

MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIALIZED EDUCATION
OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Faculty of English Philology

Soleyeva Farangiz

THEME: **Distributional approach to the parts of
speech**

Speciality - 5220100

Supervisor: Akramova Tahmina

Final Qualification Work (4 uzb 05 group)

The work has been considered

and admitted for defense,

Chair of 'English Phonetics'

Records № "9" 20 of May 2014



The head of the chair:

Obrueva G.H.

Samarkand - 2014

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	2
Chapter I A survey of modern grammars.....	5
1.1 Structure and Systemic Character of Language.....	5
1.2 General Survey of parts of speech.....	9
Conclusion on chapter I.....	18
Chapter II General problems of involving parts of speech.....	19
2.1 Problems of parts of speech.....	19
2.2 The problem of notional and formal words.....	22
2.3 Distributional Approach to the Problem of Parts of Speech.....	24
2.4 Syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations between linguistic units.....	28
2.5 The Problem of the Future Tense in English.....	37
2.6 The Problem of the Analytical Imperative.....	44
2.7 Fundamentals of Syntax.....	46
Conclusion on chapter II.....	51
Conclusion.....	52
Used literature.....	54

Introduction

It is known that the realizing selfness, national consciousness and expression of thought, mental-spiritual dependence between generations is appeared according to the language[1,42]. The main objective of all our reforms in the field of economic policy is the individual. Therefore the task of education, the task of raising up a new generation capable of national renaissance will remain the prerogative of the state constitute a priority. At present great importance is attached to the study and teaching of foreign languages.

Actuality of the research: English is an international language, spoken in many countries both as a native and as a second or foreign language. It is taught in the schools in almost every country on this earth. It is a living and vibrant language spoken by over 300 million people as their native language. Millions more speak it as an additional language. First of all, let us define the problems which students face nowadays. Generally the number of students come across with the problems of parts of speech. Why is it such a big problem? Let us speak of this problem. In order to get a full insight into language, one has to consider its organization, its mechanism, or, as is accepted to term, its structure and system. Structure is sometimes related to the elements, forms, constructions of language and their meanings. System is referred to as one complex unity of interrelated and interconnected elements, while structure represents inner relations between the elements, or the inner organization of the complex unity.

Aim of the research: At different periods depending on the aims of teaching and learning a foreign language, new methods sprang up. In each case the method received a certain name; sometimes its name denoted logical categorise. Any linguistic description may have a practical or theoretical purpose. Such a description makes it possible to gain inside the inner structure of the given language and to expose the mechanism of its functioning. Hence, the aim of the

course of theoretical grammar is to present a theoretical description of the grammatical system of language, i.e. scientifically analyse this system and define the grammatical categories in the light of principles of modern general linguistics.

Tasks of the research:

-to learn the system of parts of speech

-to give the general survey of parts of speech.

-to get knowledge about general problems of involving parts of speech

Objects of the research: This research is concerning Construction Grammar and the way it attempts to handle parts of speech categories like nouns, verbs and adjectives. It manifests the ways that when we restrict ourselves to the categories provided by traditional grammar, may face serious difficulties which call into question the fundamental categorizations of such grammar. Depending on the overall aims of the research its objects would be the following: learning problems, problems of language activities and materials.

Subject of the research: While studying English as a foreign language we come across with such skills as: grammar in context, speaking, listening, reading, writing.

Novelty of the research: The nature of grammar as a constituent part of language is better understood in the light of discriminating the two planes of language, the plane of content and the plane of expression. The plane of content comprises purely semantic elements of language. The plane of expression comprises the formal units of language taken by themselves, apart from the meaning rendered by them. The next planes are inseparably connected so that no meaning can be realized without some material means of expression. Giving learners something new does wonders in relieving boredom, sparking interest of learners on whom you may have “tried everything”. Young learners tend to have short attention spans and a lot of physical energy.

Theoretical significance of the research: A theoretical description pursues analytical purposes and presents the given part of language in relative isolation. The peculiarities of language skills and connection between them needs more investigations.

Practical significance of the research: A practical description is aimed at providing the student with practical mastery of the corresponding part of language.

Methods of inquire: Methods of foreign language learning is understood here as a body of scientifically tested theory concerning to the learning of foreign languages in HEIs. We need research activities of the following types: descriptive research which deals with "what to learn", experimental and instrumental research dealing with "how to learn and how to solve". Specific variant of Construction Grammar, namely Croft's Radical Construction Grammar, address the issue of parts of speech. Croft's grammar gives the answer to one of the central questions raised in this seminar, namely, which model is most adequate for categorizing word classes in a single language like English but also in a cross-linguistic sense.

The structure of the research: The research consist of Introduction, two main chapters: The system of parts of speech and General problems of involving parts of speech. Conclusion, list of used literature, including local and international resources.

Chapter I A survey of modern grammars

1.1 Structure and Systemic Character of Language.

Methods of a grammatical analysis of a language originated over 2000 years back. Traditional means of grammatical analysis were developed to analyze classical Greek and Latin, both of which are quite different from Modern English in several respects. More recently, other methods have developed for the analysis of languages. Our objective here will be an attempt to compare these methods, not so much to choose the best.

