

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
Донецький національний університет економіки і торгівлі
імені Михайла Туган-Барановського

Кафедра іноземної філології та перекладу

О. М. Бондаревська

Курс лекцій з дисципліни

**ПОРІВНЯЛЬНА ГРАМАТИКА АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ ТА
УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВИ**

Кривий Ріг
2018

МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
Донецький національний університет економіки і торгівлі
імені Михайла Туган-Барановського

Кафедра іноземної філології та перекладу

О. М. Бондаревська

Курс лекцій з дисципліни

**ПОРІВНЯЛЬНА ГРАМАТИКА АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ ТА
УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВИ**

Ступінь: бакалавр

Затверджено на засіданні
кафедри іноземної філології та
перекладу
Протокол № 6
від “8” листопада 2018 р.

Схвалено навчально-методичною
радою ДонНУЕТ
Протокол № 2
від “29” листопада 2018 р.

Кривий Ріг
2018

УДК 81'38 : 811.111(042.3)

ББК 81.432.1-7

81

Рецензенти:

Луценко Л. О., кандидат філологічних наук, доцент

Ревуцька С. К., кандидат філологічних наук, доцент

Бондаревська, О. М.

Б81 Курс лекцій з дисципліни «Порівняльна граматики англійської та української мови» [Текст] : для студ. спец. 035 «Філологія», ступінь бакалавр / М-во освіти і науки України, Донец. нац. ун-т економіки і торгівлі ім. М. Туган-Барановського, каф. іноземної філології та перекладу; О. М. Бондаревська. – Кривий Ріг : [ДонНУЕТ], 2018. – 82 с.

У запропонованій методичній розробці представлено основні питання порівняльної граматики як науки, зокрема, морфологія та синтаксис. Викладення теоретичних понять супроводжується великою кількістю прикладів як з англійської, так і з української художньої літератури, що істотно сприяє розумінню способів вираження граматичних понять у специфічно англо- чи україномовному функціонуванні.

Зміст посібника викликає зацікавленість, пов'язану з актуальністю розроблених тем.

Посібник відповідає сучасним методичним вимогам до навчальної літератури.

ББК 81.432.1-7

© Бондаревська О. М., 2018

© Донецький національний

університет економіки і торгівлі

ім. М. Туган-Барановського, 2018

ЗМІСТ / CONTENTS

Content Module 1.Morphology	5
1. Fundamentals	5
2. Noun as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages	15
3. Adjective as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages	24
4. Numeral as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages	36
5. Pronoun as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages	43
6. Verb as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages	57
7. Adverb as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages	69
Content Module 2.Syntax	78
8. Syntax: introduction into basic notions	78
9. The simple sentence. Parts of the sentence	85
10. The composite sentence. The compound sentence	95
11. The composite sentence. The complex sentence	104
Questions for self-control	109
	113
Перелік літератури / References	

CONTENT MODULE 1.MORPHOLOGY

1. Fundamentals PLAN

1. Language.
2. Speech.
3. Basic units of language and speech:
 - the phoneme,
 - the morpheme,
 - the word,
 - the sentence.
4. The term grammar.
5. Word as a basic language unit.
6. Types of stems.
7. The classification of words.

Concepts and terms: *language, speech, language units, the phoneme, the morpheme, the word, the sentence, phonology, morphology, syntax, grammar, basic language unit, the structure of words, grammatical morpheme, lexical morpheme, lexico-grammatical morpheme, grammatical word-morpheme, analytical word, syntactical word, types of stems, simple, derivative, compound, composite, lexeme, grammeme.*

References: 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 14

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. *Uti-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 [15; 11]. 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 [14, 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. [14, 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. Levytsky 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 [9, 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 – shallinvite* 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 stembuilding 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. [13, 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 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) [12, 19-22].

	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>mole, childi, son, male, servant, etc.</i>	<i>female, child, daughter, maid servant, etc.</i>	meanings of lexemes	meanings of grammemes

2. Noun as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

PLAN

1. Definition of the noun.
2. Classifications of the nouns.
3. The features of the English noun.
4. The peculiarities of Ukrainian and English nouns.
5. The grammatical phenomenon of opposition forming.
6. Ways of plural form building in English.
7. Ways of plural form building in Ukrainian.

