as the compound sentences joined by conjunctions, apart from the disjunctive meaning (розділове значення). In both these cases such sentences are represented by two common subtypes:

- a) Compound sentences with an implicit though quite transparent copulative interrelation between the constituent clauses and

with close semantic and syntactic ties between the succeeding and preceding clauses. As a result, asyndetically adjoined clauses in the sentences of this subtype can be substituted for syndetically connected clauses (that is with the help of the copulative conjunction “and”). Compare: *She’s worthy, she’s provincial.* — *She is worthy, and she is provincial.* Similarly in Ukrainian: *Вона гонориста; (i) вона провінціалка.*

- b) Compound sentences of the second subtype are characterized by a still looser connection between the adjoined clauses which is marked by a comma or a semicolon. The syntactic interrelation between the component clauses in the sentences of this subtype may be of copulative or adversative nature. Compare: *Young John has never studied a doctrine for himself; he has never examined a doctrine for any purpose* (M. Twain). — *Young John has never studied a doctrine for himself, (and) he has never examined a doctrine for any purpose.* The coordinate copulation is also preserved in Ukrainian: *Молодий пастор Джон ніколи не вивчав якоїсь віри, (i) він ніколи не заглиблювався в неї з якоюсь певною метою* [10; 401–402].

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. Define the composite sentence and its subtypes.
2. What is meant by “semi-complex” and “semi-compound” sentences? Are these types found in both contrasted languages?
3. Dwell upon the compound sentence with conjunctions in English and Ukrainian; state main similarities and differences.
4. Describe the copulative compound sentence in both contrasted languages. Name the types of relations between the constituent parts of the copulative compound sentence expressed with the help of the most frequent coordinative conjunctions. Provide examples in both languages.

5. Dwell upon the disjunctive compound sentences in English and Ukrainian. What are the most frequent conjunctions that unite the constituent parts of such a sentence in both languages? Provide examples.
6. Describe the adversative compound sentence in English and Ukrainian. Name the type of relations between the constituent parts of such a sentence expressed with the help of coordinative conjunctions. Provide examples.
7. What are other types of compound sentences with conjunctions besides copulative, adversative and disjunctive? Are these types present equally in English and Ukrainian? Provide your own examples.
8. Speak about the peculiarities of compound sentences with asyndetically joined clauses in English and Ukrainian.

II. In these examples, the units that are coordinated are enclosed in brackets []. Identify the structural type of the coordinated units (e.g. clauses, noun phrases, adjectives). State the type of sentences with coordinated units. Provide your own examples of sentences with coordinated clauses.

1. Um you can work [on campus] or [off campus] (conversation).
2. Be [reliant] and [helpful to others] (conversation).
3. Either [you're going to like it] or [you're going to hate it] (conversation).
4. Do you have any [start dates] or [stop dates]? (conversation).
5. Oh [she cooks] but [she never bakes] (conversation).
6. She's got [a squiggle ball case] but [no squiggle ball] (conversation).
7. I heard a story about [you] and [Dave] (conversation).
8. [You can be quite fluent in a language] and [yet, [something you say is not understood] and [you cannot understand why]] (academic prose).

*The material is taken from "Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook" by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 58.

III. State which of the presented sentences belong to compound sentences. Define the type of the found compound sentences and the type of conjunctions with the help of which their constituent parts are joined.

1. Тихесенький вечір на землю спадає, і сонце сідає в темнесенький гай (В. Самійленко).
2. Сичі в гаю перекликались, та ясен раз у раз скрипів (Т. Шевченко).
3. Світ, бачся, широкий, та нема де прихилитись в світі одиноким (Т. Шевченко).
4. Не вертаються три брати, по світу блукають, а три шляхи широкії терном заростають (Т. Шевченко).
5. Цвінуть бузки, садок біліє і тихо ронить пелюстки (М. Рильський).
6. Де-не-де біля вирв сивіє безводний полин або кущиться пахучий чебрець (О. Гончар).
7. Поет не стратить духу марно ні в стисках муки, ні в журбі, але ж страждань своїх безкарно він сам не вибачить юрбі (Г. Чупринка).
8. Бліді на небі гасли зорі, і вітер плутався в мережах верховіть, і не гойдалися берези білокорі (М. Рильський).
9. Чи тільки терни на шляху знайду, чи стріну, може, де і квіт барвистий? (Леся Українка).
10. Білясті хмарини на очах розпливаються і тануть у барвінковому небі (В. Козаченко).

*The material is taken from the text-book: Терлак З. Українська мова: Збірник вправ із синтаксису та пунктуації. — Львів: Світ, 1999. — Р. 122.

CHAPTER 12

The composite sentence. The complex sentence

The complex sentence, like the simple and compound sentences, presents a universal unit in the syntactic systems of all 5, 651 languages of the world. Consequently, this type of the composite sentence has some isomorphic features of its own. In the contrasted languages they are as follows: 1) the complex sentence has a poly-predicative nature; 2) it is characterized by the subordinate way of joining the clauses to the principal/matrix clause; 3) it may consist of homogeneous clauses or of consecutively dependent clauses joined to the matrix clause or to each other syndetically or asyndetically; 4) the arsenal of syndetic means of connection includes conjunctions, connective pronouns, connective adverbs and subordinating connective words; 5) the connectors join clauses and express some logical-grammatical relations formed within the complex sentence. These include predicative, objective, attributive and various adverbial relations expressed by the corresponding clauses which may occupy either the preceding or the succeeding position/place in regard to the matrix clause [10; 408].