Traditional grammar theory

Traditional grammar basically takes its roots from the Greek school, specifically Greek grammar. One of the distinctions in traditional school is that it for the first time ever divided language into eight parts of speech – noun, verb, participle, article, pronoun, preposition, adverb and conjunction, defining these in a variety of ways and outlining the uses of each in sentences. Also, the Greeks established as a basic assumption the idea that there was a universally correct and acceptable logic of language for man to follow in expressing his ideas. In the medieval period,

grammatical rules were held valid only when they adhered to logical system. Hence, some logical categories were transferred to grammar and this became grammatical categories in languages, including English. Many traditional grammarians still attempted to sort the English language into parts of speech and syntactic functions by defining logical – or psychological – meanings expressed by other speakers of English. For example, nouns were the names of persons, things, they served as subjects, objects, complements, and so on; they showed singular and plural number and had a common and genitive case.

Descriptive and structural linguistics

At the turn of the 20th century many linguistic scholars began to direct their attention to the events in the communicative process that could be considered objectively. They believed that in language study they could only examine the objectively verifiable events of speech and the physical situations in which an utterance appears. In America, the greatest researchers were Franz Boas and, later, Edward Sapir. Because Boas and others sought to describe languages as they were used instead of fitting them into an already established pattern, their field became known as descriptive linguistics. Because descriptive methods became the analysis of the structure of English and other languages, the term structural linguistics came into general use.

Another American linguist Leonard Bloomfield, widely regarded as the father of linguistics in this country, defined the scientific study of language as one that admitted only data which could be objectively verified. The methods of structural grammarians consist of breaking the flow of spoken language into the smallest possible units, sorting them out, and then studying the various ways in which these units are joined in meaning full combination. Structural grammarians often refer to levels of analysis. The levels of analysis are these: phonology, morphology and syntax. The grammar of a language is a complex of systems that may be analyzed, and studied on these three levels.

Generative or transformational grammar

Originated in late 50-s by the world-known American scholar Noam Chomsky, this theory involved various formulas or rules for describing simple declarative English sentences and demonstrating relationships holding between the parts of the sentences. According to this theory, a second set of formulas and rules would be required for transforming these into other type of sentences and structures. Since the theory seeks to set up a system that will generate sentences, it is frequently called generative grammar. Because a part of the theory involves transforming basic sentence types such as questions, negative and passive sentences, it is sometimes called transformational grammar. Occasionally it is referred to by the combined term transformational-generative grammar. The system assumes that sentences such as: Michael didn't paint the portrait. Did Michael paint the portrait? The portrait was painted by Michael. What did Michael paint? are all based on the transformation of a single sentence "Michael painted the portrait".

Language incorporates three constituent parts: a) the phonological system, b) the lexical system, c) the grammatical system. Only the unity of these 3 elements forms the language. Each of these 3 constituent parts of language is studied by a particular linguistic discipline. Thus, the phonological description is effected by the science of phonology, the lexical description – by the science of lexicology, the grammatical description – by the science of grammar. Any linguistic description may have a practical or theoretical purpose. A practical description is aimed at providing the student with practical mastery of the corresponding part of language. A theoretical description pursues analytical purposes and presents the given part of language in relative isolation. Such a description makes it possible to gain inside the inner structure of the given language and to expose the mechanism of its functioning. Hence, the aim of the course of theoretical grammar is to present a theoretical description of the grammatical system of language, i.e. scientifically analyze this system and define the grammatical categories in the light of principles of modern general linguistics. The term "grammar" is used in two meanings: a

part of language, its grammatical structure alongside of the other two parts: word-stock, phonological structure. The theory of grammatical structure, a science of the grammatical part of language.

The nature of grammar as a constituent part of language is better understood in the light of discriminating the two planes of language, the plane of content and the plane of expression. The plane of content comprises purely semantic elements of language. The plane of expression comprises the material (formal) units of language taken by themselves, apart from the meaning rendered by them. The 2 planes are inseparably connected so that no meaning can be realized without some material means of expression.

Grammatical elements of language present a unity of content and expression (meaning and form). In this respect they are similar to lexical elements though the quality of grammatical meaning is different from that of the lexical meaning. On the other hand, the correspondence between the planes is very complex; this is illustrated by the phenomena of polysemy, homonymy, synonymy.

In order to get a full insight into language, one has to consider its organization, its mechanism, or, as is accepted to term, its structure and system. The term “structure” is sometimes related to the elements, forms, constructions of language and their meanings. At the same time, by the term “structure” they often mean the relations and interconnections between the elements of language, or one complex which is made up of the elements and relations as well as connections between them. System is referred to as one complex unity of interrelated and interconnected elements, while structure represents inner relations between the elements, or the inner organization of the complex unity. So, system may be classified as a complex of the elements and relations between the elements (structure)

Language as a system is divided into elements on different levels. The biggest is the division into such “elements” as phonetics, lexis, word formation, morphology,

and syntax. These are the basic parts of language mechanism. There exist specific connections and relations between them.

Modern linguistics lays stress on the systemic character of language and its constituent parts. Language is a system of signs (meaningful units) which are closely connected and interdependent (structure). Units of immediate interdependencies form different micro-systems (subsystems) within the framework of the global macro-system of the whole language. The phoneme, the morpheme, the word, and the sentence are units of different levels of language structure; the phoneme is the unit of the lowest level, the sentence of the highest.