Concepts and terms: *concrete and abstract nouns, names of living beings and lifeless objects, common and proper nouns, material nouns, collective nouns, thingness, substantivity, categories of number, categories of case, augmentative suffixes, opposeme, singular, plural, countables, uncountables, way of plural form building, collective nouns, nouns determining the substance, abstract nouns, singularia tantum, pluralia tantum.*

References: 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 13

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 [4, 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 [13, 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 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) (*стареча, малеча*), 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 Чернігові*.

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 [10, 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, friendship, 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 “subjecty appraisal” (diminutive) suffixes, as in *дівчатко, носик, синок*. 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, grannie*), -let (*booklet, streamlet*), -ette (*kitchenette, launderette*), -ling (*gooseling, kingling*) [9, 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 (*мисяра, носяра*), etc. [9, 198].

3. 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 – донка, 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:

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 opposeemes at most (*boy – boys, boy's – boys'*). Many lexemes have but one opposeeme (*table – tables*) and many other have no opposeemes at all (*ink, news*). In the opposeeme *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 opposeeme is not marked, and the “plural” member is marked. In the opposeeme *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*), -єна (*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* [6, 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, обжирки, роковини*);
- names of some actions and processes (*пустощі, походеньки, заробітки, дебати*);
- names of games (*шахи, шашки, піжмурки*);
- names of abstract notions (*ресурси, хвастоці, ревноці*);
- some geographical proper names (*Чернівці, Суми, Піренеї*) [6, 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*), *pike* 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. Adjective as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

PLAN

1. Definition of the adjective.
2. Classifications of the adjectives.
3. The peculiarities of Ukrainian and English adjectives.
4. Qualitative adjectives.
5. Full adjective and short adjectives.
6. Typical features of Ukrainian and English adjectives.
7. Degrees of comparison of adjectives.

Concepts and terms: *qualitative adjectives, relative adjectives, peculiar feature of the English adjectives, qualitative adjectives, full adjectives, short adjectives, attributes of substances, quality of substances, the characteristic combinability, typical syntactic functions, suffixes of subjective appraisal, adjectival grammemes, monosemantic, the combinability of adjectives, degrees of comparison of adjectives.*

References: 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14

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, учительва, 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 wordbuilding 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.: *певний, повний*, and short adjectives (короткі або нечленні) – without flexions, e.g.: *винен, годен, 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, зеленсад*) [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. 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, безкрайї*) 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".

4. In Ukrainian as well as in English the category of the degrees of comparison is represented in three-member opposemes, 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 corresponding synthetic forms. *Більш цікавий* and *цікавіший* are rather stylistic synonyms.

5. 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.*).

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*) 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, найдовгий, 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 [6, 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 [6, 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 opposemes 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.

Therefore, an English adjective lexeme may contain three words at most (*strong – stonger – 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 [1, 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 *-иш, -иш* and the case or gender ending (*біл-ий, біл-иш-ий, біл-иш-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 elative 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 [6, 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 -і 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 ліпший) - найкращий(найліпший)* 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 *якої 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].

4. Numeral as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

PLAN

1. Definition of the numeral.
2. Classifications of the numerals.
3. Collective numerals in Ukrainian.
4. Grammatical categories of numeral.
5. The category of gender.
6. The declension of Ukrainian numerals.

Concepts and terms: *numeral, cardinal numeral, ordinal numeral, collective numerals, decimal system, simple or root numerals, derivative numerals, compound numerals, composite numerals, fractional numerals, the category of gender, the declension of Ukrainian numerals, the function of attribute, substantivized.*

References: 2, 3, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14

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) -er+o. 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* [3, 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, двойко, двочко, 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 десяти – 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 *пів*, *півтора*, *чверть* are also used as numerals. In English they are expressed correspondingly with nouns *half*, *quarter*. The numeral *пів* – 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* і *півроку*.

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

From the Ukrainian *пів* numerals *півтора*, *півтори* are formed, and in English we have the correspondent word group *one and a half* and *півтораста* – 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 “*ньрв*” (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*”/неперед). 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* [2, 55-56].

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 [6, 92-93].

In the opinion of B. Khaimovich and B. Rogovskaya, the pair *ten – tenth* forms an opposite of the grammatical category of numerical qualification [13, 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 (одиничність 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 (последовний) 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 *об* in indirect cases, which was widely used in older times.