According to I.V. Korunets' [10; 408–409], the nature of many logical-grammatical relations created between the subordinate and the matrix clause generally corresponds to the nature of relations created between the adjuncts/complements and their heads in subordinate word-groups. Hence, there are distinguished the following groups of subordinate clauses:

In English	In Ukrainian
1. Substantive-nominal: a) subject subordinate clauses, b) predicative subordinate clauses, c) objective subordinate clauses.	1. Субстантивно-номінативні: а) підметові підрядні речення, б) присудкові підрядні речення, в) додаткові підрядні речення.
2. Qualitatively-nominal: a) descriptive attributive clauses, b) restrictive/limiting attributive clauses.	2. Квалітативно-номінативні: а) описові атрибутивні підрядні речення, б) обмежувачі атрибутивні підрядні речення.
3. Adverbial clauses: of time, place, purpose, cause, attending circumstances, condition, concession, result, etc.	3. Адвербіальні підрядні речення: часу, місця, мети, причини, способу дії, умови, допусту, наслідку тощо.

Similar ideas are expressed by another Ukrainian scholar Yu.O. Zhluktenko, who claims that the structure of complex sentences and the types of complex sentences do not show much difference in English and in Ukrainian. The peculiarity of Ukrainian complex sentences is a wider use of the complex sentences in the principal part of which there is a correlative or relative (or demonstrative) word (корелятивне, або співвідносне або вказівне слово) which is concretized or specified by the subordinate clause [5; 143].

1. The subject clause / Підметове підрядне речення

This type of subordinate sentence or clause performs the function of the subject in regard to the principal clause. If such a type of clause is eliminated then the principal clause becomes incomplete and loses its sense.

In English such sentences are joined with the help of the conjunctions *that*, *whether*, *if* and the connective words (сполучні слова) *who*, *what*, *which*, the pronouns *whatever*, *whoever*, *whichever*, the pronominal adverbs *where*, *when*, *why*, *how*, e.g.:

That he has made this mistake is strange. Whether he will come is uncertain.

Ukrainian subject clauses are most often connected with the help of relative pronouns *хто, що* in the form of different cases. The main clause necessarily contains the correlative (or demonstrative) word which performs the function of the formal subject, most often these are such words as — *той, та, те, ті*, or *весь (вся, все, всі)*. Compare:

Перемагає той, хто невідступно бореться. Всі, хто побачив його, вклонилися.

When a demonstrative word is absent the connection between the principal and subordinate parts of the sentence becomes closer and acquires the adversative meaning, e.g.:

Що не склонилось — ожило, що не скорилось — не зійшло з народної дороги (А. Малишко) [5; 143–144].

2. The predicative clause / Присудкове підрядне речення

Clauses of this type are connected with the help of auxiliary part of the compound predicate of the principal clause and substitute or complement its predicative member (that is the nominal part of the compound nominal predicate). In English such sentences are connected with the help of the conjunctions *that, whether, if, as if*, and the connective words *what, who, why, where, how, when*, e.g.:

This is what I have thought for the last fifteen years.

The weather is not what it was yesterday.

The authors of different grammars do not agree in their views regarding the type of such subordinate sentences which refer to the principal clause with the formal subject *it*, e.g.: *It is strange that he should behave so*. The majority of linguists consider such clauses to be subject subordinate clauses. The linguist L. L. Ioffic is of the view that such sentences can be regarded as predicative subordinate clauses. He considers that the principal clause has the impersonal character and the relations between the adjective of the principal clause and the subordinate clause are similar to the relations between the parts of the compound predicate.

In Ukrainian predicative clauses are connected with the principal clause by means of the conjunctions and the connective words *хто, що, який, щоб* and others. The principal clause contains necessarily the correlative word *той (та, те, ті)*, or *такий (така, таке, такі)*, e.g.:

Він не такий, щоб без діла сидіти. Ми — ті, що ви хотіли бачити [5; 144].

3. The object/objective clause / Підрядне додаткове речення

English object clauses are connected by means of the conjunctions *that, whether, if* and those connective words that are used for subject and predicative subordinate clauses. The asyndetic connection of object clauses is also widespread.

In Ukrainian the most characteristic conjunctions of object clauses are *що* and *щоб*. Besides, the following connective words are also widely used: pronouns *хто, що, який, чий, котрий, стільки*; adverbs *як, де, куди, звідки, коли, чому, нащо*. Compare:

We didn't forget that our destination was far away.

Ми не забували, що до мети ще далеко.

As well as in other types of subordinate sentences main sentences can have demonstrative or correlative words *той, та, те, ті*: *Скориставшись з того, що я відвернувся, він проскочив у хату.*

In object clauses which present the indirect speech in English the phenomenon of sequence of tenses is widely spread. In Ukrainian this phenomenon is absent [5; 146–147].

4. Attributive clauses / Підрядні означальні речення

In English attributive clauses are joined to the principal clause with the help of the following connective words: relative pronouns *who, which*,

that, relative adverbs *when, where, why* or they can be joined without conjunctions at all.

In the Ukrainian language the attributive clause is typically connected with the principal clause with the help of the connective words *який, чий, хто, що, котрий* in different forms. More rarely they are joined with the help of the connective words *де, куди, звідки, коли, як*. Sometimes attributive clauses are connected with the help of the conjunctions *як, ніби, наче, неначе, мов, немов*, and others.

In both languages attributive clauses are not homogeneous in their grammatical nature and are subdivided into two distinct groups — restrictive/limiting (обмежувальні) and descriptive (описові).

Restrictive attributive clauses are tightly connected with a certain word of the main clause performing the function of its attribute. Moreover, the idea expressed by the main clause does not finish on its boundary with the subordinate clause; when the subordinate sentence is removed the meaning of the principal clause becomes blurred, unclear. Compare:

There was a small stone at that corner of the room which was the nearest to the master's desk (Ch. Dickens).