Each system is a set of elements related to one another by a common function. The lowest level of lingual segment is phonemic. The phoneme has no meaning; its function is purely differential. It differentiates morphemes and words as material bodies. Since the phoneme has no meaning, it's not a sign.

The unit of the next level is the morpheme. The morpheme is smallest meaningful unit. It is built up by phonemes, so that the shortest morpheme includes only one phoneme, e.g. ros-y, come-s.

The morphemes often express abstract meanings which are used as constituents for the formation of more concrete nominative meanings of words.

The third is level of words, or lexemic level. Since the word is built up by morphemes, the shortest words consist of 1 morpheme only, e.g. well, but, I. The word is smallest unit, that's to say it names things, actions, qualities, relations, etc., e.g. terror, to terrify, terrible. The function of word is nominative.

The sentence is the smallest communicative unit, e.g. It rains. This is a sentence since it contains information. The function of the sentence is predicative. A unit of a higher level usually contains one or more units. But the combination of units of a certain level does not make a unit of higher level unless it acquires the properties of a higher level. The combination of morphemes only is not a word, it names

nothing. The combination of the words “of the teacher” is not a sentence, it communicates nothing.

On the other hand, a single unit of a given level becomes a higher level unit on acquiring the proper qualities. The phoneme [l] becomes a morpheme when the word “awe” becomes a sentence, when it makes a communication. E.g. “What feelings did you have?” -”Awe”.

Above the sentence there is still another one that is the level of sentence-groups, “supra-sentential constructions”. The supra-sentential construction is a combination of separate sentences forming a textual unity.

The common function of the linguistic signs of all levels is to give expression to human thoughts (the main function of the language).

The systemic nature of grammar is more evident than that of the other levels, since grammar is responsible for the very organization of utterances.

1.2 General Survey of parts of speech

The problem of parts of speech is one that causes great controversies both in general linguistic theory and in the analysis of separate languages. The term "parts of speech" (as well as the corresponding terms in Russian, German, French, and other languages), though firmly established, is not a very happy one. What is meant by a "part of speech" is a type of word differing from other types in some grammatical point or points. To take the clearest example of all, the verb is a type of word different from all other types in that it alone has the grammatical category of tense. Thus, while it is perfectly reasonable to ask, "What is the past tense of the word live?" (the answer of course is, lived), it would make no sense to ask, "What is the past tense of the word city!" or "What is the past tense of the word big?" Those words just have not got any past tense or any tense whatever, for that

matter: the notion of tense cannot be applied to them. Tense is one of the distinctive features characterizing the verb as against every other type of word. However, the question is much less simple with reference to some other types of words, and a general definition of the principles on which the classification of parts of speech is based becomes absolutely necessary.

There are three principles on which the classification is based: meaning, form, and function. By meaning we do not mean the individual meaning of each separate word (its lexical meaning) but the meaning common to all the words of the given class and constituting its essence. Thus, the meaning of the substantive (noun) is "thingness". This applies equally to all and every noun and constitutes the structural meaning of the noun as a type of word. Similarly, the meaning of the verb as a type of word is that of "process", whatever the individual meaning of a separate verb may happen to be. [23,122] By form we mean the morphological characteristics of a type of word. Thus, the noun is characterized by the category of number (singular and plural), the verb by tense, mood, etc. Several types of words (prepositions, conjunctions, and others) are characterized by invariability. By function we mean the syntactical properties of a type of word. These are subdivided into two: its method of combining with other words and its function in the sentence; which has to deal with phrases, and sentence structure.

There is the question about the mutual relation of the criteria. One cannot be sure in advance that all three criteria will always point the same way. Then, again, in some cases, one of them may fail (this especially applies to the criterion of form). Under such circumstances, it may prove necessary to choose between them, i.e. to attach to one of them greater value than to another. It will also be seen that the theory of parts of speech, though considered by most scholars to be a part of morphology, cannot do without touching on some syntactical problems, namely on phrases and on syntactical functions of words.

The noun.

Proceeding in the usual order, we start with the noun, or substantive. Its characteristic features are the following.

Meaning: thingness. Thus, nouns include not only chair, and iron, etc., but also beauty, peace, necessity, journey, and every-thing else presented as a thing, or object.

Form. Nouns have the category of number (singular and plural), though some individual nouns may lack either a singular or a plural form. They also, in the accepted view, have the category of case (common and genitive).

Function, a) Combining with words to form phrases. A noun combines with a preceding adjective (large room), or occasionally with a following adjective (times immemorial), with a preceding noun in either the common case (iron bar) or the genitive case (fathers room), with a verb following it (children play) or preceding it (play games). Occasionally a noun may combine with a following or a preceding adverb (the man there; the then president). It also combines with prepositions (in a house; house of rest). It is typical of a noun to be preceded by the definite or indefinite article (the room, a room), (b) Function in the sentence. A noun may be the subject or the predicative of a sentence, or an object, an attribute, and an adverbial modifier. It can also make part of each of these when preceded by a preposition.

The adjective.

1) Meaning. The adjective expresses property.

2) Form. Adjectives in Modern English are invariable. Some adjectives form, degrees of comparison (long, longer, longest).