The numerals *нівтора, нівтору, 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) [2, 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.

5. Pronoun as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

PLAN

1. Definition of the pronoun.
2. Classifications of the pronouns.
3. The peculiarity of pronouns as a class of words.
4. The role of pronouns.
5. Grammatical categories of pronouns.
6. Classes of pronouns.

Concepts and terms: *pronoun, noun pronouns, adjective pronouns, classes of pronouns, personal, possessive, reflexive, demonstrative, interrogative, relative, indefinite, negative, personal, connective, reciprocal, generalizing, quantitative, contrasting, simple, complex and compound pronouns, category of number, personal pronouns, personal-demonstrative pronouns, conjoint possessive pronouns, absolute possessive pronouns, reflexive and strengthening pronouns.*

References: 1, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15

Words fall into classes known as parts of speech in accordance with their lexicogrammatical 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 pronoun.

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 [1, 96-99].

According to Y u.O. Zhluktenko [3, 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. [2, 99].

In his turn the Ukrainian linguist O.D. Ponomariv (with co-authors) [6, 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*).

1. 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 sheep = 1 sheep + 1 sheep*, in other words *sheep pi. = sheep sg. + sheep sg.* With *you* it is different. *You pi.* 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 (*/ 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 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 їде 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, його, 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].

2. 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, мистеся* 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.: *Сховайтеся 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].

3. 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, цяя, 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].

6. Verb as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

PLAN

1. Definition of the verb.
2. The main division within the verb system.
3. The peculiarity of verb as a class of words.
4. The role of verb.
5. Grammatical categories of verb.
6. Classes of verb.

Concepts and terms: *finite verbs, finites, non-finite verbs, non-finites, verbids, conjugated verb forms, non-coniugated verb forms, personal and nonpersonal verb forms, the first conjugation, the second conjugation, the lexico-grammatical meaning of “action/process”, typical stem building elements, the category of aspect and voice, the category of mood, the category of tense, the category of person, the category of number, category of gender, simple verbs, derived verbs.*

References: 1, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14

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-coniugated verb forms (невідмінювані форми) – infinitives, participles, 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 nonpersonal 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* (*занятати*), or the combination of suffixes *-уєа* and *-ти* in derivative verbs (*перечитувати, пересилювати*); prefixes: *-о* (*оминати*), *у-* (*уможливити*), *об-*

(обробити), пере- (перебільшувати), ви- (видужати), з- (звукити, знеболити) and the peculiar Ukrainian postfix -ся (недорозвинутися, 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 ask- ing*) – 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). Verbids 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; стоять – 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; йти, їсти*).

b) Derived verbs (*organize, rewrite, purify, underestimate; викорі- нити, пересунити*).

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) transport*. 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, розповідати 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: *спитьсья, 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*) [6, 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 [5, 116-121]. Ukrainian verbs possess the mentioned two groups as

well (link verbs: *бути, ставати*-, modal verbs – *могти, мусіти*). 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 nounequivalents) denoting the subject and the object of the action named by the verb. Subjective verbs are associated only with nouns (nounequivalents) 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 [6, 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 – прусікти*).

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 nonpersonal 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].

1. 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 opposemes 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*) [8, 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 [8, 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 [3, 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 пере- болюю ...* (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 вечорити.* 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, пече, коле;*

4) emotional states or the general state of the person: *гнітить, не терпиться, не спиться, добре працювалося* and others. English impersonal verbs include only such verbs that denote natural phenomena: *it rains "іде дощ", it snows "іде 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 – ореться, 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].

7. Adverb as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian languages

PLAN

1. Definition of the adverb.
2. The main features of the adverbs.
3. The peculiarity of adverbs as a class of words.
4. The role of adverbs.
5. Grammatical categories of adverbs.
6. Classes of adverbs.

Concepts and terms: *lexico-grammatical meaning of adverbs, the degrees of comparison, qualitative adverbs, quantitative adverbs, circumstantial adverbs, primary adverbs, secondary adverbs, adverbialization, adverbs expressing comparison and similarity, words of the category of state, mental and physical states of a person or of any living creature altogether, the state of the surrounding or its evaluation, the state with some modal connotation.*

References: 3, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14

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, backwards, 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-, хтоз- на-* (*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, аби як, ані-коли, чимало, неспокійно, нікуди, щодень, неохвально*, 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, homewards*, 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 opposemes of any grammatical category [8, 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) adverbsofmanner – *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, зопалу, навмисне, нащастя*).