У тому кутку кімнати, що був найближче до столу вчителя, був невеликий камінь.

Descriptive attributive clauses also belong to one member of the main clause but are not connected with it so tightly. Such subordinate clauses can be easily omitted without distorting the content of the main clause. Compare:

The manager of our office, who is a highly educated man, speaks several foreign languages.

Менеджер нашої установи, який є високоосвіченим, розмовляє кількома іноземними мовами.

The connective word in sentences of such a type can be easily replaced by the coordinating conjunction (сурядний сполучник) and the pronoun, e.g.:

In the street I met some children, who (= and they) showed me the way to the station.

На вулиці я зустрів дітей, які (= і вони) показали мені дорогу на станцію.

In English restrictive attributive clauses are more tightly connected with the main clause than in Ukrainian. In terms of punctuation it is revealed in the way that English restrictive attributive clauses are not separated by commas whereas in Ukrainian all attributive clauses are separated by commas [5; 144–145].

5. Adverbial clauses / Підрядні обставинні речення

Such clauses are of various types in both languages.

5.1. Adverbial clauses of place / підрядні речення місця

In both languages the sentences of such a type characterize the action of the main or principal clause, pointing towards its place or direction.

English sentences are joined to the main clause with the help of the connective words *where, wherever, whence*.

Ukrainian adverbial clauses of place are connected with the principal clause with the help of the connective words *де, куди, звідки* (розм. *відкіль, звідкіль*). Unlike English in the Ukrainian main clauses there can be observed the use of the so-called demonstrative words — adverbs, having spatial meaning, — *там, туди, звідти* (розм. *звідтіль, відти*), for example:

Звідти, звідки на темному фоні неба все частіше спалахувала блискавка, загуркотів грім.

In the English main clauses demonstrative words of such a meaning are not used in similar cases, and the main function of the expression of relations of place and direction is rendered with the help of the connective word and the context. Compare:

I shall go where my brother lives. Я поїду туди, де живе мій брат [5; 147–148].

5.2. Adverbial clauses of time / підрядні речення часу

The adverbial clauses of time are joined in English to the main one with the help of the conjunctions *when, while, as, after, before, till, until, since, as long as*, etc. In Ukrainian the adverbial clauses of time are joined with the help of the following connective words and conjunctions: *коли, відколи, поки* (розм. *покіль*), *аж поки, доки* (розм. *докіль*), *аж доки, як після того як, в міру того як, тільки, як тільки, тільки що, щойно, ледве, скоро* and others.

In English the function of conjunctions of adverbial clauses of time can be also fulfilled by some adverbs, for example, *directly, immediately*:

I recognized the place directly I saw it. — Я пізнав це місце, як тільки його побачив.

Immediately he received the telegram, he started for Kyiv. — Як тільки (ледве, щойно) він одержав телеграму, він виїхав до Києва.

The connective function with the meaning of time is performed in modern English also by some nouns or word-combinations: *the moment* (в ту мить як), *the day* (в той день коли), *the evening* (у той вечір коли), *the next time* (наступного разу), *at the time* (в той час як), *by the time* (до того часу коли), etc.:

The moment I saw him I understood everything. — У ту мить, як я його побачив, я все зрозумів.

The peculiarity of Ukrainian adverbial clauses of time are the composite conjunctions of the type *після того як, відтоді як, з того часу як, в той час як* etc. The first part of such a conjunction can be placed in the main clause, whereas the second part *як (коли)* — is in the subordinate clause and is separated from the first one by the intonation pause, and by comma in writing, e.g.:

Зробимо це після того, як усі матеріали будуть перевірені [5; 147–149].

5.3. Adverbial clauses of manner (attending circumstances) / підрядні речення способу дії (супровідних обставин)

Adverbial classes of manner are joined in English with the help of the conjunctions *as, the way, as if, as though*. They point out in what way the action of the main clause takes place. Rather often such a sentence bears in its meaning some sort of comparison, connected with the shade of suggestion, e.g.: *You speak so as if you did not know me.* — *Ви говорите так, ніби ви мене не знаєте.*

In Ukrainian such subordinate sentences are joined with the help of the connective word *як* and the conjunctions: *як, ніби, мов, немов, наче, неначе, ніж* (розм. *аніж*), *що* and others. All of them (except *ніж*) have a correlative word *так* in the main clause, which is concretized by the subordinate sentence: *Він ішов так, наче добре знав дорогу.*

Among the adverbial clauses of manner there are differentiated in both languages three subtypes:

- a) Adverbial clauses of manner proper (власне способу дії), joined in English with the help of the conjunctions: *as, as ... as* and others; in Ukrainian — *як, що, щоб*, e.g.: *You ought to write as he does.* *Буде так, як хотіла ти* (В. Сосюра).
- b) Adverbial clauses of comparison (порівняльні) with the conjunctions: in English *as if, as though*; in Ukrainian *як, ніби, мов, немов, наче, неначе*, e.g. *I remember this story as if (as though) I had just read it.* *А він, мов нічого не чув, іде собі далі* (А. Малишко).

The peculiarity of English adverbial clauses of comparison is that their predicate is used in the form of conditional mood: *He spoke as if (as though) he knew this question very well.*

In Ukrainian the adverbial clauses of comparison are also widely used in conditional mood, where almost all conjunctions can be joined with the particle *би/б*: *По траві плили хвилі, начебто це був не луг, а річка.*

- c) Adverbial clauses of result (наслідкові) with the conjunctions: in English *so ... that*; in Ukrainian *що, аж*, for example: *He played so that we admired him. Вода б'ється в береги, аж осока шумить* (Леся Українка) [5; 149–150].