3) Function, a) Adjectives combine with nouns both preceding and (occasionally) following them (large room, times immemorial). They also combine with a preceding adverb (very large). Adjectives can be followed by the phrase "preposition + noun" (free from danger). Occasionally they combine with a

proceeding verb (married young), in the sentence, an adjective can be either an attribute (large room) or a predicative (is large). It can also be an objective predicative (painted the door green).

The pronoun.

The meaning of the pronoun as a separate part of speech is somewhat difficult to define. In fact, some pronouns share essential peculiarities of nouns (e.g. he), while others have much in common with adjectives (e.g. which). This made some scholars think that pronouns were not a separate part of speech at all and should be distributed between nouns and adjectives. However, this view proved untenable and entailed insurmountable difficulties. Hence it has proved necessary to find a definition of the specific meaning of pronouns, distinguishing them from both nouns and adjectives. From this angle the meaning of pronouns as a part of speech can be stated as follows: pronouns point to the things and properties without naming them. Thus, for example, the pronoun it points to a thing without being the name of any particular class of things. The pronoun its points to the property of a thing by referring it to another thing. The pronoun what can point both to a thing and a property.

Form. As far as form goes pronouns fall into different types. Some of them have the category of number (singular and plural), e. g. this, while others have no such category, e. g. somebody. Again, some pronouns have the category of case (he — him, somebody — somebody's], while others have none (something).

Function, a) Some pronouns combine with verbs (he speaks, find him), while others can also combine with a following noun (this room), b) In the sentence, some pronouns may be the subject (he, what) or the object, while others are the attribute (my). Pronoun can be predicative.

The Numeral.

The treatment of numerals presents some difficulties, too. The so-called cardinal numerals (one, two) are somewhat different from the so-called ordinal numerals (first, second).

1) Meaning. Numerals denote either number or place in a series.

2) Form. Numerals are invariable.

3) Function, a) As far as phrases go, both cardinal and ordinal numerals combine with a following noun (three rooms, third room); occasionally a numeral follows a noun (soldiers three, George the Third), (b) In a sentence, a numeral most usually is an attribute (three rooms, the third room)^ but it can also be subject, predicative, and object: Three of them came in time; "We Are Seven" (the title of a poem by Wordsworth); / found only four,

The stative.

The next item in our list of parts of speech is a controversial one. Such words as asleep, ablaze, afraid, etc. have been often named adjectives, though they cannot (apart from a few special cases) be attributes in a sentence, and though their meaning does not seem to be that of property. In spite of protracted discussion that has been going on for some time now, views on this point are as far apart as ever. We will expound here the view that words of the asleep type constitute a separate part of speech, and we will consider the various arguments for and against this view. As for the term "stative", it may be used to denote these words, on the analogy of such terms as "substantive" and "adjective"[13;98]

1) Meaning. The meaning of the words of this type is that of a passing state a person or thing happens to be in.

2) Form. Statives are invariable.

3) Function, a) Statives most usually follow a link verb (was asleep, fell asleep). Occasionally they can follow a noun (man alive). They can also sometimes be preceded by an adverb (fast asleep), (b) In the sentence, a stative is most usually a

predicative (he fell asleep). They can also be objective predicatives (I found him asleep) and attributes, almost always following the noun they modify (a man asleep in his chair).

The verb.

1) Meaning. The verb as a part of speech expresses a process.

2) Form. The verb is characterized by an elaborate system of morphological categories, some of which are, however, controversial. These are: tense, aspect, mood, voice, person, and number.

3) Function, a) Verbs are connected with a preceding noun (children play) and with a following noun (play games). They are also connected with adverbs (write quickly). Occasionally a verb may combine with an adjective (married young), b) In a sentence a verb (in its finite forms) is always the predicate or part of it (link verb). The functions of the verbals (infinitive, participle, and gerund) must be dealt with separately.

The adverb.

1) The meaning of the adverb as a part of speech is hard to define. Indeed, some adverbs indicate time or place of an action (yesterday, here), while others indicate its property (quickly) and others again the degree of a property (very). As, however, we should look for one central meaning characterizing the part of speech as a whole, it seems best to formulate the meaning of the adverb as "property of an action or of a property".

2) Form. Adverbs are invariable. Some of them, however, have degrees of comparison (fast, faster, and fastest).

3) Function, a) An adverb combines with a verb (run quickly), with an adjective (very long), occasionally with a noun (the then president) and with a phrase (so out of things), b) An adverb can sometimes follow a preposition (from there), c) In a

sentence an adverb is almost always an adverbial modifier, or part of it (from there), but it may occasionally be an attribute.

The preposition.

The problem of prepositions has caused very heated discussions, especially in the last few years: Both the meaning and the syntactical functions of prepositions have been the subject of controversy. We will treat of this matter at some length in Chapter XVIII, and here we will limit ourselves to a brief statement of our general view on the subject.

1) Meaning. The meaning of prepositions is obviously that of relations between things and phenomena.

2) Form. Prepositions are invariable.