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 (6, 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, змалечку, 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/ після логи). 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).

1. 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*.

2. 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 благоанням) подивився на свого брата.*)

3. 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].

1. 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.

2. 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: *мнебылоприятно, 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 [5, 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]:

The air was a gleam with diamonds. Повітря сяяло діамантами.

She was astir. Вона заворушилася.

He was asleep. Він спав.

He is unaware of that. Він не знає про це.

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 *-o, -e*.

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 postpositive attribute and the objective predicative member;

3) Ukrainian words of the category of state in *-o, -e* 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,*

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 [6, 199-200].

CONTENT MODULE 2. SYNTAX

8. Syntax: introduction into basic notions

PLAN

1. The basic unit of syntax.
2. The main parts of the sentence.
3. The classification of sentences as to their structure.
4. Composite sentences.
5. One-member sentences.
6. Different types of sentences.

Concepts and terms: *sentence, communication, the act of speech, the speaker, reality, the subject, enclosure, composite sentences, subordinate clause, one-member sentences, nominative sentences, imperative sentences, infinitive sentences, impersonal sentences, indefinite-personal sentences, generalizing-personal, unchangeable verbal predicate forms, subject which is not named, contracted sentence.*

References: 1, 2, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14

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 irreality 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* [15, 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 / (*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. Geroge's are brilliant ideas*, The subject is *George's*, though the predicates agree in number with the nouns *idea, ideas*.

1. 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 adjointment – 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 enclosement (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 enclosement 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*.

2. 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, стягнених). 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!* [8, 240-241].

3. 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 їти ... Оце йробити!*

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 midstream.*

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.*

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): *І більше його там не бачили. And he wasn't seen there any more. Кажє, приходь. They say, you can come* [9, 121-122].

9. The simple sentence. Parts of the sentence

PLAN

1. Primary parts of the sentence.
2. Secondary parts of the sentence.
3. Notional and semi-notional words.
4. The subject.
5. The simple predicate.
6. The compound nominal predicate.
7. The compound verbal predicate.
8. The object

Concepts and terms: *primary or principal parts of the sentence, secondary parts of the sentence, subject, predicate, head-words, notional words, semi-notional words, subject, the simple predicate, the compound nominal predicate, linking verbs, the compound verbal predicate, modal, aspect, nominal-verbal modal predicate, the object, the direct object, the indirect object.*

References: 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15

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 [7, 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 lexico- grammatical 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 [3, 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 *Its 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 стона*. Almost all Ukrainian subjectless sentences correspond to English sentences with the subject. Compare: *Кажуть. They say. Суменіє. 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 ...* (8, 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 nonverbal 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)¹ 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 *Прійду. Пише.* 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?* [5, 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 – поступатися, take courage – зважитися, have a smoke –*

покуритуєтс. 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 непряий 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 давний 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 олівця, 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].

10. The composite sentence. The compound sentence

PLAN

1. Definition of the composite sentence.
2. Structural types of the composite sentence.
3. The nature of the composite sentence.
4. The copulative compound sentence.
5. The disjunctive compound sentence.
6. The adversative compound sentence
7. The causative-consecutive compound sentences.
8. Compound sentences with the meaning of suddenness.

Concepts and terms: *composite sentence, the compound sentence with conjunctions, the copulative compound sentence, proper copulative, adjoining meaning, meaning of recounting, meaning of consequence, the composite conjunction, copulative-negative meaning, the disjunctive compound sentence, adversative compound sentence, contrasting, sequence of events, separate fulfilling of events, conclusion.*

References: 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15

A composite sentence (складнеречення) 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 такі 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, well as compound sentences with causative and consecutive interrelations 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: *і (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 “*і (ї)*”. They render a variety of relations between sentences.

The peculiarity of the Ukrainian conjunction *ї* is the fact that it has its phonetic variant *й* with which it alternates depending on the phonetic syllable of the closest to it surrounding words. Sometimes the conjunction *h* has also a semantic difference, pointing towards the closer connection in comparison to the conjunction *і*.