5.4. Adverbial clauses of measure or degree / підрядні речення міри або ступеня

These adverbial clauses are very close in their meaning to adverbial clauses of manner. While the latter usually explain the verb-predicate of the main clause, adverbial clauses of measure or degree refer to some adjective or adverb in such a sentence.

In English such sentences are connected with the main clause with the help of the conjunctions *as...as, so...as, as, as if, as though, not so...as* and others, e.g.: *He played so well that everybody admired him.* — *Він грав так гарно, що всі ним захопилися.*

In Ukrainian the adverbial clauses of measure or degree also include clauses joined with the help of double conjunctions *чим...тим, що...то, чим...то* and others, for example: *Чим вище дерево, тим глибше йде коріння. Що далі ми заглиблювалися в ліс, то темніше ставало навкруги* [5; 150–151].

5.5. Adverbial clauses of purpose / підрядні речення мети

English adverbial clauses of purpose are joined with the help of the conjunctions *that, in order that, so that, lest, for fear (that)*. These clauses are marked in the way that their predicate has a special modal expression. Very often it is used in the analytical form of conditional mood: *I speak slowly so that you may understand me. Я говорю повільно, щоб ви мене зрозуміли.*

In Ukrainian such clauses are joined most often by the conjunctions *щоб* and *для того щоб*, less often by — *аби*, for example: *Він піде туди, щоб почути все самому* [5; 151].

5.6. Adverbial clauses of cause / підрядні речення причини

Adverbial clauses of cause are joined in English to the main clause with the help of the conjunctions *because, as, since, now that*. Sentences with the conjunction *because* point towards the immediate cause of action or state, which is spoken about in the main clause, while the adverbial clause of cause with the conjunction *as* usually motivates the content of the main sentence. Compare:

I went away because there was no one there. — Я пішов, бо там не було нікого.

As there was no one there, I had to work alone. — Оскільки там не було нікого, я мусив працювати один.

Besides the mentioned conjunctions the adverbial clauses of cause are joined with the main clause also by means of the composite conjunctions, which originated from the substantival and participial word combinations, for example: *for the reason that, on the ground that, seeing that, considering that*.

In Ukrainian conjunctions most frequently used in adverbial clauses of cause are as follows: *бо, тому що, через те що, тим що, від того що, що, а що, а як* and others. The most typical of them are *бо, тому що, через те що*, for example: *Він не ходить на збори, тому що боїться критики* [5; 152].

5.7. Adverbial clauses of condition / підрядні речення умови

In English the adverbial clauses of condition are joined with the help of the conjunctions *if, unless, but that, in case, provided, suppose, supposing* and others. The most frequent of them is the conjunction *if*. The conjunctions *unless* and *but* having negative meaning point to the fact that the action of the main sentence can take place only in case, when the action of the subordinate sentence does not take place, for example:

He is sure to come unless he has some urgent work to do. — Він обов'язково прийде, якщо тільки в нього немає якої-небудь дуже термінової роботи.

Adverbial clauses of condition are characterized by distinct modality. That is why they are so widely used in conditional mood.

In English complex sentences with adverbial clauses of condition are characterized by asyndentic connection. At that there is often observed inversion, for example: *Had it not been so late, I should have stayed longer.*

Widely spread in English are eleptical clauses of condition of the type: *If necessary, I shall do it. I am sure you would act in the same way if in his place.*

In Ukrainian adverbial clauses of condition are connected with the help of the conjunctions *коли, якщо, як, як тільки, аби, скоро, раз* and others. When the adverbial clause of condition is placed before the main one, then the latter starts with the conjunction-equivalent *то*: *Якби я знала, що діждуся, що побачу, то ще б підждала* (Т. Шевченко) [5; 153].

5.8. Adverbial clauses of concession / підрядні речення допусту

Adverbial clauses of concession are joined in English with the help of the conjunctions and the connective words *though (although), in spite of the fact that, notwithstanding that, whoever, whatever, however, no matter that*.

Though it was only nine o'clock, there were few people in the streets. — *Хоч була лише дев'ята година, на вулицях було мало людей.*

He went out in spite of the fact that he was quite ill. — *Він вийшов, хоч був зовсім хворий.*

In Ukrainian adverbial clauses of concession are joined with the main clause by means of the conjunctions and the connective words *хоч (хоча), хай (нехай), дарма що, незважаючи на те що, як не, скільки не* and others. These conjunctions can have as their correlatives the adversative conjunctions *а, але, однак, проте* etc., for example: *Хоч уже листя падало, осінню пахло, а проте було тепло та ясно* (П. Мирний) [5; 156].

5.9. Adverbial clauses of result / підрядні речення наслідку

Adverbial clauses of result are joined in English to the main sentence with the help of the composite conjunction *so that* or the conjunction *that*, which has as its correlative the demonstrative adverb *so*, compare:

She sat behind me so that I couldn't see her face. — *Вона сиділа позаду мене, так що я не міг бачити її обличчя.*

The weather was so bad that the plane could not start. — *Погода була така погана, що літак не міг вилетіти.*

Ukrainian adverbial clauses of result have the same type of conjunction *так що* (й): *Підхопили всі, всі враз і з усіх сил, так що коні шарахнулися набік* (Ю. Смолич).

In both languages adverbial clauses of result usually occupy the position after the main clause [5; 155–156].