3) Function, a) Prepositions enter into phrases in which they are preceded by a noun, adjective, numeral, stative, verb or adverb, and followed by a noun, adjective, numeral or pronoun, b) In a sentence a preposition never is a separate part of it. It goes together with the following word to form an object, adverbial modifier, predicative or attribute, and in extremely rare cases a subject (There were about a hundred people in the hall).

The Conjunction.

The problem of conjunctions is of the same order as that of prepositions, but it has attracted less attention. We will reserve full discussion of the matter to Chapter XIX and we will only state here the main points.

1) Meaning. Conjunctions express connections between things and phenomena.

2) Form. Conjunctions are invariable.

3) Function, a) They connect any two words, phrases or clauses, b) In a sentence, conjunctions are never a special part of it. They either connect homogeneous parts of a sentence or homogeneous clauses (the so-called coordinating conjunctions),

or they "join a subordinate clause to its head clause (the so-called subordinating conjunctions).

A further remark is necessary here. We have said that prepositions express relations between phenomena, and conjunctions express connections between them. It must be acknowledged that the two notions, relations and connections, are somewhat hard to distinguish. This is confirmed by the well-known fact that phrases of one and the other kind may be more or less synonymous: e. g., an old man and his son and an old man with his son. It is also confirmed by the fact that in some cases a preposition and a conjunction may be identical in sound and have the same meaning (e. g. before introducing a noun and before introducing a subordinate clause; the same about after]. Since it is hard to distinguish between prepositions and conjunctions as far as meaning goes, and morphologically they are both invariable, the only palpable difference between them appears to be their syntactical function. It may be reasonably doubted whether this is a sufficient basis for considering them to be separate parts of speech. It might be argued that prepositions and conjunctions make up a single part of speech, with subdivisions based on the difference of syntactical functions. Such a view would go some way toward solving the awkward problem of homonymy with reference to such words as before, after, since, and the like. However, since this is an issue for further consideration, we will, for the time being, stick to the traditional view of prepositions and conjunctions as separate parts of speech.

The Particle.

By particles we mean such words as only, solely, exclusively, even (even old people came), just (just turn the handle), etc. These were traditionally classed with adverbs, from which they, however, differ in more than one respect.

1) Meaning. The meaning of particles is very hard to define. We might say, approximately, that they denote subjective shades of meaning introduced by the speaker or writer and serving to emphasize or limit some point in what he says.

2) Form. Particles are invariable.

3) Function, a) Particles may combine with practically every part of speech, more usually preceding it (only three), but occasionally following it (for advanced students only), b) Particles never are a separate part of a sentence. They enter the part of the sentence formed by the word (or phrase) to which they refer. (It might also be argued that particles do not belong to any part of a sentence.)

The Modal word.

Modal words have only recently been separated from adverbs, with which they were traditionally taken together. By modal words we mean such words as perhaps, possibly, certainly.

1) Meaning. Modal words express the speaker's evaluation of the relation between an action and reality.

2) Form. Modal words are invariable.

3) Function, a) Modal words usually do not enter any phrases but stand outside them. In a few cases, however, they may enter into a phrase-with a noun, adjective, etc, (he will arrive soon,, possibly tonight), b) The function of modal words in a sentence is a matter of controversy. We will discuss this question at some length in Chapter XXI and meanwhile we will assume that modal words perform the function of a parenthesis. Modal words may also be a sentence in themselves.

The interjection.

1) Meaning. Interjections express feelings (ah, alas). They are not names of feelings but the immediate expression of them, Some interjections represent noises, etc., with a strong emotional coloring (bang!).

2) Form. Interjections are invariable.

3) Function, a) Interjections usually do not enter into phrases. Only in a few cases do they combine with a preposition and noun or pronoun, e.g. alas for him! b) In a

sentence an interjection forms a kind of parenthesis. An interjection may also be a sentence in itself, e. g. Alas! as an answer to a question.

So far we have been considering parts of speech as they are usually termed and treated in grammatical tradition: we have been considering nouns, adjectives, verbs, etc. Some modern linguists prefer to avoid this traditional grouping and terminology and to establish a classification of types of words based entirely on their morphological characteristics and on their ability (or inability) to enter into phrases with other words of different types. Thus, for instance the words and and or will fall under one class while the words because and whether will fall under another class.

These classes are not denoted by special terms, such as "noun" or "adjective"; instead they are given numbers; thus, the words concert and necessity would belong to class 1, the words seem and feel to class 2, etc. Without even going into details, it is easy to see that the number of such classes is bound to be greater than that of the usual parts of speech. For instance, in the classification proposed by C. C. Fries there are no less than 19 classes of words.

It must be recognized that classifications based on these principles yield more exact results than the traditional ones, but the system thus obtained proves to be unwieldy and certainly unfit for practical language teaching. Whether it can be so modified as to be exact and easily grasped at the same time remains to be seen.

Conclusion on chapter I

The problem of parts of speech is one that causes great controversies both in general linguistic theory and in the analysis of separate languages. The term "parts of speech" (as well as the corresponding terms in Russian, German, French, and

other languages), though firmly established, is not a very happy one. What is meant by a "part of speech" is a type of word differing from other types in some grammatical point or points. To take the clearest example of all, the verb is a type of word different from all other types in that it alone has the grammatical category of tense. There is the question about the mutual relation of the criteria. One cannot be sure in advance that all three criteria will always point the same way. Then, again, in some cases, one of them may fail (this especially applies to the criterion of form). Under such circumstances, it may prove necessary to choose between them, i.e. to attach to one of them greater value than to another. We have been considering parts of speech as they are usually termed and treated in grammatical tradition: we have been considering nouns, adjectives, verbs, etc. Some modern linguists prefer to avoid this traditional grouping and terminology and to establish a classification of types of words based entirely on their morphological characteristics and on their ability (or inability) to enter into phrases with other words of different types.