The main shades of meaning of the Ukrainian conjunction *і* and the English *and* coincide. They render first of all the following meanings:

a) The proper copulative meaning (власно-єднальне 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 (єднально-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 думка*

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. Foreexample: *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..., ніані ...» 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 коливання 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: *Рантом 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 these parathion in the facts alternation (*То ми дотвсходили, то вони до нас.* – (Ю. Корнійчук)). The conjunction *не то ... не то* renders simultaneously doubt and hesitation: *Нето 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, протє, 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 *al* there is also widely used the adversative conjunction *a*. It has more shades of meaning than the conjunction *але*, e.g.:

- Contrasting (протиставлення): *І на оновленій землі врага не буде, супостата, 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, працюй, а ти, поете, співай, завжди співай* (В. Сосюра).
- Conclusion (висновок): *От і станція Сокопгорна, 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 *a*. 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 *a 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, вражних 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 day light, 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 вирунають (Т. Шевченко).

Коли гляне – поперед 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; (і) 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 Джонніколи не вивчав якоїсь віри, (і) він ніколи не заглиблювався в неї з якоюсь певною метою* [10, 401-402].

11. The composite sentence. The complex sentence.

PLAN

1. Definition of the complex sentence.
2. Isomorphic features of the complex sentence.
3. The nature of many logical-grammatical relations of the complex sentence.
4. The subject clause.
5. The predicative clause.
6. The object/objective clause.
7. Attributive clauses.

Concepts and terms: *complex sentence, isomorphic features, the subject clause, the predicative clause, the object/objective clause, attributive clauses, descriptive attributive clauses, attributive clauses, principal clause, connective word, restrictive attributive clauses.*

References: 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15

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 polypredicative 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.

<p>2. Qualitatively-nominal: a) descriptive attributive clauses, b) restrictive/limiting attributive clauses.</p>	<p>2. Квалітативно-номінативні: а) описові атрибутивні підрядні речення, б) обмежуючі атрибутивні підрядні речення.</p>
<p>3. Adverbial clauses: of time, place, purpose, cause, attending circumstances, condition, concession, result, etc.</p>	<p>3. Адвербіальні підрядні речення: часу, місця, мети, причини, способу дії, умови, допусту, наслідку тощо.</p>

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 вклонилось – ожило, що не скорилось – не зійшло з народної дороги (А. Малишко) [5, 143-144].

2. The predicative clause / Присудкове підряднеречення

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].

Questions for self-control

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 subfields of grammar? What types of grammar can be mentioned?
5. What is meant by a word structure as a basic language unit?
6. Dwell upon the classes of nouns differentiated according to different criteria. Provide examples.
7. 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?
8. 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.
9. Provide examples of nouns containing typical stem-building elements in English and Ukrainian.
10. Describe the typical oppositions within the system of the English noun and the Ukrainian noun. Show differences and similarities.
11. Mention the groups, into which adjectives are subdivided as a class of lexemes, taking into account their grammatical and semantic characteristics. Provide examples.
12. What are the peculiarities of the Ukrainian qualitative adjectives? Is there any difference between Ukrainian and English qualitative adjectives?
13. Mention the allomorphic groups of adjectives in both contrasted languages.
14. What groups are Ukrainian adjectives divided into according to their morphological structure?
15. 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?
16. Characterize the groups of numerals in English and Ukrainian languages.
17. What are the peculiarities of Ukrainian collective numerals?
18. What are the groups of English and Ukrainian numerals according to their stem-structure?
19. Compare the group of fractional numerals in both contrasted languages.
20. What are the peculiarities of Ukrainian ordinal numerals in comparison with the English ones?
21. Present the general characteristics of pronoun as a part of speech. Do pronouns differ from other classes of words?
22. Enumerate the classes of pronouns in the contrasted English and Ukrainian languages. Does their number differ?
23. Highlight the opinions of different linguists concerning the issues of differentiating classes of pronouns.
24. Dwell upon the grammatical categories characteristic of English and Ukrainian

pronouns.