Questions for discussion and exercises:

I. Consider your answers to the following:

1. Dwell upon the nature of complex sentences in English and Ukrainian.
2. Describe the subject subordinate clause in both contrasted languages.
3. Are there any difficulties in singling out predicative subordinate clauses in English and Ukrainian?
4. Compare the means of joining object clauses to the matrix clause in contrasted languages.
5. Is there any difference between English and Ukrainian descriptive attributive clauses and descriptive attributive clauses?
6. Describe the peculiarities of adverbial clauses in both contrasted languages. Provide examples of the main types of adverbial clauses in English and Ukrainian.

II. Identify complex sentences in the passages below. Dwell upon the types of clauses in these sentences; describe the means of connection of subordinate clauses to the matrix clause.

1. Temple is guilty of outright cowardice, as was National Public Radio when, in 1994, it decided not to air a series of Abu-Jamal commentaries on prison life. Some folks have speculated that both Temple and NPR knuckled under to pressure from the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP). That the FOP wouldn't want a convicted cop killers views on the air is understandable. But I feel some voices need to be heard. (newspaper writing)
2. There are many players who might win the Masters, many who could. But the feeling about Faldo is that if he is at the top of his game, he could win it. That he is ranked only No 4 in the world at the moment is due to the eccentricity of the system. His first Masters win has now slipped from his ranking points. (newspaper writing)
3. Republican presidential nominee Bob Dole has said, "If World War III were declared, the media would still ask me about abortion." That the media are fixated upon the differences within the GOP regarding abortion no longer is in doubt. That they don't just as enthusiastically dissect the differences within the Democratic Party regarding abortion and same-sex marriages is a troubling example of poor journalism. (newspaper writing)

*The material is taken from "Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook" by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 75.

III. Identify the type of adverbial clauses in the sentences below. Identify the type of subordinator in each case.

1. Whenever I phone them up they all pretend to have emigrated to Australia (conversation).
2. Because schizophrenia is a brain disorder, it's nobody's fault, she says (newspaper writing).
3. For hours he sat there as if deliberately waiting me out (fiction writing).

4. It's not my fault if you don't pass your exams (conversation).
5. She was dark skinned and in her late fifties, although she looked much younger (fiction writing).
6. I haven' been there since I was a kid (conversation).
7. Since the purpose of the list is heuristic, there is no harm in "mixing categories" this way (academic prose).
8. "Trouble just seemed to follow me wherever I went — except here," he said (newspaper writing).
9. As far as farmers are concerned tree planting has not been integrated into their work patterns or land management (newspaper writing).
10. If I were you I wouldn't have told her (conversation).

*The material is taken from "Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English Workbook" by Susan Conrad, Douglas Biber, Geoffrey Leech, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — P. 86.

IV. Identify the type of clauses in the sentences below; describe the means of connection of subordinate clauses to the matrix clause.

1. День кінчався, уступаючи дорогу вечорові, що вже ховався у довгих тінях дубів, серед кущів ліщини, наче соромлячись сонця (В. Гжицький).
2. Немає в світі бурі, щоб огонь могла задути вічний та правдивий (І. Кочерга).
3. Віддайте мені мову, якою мій народ мене благословив (Л. Костенко).
4. І стежечка, де ти ходила, колючим терном поросла (Т. Шевченко).
5. Благословенна та ясна година, коли дитя читає "Кобзаря" (Д. Павличко).
6. Стали спускатися в яр, звідки повіяло холодом і проваллям (Г. Тютюнник).
7. Залазити в чужу душу — це таке ж злодійство, як залазити в чужу комору (М. Стельмах).

8. Хто хоче бути вольовою людиною, той не може не побороти в собі невпевненість (М. Хвильовий).
9. Я весь був як пісня, як акорд суму, що злився з піснею моря, сонця і скель (М. Коцюбинський).
10. Як передать журбу без краю, що закувала серце в лід? (В. Сосюра).

*The material is taken from the text-book: Терлак З. Українська мова: Збірник вправ із синтаксису та пунктуації. — Львів: Світ, 1999. — Р. 135–136.

V. Identify the type of connection between simple sentences within the composite sentence:

- 1) the coordinate connection unites one simple and one or several complex sentences;
- 2) the coordinate connection unites two or several complex sentences;
- 3) the coordinate connection unites two or more simple sentences, which have a common subordinate clause.

Name the types of compound and complex sentences. Think of your own examples of similar sentences in English.

1. Він заграв — і з перших звуків усі збагнули, що він був майстром своєї справи (Марко Вовчок).
2. Степан вперше за цей вечір, одірвавшись поглядом від землі, підвів очі до неба, і чудне тремтіння пройняло його, коли побачив угорі ріжок місяця серед знайомих зірок, того місяця, що світив йому й на селі (В. Підмогильний).
3. Сонце і повітря лоскочуть щоки, а зелень ялинових гілок виглядає з-під снігу так свіжо, що, здається, надворі стоїть весна, одягнена у білі шати (М. Коцюбинський).
4. Деревя стоять похнюпившись, і чути, як падають їхні сльози на землю (В. Підмогильний).

5. Хто не був високо, той зроду не збагне, як страшно —
впасти, і хто не звик до чистоти кришталю, не тямить, як то
тяжко — забруднитись (Леся Українка).
6. Григорій Косинка ніби напився з потоку Стефаника суво-
рої, гіркої і терпкої правди життя, і відкрилося йому, як
треба цінити слово (З газ.).
7. Сонце тільки-тільки виглядало з-за якогось ліска, що тем-
нів по краєвиду тоненькою смужкою, і роса ще не встигла
розійтися туманом по зеленому полю (В. Винниченко).
8. Хвилі світла лились з неба, і чорні тіні десь пощезли, неначе
сонячне сяйво загнало їх у землю (М. Коцюбинський).
9. Ми підем, де трави похилі, де зорі в ясній далині, і карії очі,
і рученьки білі ночами насняться мені (А. Малишко).