Chapter II General problems involving parts of speech

2.1 Problems of parts of speech

The words of language, depending on various formal and semantic features, are divided into grammatically relevant classes. The traditional grammatical classes of words are called "parts of speech."

The problem of parts of speech caused much difficulty both in general linguistics and in the analysis of separate languages. Though it has been studied for more than 200 years, the criteria for defining parts of speech have not been worked out yet. Traditionally grammar gave a semantic definition of parts of speech, taking into account only meaning. However, only meaning cannot be a reliable criterion for defining parts of speech because different parts of speech may have the same meaning and vice versa. E.g. the nouns “books”, “tables”, “students”, denote objects and there are nouns as “flight”, “movement”, “arrival”, which do not denote objects but belong to nouns. We see that meaning cannot be the only criterion for defining parts of speech. The structural school of linguistics does not take into account meaning only but only form. Form alone cannot be a reliable criterion either because many parts of speech especially in English may have the same form, e.g. water-to water, silk (adj.) - to silk. Moreover, if we take into account only form, then such unchangeable words as article, particle should be referred to only part of speech.

We see that the criterion of form is not sufficient. The grammatical criterion should be taken into account to give an adequate definition of any part of speech. By grammatical features we mean: morphological and syntactical features.

By morphological features different categories are meant. The morphological categories of noun are the categories of number and case. By morphological categories of adjectives we mean the category of quality (degrees of comparison).

By syntactical features of the part of speech the syntactical functions of it are meant. The syntactical function is the most reliable criterion. Thus, the modern conception and amended definition of part of speech should take into account all the above mentioned criteria in complex.

“Word classes which also known as parts of speech are essential for any grammatical description, even though we can never really be entirely sure what their nature is. The reason for this uncertainty is that word classes are not tangible

three-dimensional entities, but mental concepts, i.e. they ‘exist’ only in our minds.” [24,126]. Parts of speech emerge from a process of classification which takes into account formal and functional features of the words to be classified as parts of speech.[24,143] Azar B. Sh. points out that these parts of speech or word classes can be viewed as abstractions over sets of words displaying some common property or properties.[3,88]

Further states that attempts to classify parts of speech go back to the ancient world of Plato and Aristotle. Plato developed a system which split up speech acts into two categories, namely ONOMA (name) and RHEMA (declaration).[22,116] Together, these categories form the LOGOS, the speech or discourse. In example: The earth is flat: The Earth would be the onoma, while is flat is the rhema of the sentence. Other related labels for onoma and rhema would be noun, subject, thing or argument for onoma and verb, predicate, property or function for rhema.

Aristotel later added the category of SYNDESMOS, which are those things that connect onoma and rhema into sentences. In traditional grammatical terminology, the category syndesmos might include such word classes as conjunctions, prepositions, pronouns and articles. But while Plato only made a logical division between parts of speech in terms of their discourse and meaning, Aristotle’s new category is grounded on a formal level. Aristotle hereby set an example for many others to follow; by adding more and more formal features to a model initially based solely on logical criteria, two different levels of categorization were mixed which, under close scrutiny, turned out to not have been well combined indeed. In the first century B.C., the grammarian DionysiusTrax developed a theory of eight parts of speech, which is still the basis of current attempts to classify parts of speech. This model includes nouns, verbs, adjectives, articles, pronouns, prepositions, adverbs and conjunctions. However, Bybee Joan L, shows that there exist a number of difficulties in fitting various words into these categories. First of all, the different consideration or accentuation of those aspects that might be employed for grouping different items into the parts of speech categories

mentioned result in different categorizations or group memberships of these items. Bybee Joan L, lists morphological aspects (e.g. differentiation between inflecting and non-inflecting words), syntactic aspects (e.g. the ability to occur in certain phrases like noun phrase or verb phrase, the ability to occur with an article) and semantic aspects, which include the observation that the parts of speech such as noun, adjective and verb are based on logical categories ('substance', 'property', 'process') while conjunctions and prepositions are based on the category of 'relation'. [5,142] The difficulties that arise have their roots in the inconsistency in which the aforementioned criteria are applied to classify parts of speech. These criteria are often arbitrary or overlap, like in the case of numerals. Numerals on the basis of their common lexical features (they signify numbers and masses) form their own class, even though their single members, from a syntactic point of view, might behave like nouns (thousands of people), adjectives (one book) or adverbs (he called thrice). Another difficulty arises from homonymy, which occurs when two or more words that sound the same have to be included within different parts of speech, e.g. rain(verb) and rain(noun). Concerning the semantic aspects Abbott G, points out that the so-called notional definitions which might be useful in certain pedagogical settings (like school grammars) are not adequate for defining parts of speech. Notional definitions make statements like "a noun is defined as 'a word that denotes a person [sic] place or thing', and a verb is an 'action word.' [2,78] But when we look at a verb like to see, we can clearly see that it does not denote an action, while nouns like action and activity certainly do not denote persons, places or things. Different theories of grammar have different approaches for categorizing which words belong to which parts of speech. One of them is generative grammar.