25. What are the peculiarities of English versus Ukrainian personal pronouns?
26. Compare the English verb system with the Ukrainian verb system.
27. 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?
28. What is the subdivision of verbs according to their stem structure? Does it coincide in English and Ukrainian languages?
29. 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.
30. Describe the category of person of the verb. Does it differ in two languages under study?
31. Mention the groups, into which adverbs are subdivided as a class of lexemes, taking into account their grammatical and
32. Semantic characteristics. Provide examples in both contrasted languages.
33. Mention the allomorphic groups of adverbs in both contrasted languages.
34. 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?
35. Describe the grammatical categories of adverb as a part of speech. Does their number differ in the contrasted languages?
36. 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.
37. Define the sentence as the basic unit of syntax.
38. What are the phenomena, present at every act of speech?
39. What is the relation between such notions as “predicativity” and “predication”?
40. Dwell upon the expression of syntactic relations in both contrasted languages.
41. How are sentences classified as to their structure?
42. Describe the nature of a simple sentence. What parts of the sentence are usually enough to make a simple sentence?
43. State the difference between the principal parts of the sentence and the secondary parts of the sentence.
44. Define the subject of the sentence. Are there any differences in the subject expression in English and Ukrainian languages?
45. What are subjectless sentences?
46. Define the predicate of the sentence. Are there any differences in the predicate expression in English and Ukrainian languages?
47. Define the composite sentence and its subtypes.
48. What is meant by “semi-complex” and “semi-compound” sentences? Are these types found in both contrasted languages?
49. Dwell upon the compound sentence with conjunctions in English and Ukrainian; state main similarities and differences.
50. 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.

51. 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.

52. Dwell upon the nature of complex sentences in English and Ukrainian.

53. Describe the subject subordinate clause in both contrasted languages.

54. Are there any difficulties in singling out predicative subordinate clauses in English and Ukrainian?

55. Compare the means of joining object clauses to the matrix clause in contrasted languages.

Перелік літератури / References

1. Джеймс К. Контрастивний аналіз // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – Москва: – 1989. – Вып. XXV. Контрастивная лингвистика. – С. 205-306.
2. Жлуктенко Ю. О. Контрастивний аналіз як прийом мовного дослідження // Нариси з контрастивної лінгвістики. – Київ : Наукова думка. – 1979. – С. 5-11.
3. Жлуктенко Ю. О., Бублик В. Н. Контрастивна лінгвістика: Проблеми і перспективи // Мовознавство. – 1976. – №4. – С. 3-15.
4. Зубков М. Г. Українська мова: універсальний довідник. – Харків : Школа, 2004. – 496 с.
5. Ильиш Б. А. Строй современного английского языка. – Москва : Просвещение, 1971. – 366 с.
6. Карамішева 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. – Київ, – 2005. – 19 с.
7. Корунець І. В. Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов / Навч. посібник. – Вінниця: Нова книга, 2003. – 464 с.
8. Кочерган М. П. Основи зіставного мовознавства: Підручник. – Київ: Академія, 2006. – 424 с.
9. Левицький А. Е. Порівняльна граматики англійської та української мов: Підручник. – Київ: Видавничо-поліграфічний центр “Київський університет”, 2008. – 264 с.
10. Немзер У. Проблемы и перспективы контрастивной лингвистики // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – Москва, 1989. – Вып. XXV. Контрастивная лингвистика. – С. 128 – 143.
11. Никель Г. Контрастивная лингвистика и обучение иностранным языкам // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – Москва, 1989. – Вып. XXV. Контрастивная лингвистика. – С. 350-365.
12. Урок Української. – Науково-публіцистичний журнал. 2005. – № 2-3.
13. Хаймович Б. С, Роговская Б. И. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. – Москва: Высшая школа, 1967. – 298 с.
14. Conrad Susan, Biber Douglas, Leech Geoffrey. Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English. – Longman, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. – 487 p.
15. Conrad Susan, Biber Douglas, Leech Geoffrey. Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Workbook. – Longman, Pearson Education Limited, 2003. – 140 p.

Навчальне видання

Бондаревська Олена Михайлівна

Кафедра іноземної філології та перекладу

Курс лекцій з дисципліни

ПОРІВНЯЛЬНА ГРАМАТИКА АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ
ТА УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВИ

Формат 60×84/8. Ум. др. арк. 5

Донецький національний університет економіки і торгівлі
імені Михайла Туган-Барановського
50005, Дніпропетровська обл.,
м. Кривий Ріг, вул. Трамвайна, 16.

Свідоцтво суб'єкта видавничої справи ДК № 4929 від 07.07.2015 р.