*The material is taken from the text-book: Терлак З. Українська мова: Збірник вправ із синтаксису та пунктуації. — Львів: Світ, 1999. — Р. 173–174.

CONCLUSION

Contrastive linguistics attracts attention of linguists around the world, since its value is not purely theoretical, but serves as a basis for the practical application of the linguistic science.

The birth of contrastive language studies was caused by the need to study foreign languages, which is of topical character nowadays. One of the factors creating obstacles for the successful acquisition of a foreign language is the negative influence of the native tongue (also called native language interference). This influence can be removed by **contrastive analysis** of the native tongue (the source language) and the foreign language being acquired (the target language).

The results of contrastive linguistics (in particular contrastive grammar) can be applied for the development of the **methodology of foreign language teaching**. Nationally targeted methodology, which is based on the results of the contrastive language study, creates a lot of advantages for the learning process, namely: provides increasing of effectiveness and intensifying of the learning process, gives the possibility to widen the learning material, its quicker and deeper comprehension, lessens the factor of native language interference, increases the level of language culture awareness. The contrastive aspect provides as well the possibility to determine the study direction of the language material presentation: from the form to the content (in case of analogies in presenting phenomena, easy for acquisition), or from the content to the form (in case of analogies absence and presence of differences, creating difficulties for a certain national group of language learners).

Contrastive linguistics is of practical value for *translation studies*. Results of contrastive analysis of the lexical, grammatical and stylistic systems of two languages facilitate the work of a translator, giving the possibility to observe all the inadequacies on different language levels and the possible ways of their rendering.

Contrastive linguistics contributes greatly to the theory of *language typology*. Due to the observation of similarities and differences in languages we can speak about the initiation of their typological classification, its aim nowadays being the establishing of language types on the basis of their structure specific features, that is taking into account characteristics reflecting the most important features of a language structure.

As a result of contrasting languages scholars came to reveal *language universals* (features or phenomena available in all or the majority of languages of the world). Therefore, nowadays the contrastive analysis continues, on the one hand, to supply the facts for the universology, being, on the other hand, the instrument, which enables the discovery of new universals without the necessity to study all languages of the world for this purpose.

Contrastive linguistics yields valuable results for the *lexicography*. The contrastive analysis of language systems is substantial for the translation dictionary compiling. The lexicographic work upon the bilingual types of dictionaries is, in fact, language contrasting.

The present period of language studies witnesses the intensification in the research of *national language pictures of the world*. This research has become possible due to the contrastive language studies, since the peculiarities of the language conceptualization by means of each separate language can be revealed, first of all, through language contrasting.

Therefore, the results of contrastive analysis have the practical application in all the mentioned cases, when a researcher or learner deals with the *cross-language information recoding*.

The practical value of contrastive linguistics is constantly increasing. It is widening the sphere of its application, which is connected with the growing role of cross-language and cross-cultural communication in

all its forms (internationalization of European education standards, the increase in effectiveness of foreign language teaching, as well as in demands for translation quality in different spheres of activity). Contrastive linguistics is changing with the shift of linguistics interests towards the sphere of language usage; with the appearance of corpus linguistics and development of applied/computer linguistics, which present researchers with the possibilities of language data analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Джеймс К. Контрастивный анализ // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. — М., 1989. — Вып. XXV. Контрастивная лингвистика. — С. 205–306.
2. Єрмоленко С. Я., Биби́к С. П., Тодор О. Г. Українська мова. Короткий тлумачний словник лінгвістичних термінів. — К. : Либідь, 2001. — 224 с.
3. Жлуктенко Ю. О. Контрастивний аналіз як прийом мовного дослідження // Нариси з контрастивної лінгвістики. — К. : Наукова думка. — 1979. — С. 5–11.
4. Жлуктенко Ю. О. О некоторых вопросах контрастивного анализа языков // Вестник КГУ. — 1978. — Романо-германская филология. — № 12.
5. Жлуктенко Ю. О. Порівняльна грамати́ка англійської та української мов: Посіб. — К. : Радянська школа, 1960. — 160 с.
6. Жлуктенко Ю. О., Бублик В. Н. Контрастивна лінгвістика: Проблеми і перспективи // Мовознавство. — 1976. — №4. — С. 3–15.
7. Зубков М. Г. Українська мова: універсальний довідник. — Харків: Школа, 2004. — 496 с.
8. Ильиш Б. А. Строй современного английского языка. — Л. : Просвещение, 1971. — 366 с.
9. Карамишева І. Д. Структурні та функціональні особливості вторинної предикації в сучасній англійській мові (досвід формально-граматичного моделювання): Автореф. дис. ...