2.2 The problem of notional and formal words

According to the view held by some grammarians, words should be divided into two categories on the following principle: some words denote things, actions, and other extra linguistic phenomena (these, then, would be notional words), whereas other words denote relations and connections between the notional words, and thus have no direct bearing on anything extra linguistic (these, then, would be the formal words, or form words). Authors holding this view define prepositions as words denoting relations between words (or between parts of a sentence), and conjunctions as words connecting words or sentences.

However, this view appears to be very shaky. Actually, the so-called formal words also express something extra linguistic. For instance, prepositions express relations between things. e. g., The letter is on the table and The letter is in the table: two different relations between the two objects, the letter and the table, are denoted by the prepositions. In a similar way, conjunctions denote connections between extra linguistic things and phenomena. Thus, in the sentence The match was postponed because it was raining the conjunction because denotes the causal connection between two processes, which of course exists whether we choose to express it by words or not. In the sentence It was raining but the match took place .all the same the conjunction but expresses a contradiction between two phenomena, the rain and the match, which exists in reality whether we mention it or not. It follows that the prepositions on and in, the conjunctions because and but express some relations and connections existing independently of language, and thus have as close a connection with the extra linguistic world as any noun or verb. They are, in so far, no less notional than nouns or verbs.

Now, the term "formal word" would seem to imply that the word thus denoted has some function in building up a phrase or a sentence. This function is certainly performed by both prepositions and conjunctions and from this point of view prepositions and conjunctions should indeed be singled out.

But this definition of a formal word cannot be applied to particles. A particle does not do anything in the way of connecting words or building a phrase or a sentence.

There does not therefore seem to be any reason for classing particles with formal words. If this view is endorsed we shall only have two parts of speech which are form words, viz. prepositions and conjunctions.

It should also be observed that some words belonging to a particular part of speech may occasionally, or even permanently, perform a function differing from that which characterizes the part of speech as a whole. Auxiliary verbs are a case in point. In the sentence / have some money left the verb have performs the function of the predicate, which is the usual function of a verb in a sentence, In this case, then, the function of the verb have is precisely the one typical of verbs as a class. However, in the sentence / have found my briefcase the verb have is an auxiliary: it is a means of forming a certain analytical form of the verb find. It does not by itself perform the function of a predicate. We need not assume on that account that there are two verbs have, one notional and the other auxiliary. It is the same verb have, but its functions in the two sentences are different. If we take the verb shall, we see that its usual function is that of forming the future tense of another verb, e. g. I shall know about it to-morrow. Shall is then said to be an auxiliary verb, and its function differs from that of the verb as a part of speech, but it is a verb all the same. Some linguists are of the opinion that the distinction between notional and formal parts of speech is to some extent relative. The matter is that some words belonging to particular part of speech is occasionally perform a function differing from that which characterized the parts of speech as a whole. E.g., in the sentence "I have some money left" the verb "have" performs the function of the predicate, which is the usual function of a verb in a sentence. In this case it is a notional word. But in the sentence "I have found my briefcase" the verb "have" is an auxiliary; it is a means of forming a certain analytical form of the verb find. So, we have one and the same verb "have" but with different functions on the sentence.

2.3 Distributional Approach to the Problem of Parts of Speech

Distributional approach, which was formulated by Charles Fries, has become popular with the grammarians of the 20th century. He applied two principles:

The principle of distribution and the principle of substitution

The principle of distribution consisted in the fact that he classified all the words of their position in the sentence. He found four main positions of notional words in the English sentence; those of the noun (N), verb (V), adjective (A), adverb (D). So, he divided all the notional words into 4 classes. His principle of substitution consisted in substituting the words of other positions. He found out that all the word that can occupy the same position in different test frames (A, B, C) belong to the same part of speech.

A. The concert was good (always).

B. The man remembered the task (suddenly).

C. The team went there.

The 4 main classes contain approximately 67 percent of the total number of words. Functional words (function words) are unable to fill in the position of the frames without destroying their structural meaning.

Modern English is exceptionally rich in homonymous words and word-forms. It is held that languages where short words abound have more homonyms than those where longer words are prevalent. Therefore, abundance of homonyms in Modern English is to be accounted for by the monosyllabic structure of the commonly used English words.

Homonymy of the words and homonymy of word-forms.

When analyzing different cases of homonymy we find that some words are homonymous in all their forms, i.e. we observe full homonymy, e.g. in seal “a sea animal” and seal- “a design printed on paper”. The paradigm “seal, seal’s, seals, seals” is identical for both of them.

In other cases, e.g. “seal” – “a sea animal” and “to seal” – “to close tightly”, we see that although some individual word-forms are homonymous, the whole of the paradigm is not identical:

seal – “seal, seal’s, seals, seals”

(to) seal – “seal, seals, sealed, sealing”

It is easily observed that only some of the word-forms (seal, seals) are homonymous, whereas others (e.g. sealed, sealing) are not. In such case we cannot speak of homonymous words but only of homonymy of individual word-forms or of partial homonymy. This is true of “find, found, found” and “found, founded, founded”.