- канд. філол. наук: 10.02.04 / Київ. нац. лінгвістичний ун-т. — К., 2005. — 19 с.
10. Корунець І. В. Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов. Навч. посібник. — Вінниця: Нова книга, 2003. — 464 с.
 11. Кочерган М. П. Основи зіставного мовознавства: Підручник. — К.: Академія, 2006. — 424 с.
 12. Левицький А. Е. Порівняльна граматики англійської та української мов: Підручник. — К.: Видавничо-поліграфічний центр “Київський університет”, 2008. — 264 с.
 13. Немзер У. Проблемы и перспективы контрастивной лингвистики // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. — М., 1989. — Вып. XXV. Контрастивная лингвистика. — С. 128–143.
 14. Никель Г. Контрастивная лингвистика и обучение иностранным языкам // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. — М., 1989. — Вып. XXV. Контрастивная лингвистика. — С. 350–365.
 15. Порівняльні дослідження з граматики англійської, української, російської мов / Відп. ред. Ю. О. Жлуктенко. — К.: Наукова думка, 1981. — 353 с.
 16. Сучасна українська мова: Підручник / За ред. О. Д. Пономарева. — К.: Либідь, 2001. — 400 с.
 17. Терлак З. Українська мова: Збірник вправ із синтаксису та пунктуації. — Львів: Світ, 1999. — 224 с.
 18. Урок Української. — Науково-публіцистичний журнал. — 2005. — № 3–4.
 19. Урок Української. — Науково-публіцистичний журнал. — 2005. — № 5–6.
 20. Урок Української. — Науково-публіцистичний журнал. — 2005. — № 9–10.
 21. Урок Української. — Науково-публіцистичний журнал. — 2005. — № 11–12.
 22. Урок Української. — Науково-публіцистичний журнал. — 2006. — № 5–6.

23. Урок Української. — Науково-публіцистичний журнал. — 2007. — № 2–3.
24. Урок Української. — Науково-публіцистичний журнал. — 2007. — № 9–10.
25. Хаймович Б. С., Роговская Б. И. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. — М. : Высшая школа, 1967. — 298 с.
26. Штернеманн Р. (рук.) и коллектив авторов. Введение в контрастивную лингвистику // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. — М., 1989. — Вып. XXV. Контрастивная лингвистика. — С. 145–150.
27. Conrad Susan, Biber Douglas, Leech Geoffrey. Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English. — Longman, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — 487 p.
28. Conrad Susan, Biber Douglas, Leech Geoffrey. Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Workbook. — Longman, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — 140 p.

FURTHER SUGGESTED READINGS

Main suggested readings:

1. Блох М. Я. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка: Учеб. — 3-е изд., испр. — М.: Высшая школа, 2000. — 381 с.
2. Вихованець І.Р. Грамматика української мови. Синтаксис: Підруч. — К.: Либідь, 1993. — 368 с.
3. Ганич Д. І., Олійник І. С. Словник лінгвістичних термінів. — К.: Вища школа, Гол. вид-во, 1985. — 360 с.
4. Жлуктенко Ю. О. Контрастивний аналіз як прийом мовного дослідження // Нариси з контрастивної лінгвістики. — К.: Наукова думка. — 1979. — С. 5–11.
5. Жлуктенко Ю. О. О некоторых вопросах контрастивного анализа языков // Вестник КГУ. — 1978. — Романо-германская филология. — № 12.
6. Жлуктенко Ю. О. Порівняльна граматики англійської та української мов: Посібник. — К.: Радянська школа, 1960. — 160 с.
7. Жлуктенко Ю. О., Бублик В. Н. Контрастивна лінгвістика: Проблеми і перспективи // Мовознавство. — 1976. — № 4. — С. 3–15.
8. Загнітко А.П. Теоретична граматики української мови. Синтаксис. — Донецьк: ДонНУ, 2001. — 663 с.
9. Загнітко А. П. Теорія сучасного синтаксису: Монографія. Вид. 3-тє виправл. і доп. — Донецьк: ДоНУ, 2008. — 294 с.
10. Ильиш Б. А. Строй современного английского языка. (V.Ilyish. The Structure of Modern English). — Л.: Просвещение, 1971. — 366 с.
11. Корунець І. В. Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов. Навчальний посібник. (Korunets' I.V. Contrastive Typology of the English and Ukrainian languages). — Вінниця: Нова книга, 2003. — 464 с.

12. Кочерган М. П. Основы зівастного мовознавства: Підручник. — К. : Академія, 2006. — 424 с.
13. Левицький А. Е. Порівняльна граматики англійської та української мов: Підручник. — К. : Видавничо-поліграфічний центр “Київський університет”, 2008. — 264 с.
14. Порівняльні дослідження з граматики англійської, української, російської мов / Відп. ред. Ю. О. Жлуктенко. — К. : Наукова думка, 1981. — 353 с.
15. Сучасна українська мова: Підручник / За ред. О.Д. Пономарева. — К. : Либідь, 2001. — 400 с.
16. Хаймович Б. С., Роговская Б. И. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. — М.: Высшая школа, 1967. — 298с.
17. Biber D., Conrad S., Leech G. Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English. — Pearson Education Limited, 2003. — 487 p.
18. Greenbaum S., Quirk R. A Student’s Grammar of the English Language. — L.: Harlow: Longman, 1991. — 490 p.

Additional suggested readings:

1. Ахманова О. С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. — М. : Советская энциклопедия, 1969. — 607 с.
2. Бархударов Л. С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. — М.: Высшая школа, 1966. — 200 с.
3. Блох М. Я. Теоретические основы грамматики: Учеб. пособ. — М. : Высшая школа, 1986. — 159 с.
4. Джеймс К. Контрастивный анализ // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. — М., 1989. — Вып. XXV. Контрастивная лингвистика. — С. 205–306.
5. Иванова И. П., Бурлакова В. В, Почепцов Г. Г. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка: Учебник. — М. : Высшая школа, 1981. — 285 с.

6. Иванова Л. П. Методы лингвистических исследований: Учеб. пособие. — К. : ИСДО, 1995. — 88 с.
7. Касевич В. Б. Элементы общей лингвистики. — М.: Наука, 1977. — 183 с.
8. Кочерган М.П. Загальне мовознавство: Підруч. — К. : Вид. центр “Академія”, 2003. — 463 с.
9. Кочергина В.А. Синтаксис. (Учеб. пособ. по курсу “Введение в языкознание”). — М.: Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 1974. — 94 с.
10. Манакин В. Н. Сопоставительная лексикология. — К. : Знання, 2004. — 326 с.
11. Мороховская Э. Я. Основы теоретической грамматики английского языка: Учеб. пособ. — К. : Вища школа, 1984. — 287 с.
12. Немзер У. Проблемы и перспективы контрастивной лингвистики // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. — М., 1989. — Вып. XXV. Контрастивная лингвистика. — С. 128–143.
13. Никель Г. Контрастивная лингвистика и обучение иностранным языкам // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. — М., 1989. — Вып. XXV. Контрастивная лингвистика. — С. 350–365.
14. Раевська Н.М. Present-day English Syntax. [Синтаксис сучасної англійської мови: Підруч.]. — К. : Вища школа, 1970. — 179 с.
15. Сазонова Н. М. К вопросу теории предложения. (На материале современного английского и украинского языков). — К. : Вища школа, 1974. — 86 с.
16. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми: Підручник. — Полтава: Довкілля-К, 2008. — 712 с.
17. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енциклопедія. — Полтава: Довкілля-К, 2006. — 716 с.
18. Смирницкий А. И. Синтаксис английского языка. — М. : Изд-во лит-ры на иностр. языках, 1957. — 286 с.
19. Сосюр Фердинанд де. Курс загальної лінгвістики: Пер. з фр. А. Корнійчук, К. Тищенко. — К. : Основи, 1998. — 324 с.
20. Структурный синтаксис английского языка: Пособ. по теор. грамматике / Под ред. проф. Л. Л. Иофик. — Л.: Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1972. — 176 с.

21. Теньер Л. Основы структурного синтаксиса / Пер. с фр. И. М. Богуславского и др.: Вступ. ст. [С. 5–21], общ. ред. В.Г. Гака. — М.: Прогресс, 1988. — 653 с.
22. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка: Учеб. пособ. / С. П. Балашова, О. И. Бродович, В. В. Бурлакова и др. / Отв. ред. В. В. Бурлакова. — Л.: Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1983. — 253 с.
23. Штерн І. Б. Вибрані топіки та лексикон сучасної лінгвістики: Енциклопедичний словник для фахівців з теоретичних гуманітарних дисциплін. — К.: АРТЕК, 1998. — 336 с.
24. Штернеманн Р. (рук.) и коллектив авторов. Введение в контрастивную лингвистику // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. — М., 1989. — Вып. XXV. Контрастивная лингвистика. — С. 145–150.
25. Carter R., McCarthy M. Cambridge Grammar of English. A Comprehensive Guide. Spoken and Written English Grammar and Usage. — Cambridge University Press, 2007. — 973 p.
26. Chomsky N. Syntactic Structures / with an introd. by D.W.Lightfoot. — 2-d ed. — Berlin; N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002. — 117 p.
27. Collins Cobuild English Grammar. — L.: Harper Collins Publishers, 1992. — 486 p.
28. Crystal D. An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Language and Languages. — Oxford: Blackwell Reference, 1993. — 428 p.
29. Crystal D. The Penguin Dictionary of Language. — L.: Penguin books, 1999. — 390 p.
30. Kobrina N.A., Korneyeva E.A. An Outline of Modern English Syntax. — М.: Higher School Publishing House, 1965. — 210 p.
31. Leech G., Svartvic J. A Communicative Grammar of English. — L. — N.Y.: Longman, 1994. — 423 p.
32. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English / D. Biber, S. Johansson, G. Leech and others. — L.: Longman, 1999. — 1204 p.
33. Swan M. Practical English Usage. — Oxford: Oxford Un-ty Press, 1996. — 654 p.

Посібник за змістом відповідає вимогам програми з дисципліни “Контрастивна граматики англійської та української мов”. Містить тлумачення основних теоретичних понять контрастивної лінгвістики загалом і контрастивної граматики зокрема. Описана методика контрастивних досліджень та висвітлені найважливіші спільні й відмінні риси морфологічного та синтаксичного рівнів англійської та української мов. Кожен розділ посібника закінчується контрольними питаннями для визначення рівня засвоєння опрацьованого теоретичного матеріалу. Низка вправ забезпечує можливість удосконалити набуті теоретичні знання на практичних заняттях та самостійно.

Призначений для студентів базового напрямку “Філологія” спеціальностей “Прикладна лінгвістика”, “Переклад (англійська мова)”, “Мова та література (англійська)”, а також може зацікавити викладачів англійської мови вищих і спеціальних середніх навчальних закладів, аспірантів, студентів та перекладачів.

Навчальне видання

Кармишева Ірина Дамірівна

КОНТРАСТИВНА ГРАМАТИКА АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ ТА УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВ

Навчальний посібник (англійською мовою)

Редактор *Мазур С. І.*

Комп’ютерна верстка: *Парфенюк О. С.*

Підписано до друку 02.12.11. Формат 60×84/16. Папір офсетний.

Гарнітура Мініон. Друк офсетний. Ум. друк. арк. 18,67.

Тираж 300 пр. Зам. № 590.

ПП “Нова Книга”

21029, м. Вінниця, вул. Квятека, 20

Свідоцтво про внесення суб’єкта видавничої справи
до Державного реєстру видавців, виготівників
і розповсюджувачів видавничої продукції

ДК № 2646 від 11.10.2006 р.

Тел. (0432) 52-34-80, 52-34-82. Факс 52-34-81

E-mail: info@novaknyha.com.ua

www.novaknyha.com.ua

Віддруковано з готових діапозитивів у ПП “Юнісофт”

61045, м. Харків, вул. О.Яроша, 18

www.tornado.com.ua; info@tornado.com.ua для питань з приводу друку.



2023107119008