Homonyms may be also classified by the type of meaning into lexical, lexico-grammatical and grammatical. In seal₁ and seal₂ the part of speech meaning of the word and the grammatical meanings of all its forms are identical. The difference is confined to the lexical meaning only: seal denotes “a sea animal”, seal– “a design printed on paper”. So we can say that seal and seal are lexical homonyms because they differ in lexical meaning. If we compare seal (a sea animal) and seal (to close tightly), we shall observe not only the difference in the lexical meaning of their homonymous word-forms but a difference in their grammatical meanings as well. As both grammatical and lexical meanings differ we describe these homonymous word-forms as lexico-grammatical.

Language and Speech

Language is defined as a system of signs, while speech as the use of signs. The sign (meaningful unit) in the system of language has only a potential meaning in

speech. The potential meaning of the linguistic signs is actualized, that's to say is made situational significant as part of grammatically organized text.

Language is understood by modern linguists as a system of signs having their own meaning and form, while speech is understood as a system of the use of these signs. Language in the narrow sense is a system of means of expressions, while speech is the manifestation of the system of language in the process of communication. The system of language includes, on the one hand, the body of material units; on the other hand, the regularities or rules of the use of these units. Speech comprises both the act of producing utterances, and the utterances themselves. Thus, language is realized through speech. For instance, the concrete phrase "very fine weather" is a fact of speech, created by the individual spoken for his own purpose, and founded on the knowledge of the pattern "adverb + adjective + noun", which is certainly a statement about language, namely, about the syntactical system of English on the phrase level.[6,98]

We have the broad philosophical concept of language, according to which language is the system of signs (language proper) and the use of signs (speech proper).

Grammar (the grammatical system) is an integral part of the lingual macro-system – language- because it connects language and speech. Sentences pronounced or written are the result of organizing words taken from the word-stock of the language according to the rules existing in the grammatical system of the language. The grammatical relations are expressed in different language differently.

American Sign Language

The grammars of sign languages may be just as complex as those of spoken languages.

Finally let's consider agreement morphology on verbs in a sign language. We have already seen one example of this in the discussion of mutation morphology. ASL has a category of verbs that sign linguists call «directional verbs». These are verbs

designating transfer events, or information transfer events, or other events viewed as having a direction. These verbs have a basic handshake and a position on the body, but their direction has to agree with the source and the goal (often the recipient) of the event. The agreement is with what corresponds to person in ASL, the position in signing space of the participants. 1st and 2nd person have the position of the signer and the sign interpreter, and other participants are «placed» in signing space by the signer as they come up.

For example, to produce the sign for 'give' in ASL when the source/agent is neither the signer nor the sign interpreter and the recipient is the signer, the signer uses the basic handshake for 'give', moving one hand from the position of the giver in signing space to the signer's own chest. The direction would be the opposite if the roles were reversed.

Another form of agreement in ASL makes use of classifiers. Classifiers in ASL take the form of particular handshakes that represent general properties of things. For example, an index finger pointing upward represents a standing person, a cupped hand represents a container, and the extended thumb and first two fingers represents a vehicle. One use of classifiers is as morphemes agreeing with the subjects of verbs designating move events and be at states. In this case the agreement is the opposite of what happens with verbs of giving and telling. It is the handshake that represents the agreement morpheme and the movement of the hand(s) that represents the content of the verb. For example, to sign a sentence meaning 'the car is here', the signer would make the sign for 'car', then with the 'vehicle' classifier handshake sign 'be here', that is, move the hand downward in front of the body.

How is verb agreement in ASL like the verb agreement in the spoken languages we have considered? At least in many cases agreement in ASL is obligatory, as it is in spoken languages. It may also be redundant, as in the 'vehicle' example.

Agreement in ASL, in fact morphology in sign languages generally, is strikingly different from spoken language morphology in one way. It is invariably iconic; all of these examples we have seen «make sense». With respect to form alone, sign language grammatical morphology differs in another way from most spoken language grammatical morphology in that it occurs simultaneously with the root morpheme. Of course this derives from the potential in sign languages to maintain a particular handshake while a movement is executed.

One point of this section has been to show how much languages can vary in terms of what information gets represented on their verbs. It is on verbs that we see how different languages can get. Within our set of languages, we have seen a range of possibilities, but we still are not close to the extreme of some American Indian and Eskimo languages, like Inuktitut, where verbs frequently include more than ten morphemes. However, those words usually include morphemes that go beyond the functions we've discussed in this chapter. Such languages excel at creating new words from a small number of roots and extensive productive morphology. How this sort of process works is the topic of the next chapter.

Types of languages

All the languages are divided into synthetic and analytical. The Dutch scholar Otto Jespersen connected the development of the language with its progress. He considered languages which we developed from synthetic into analytical to be advanced and vice-versa – from analytical into synthetic – regressive.

The grammatical signals of analytical languages are follows: word order is fixed in analytical languages and it is very important because of the loss of inflexions. E.g. The hunter killed the bear. The bear killed the hunter. The existence of a large number of functional words, like auxiliary words and form words (prepositions, conjunctions, articles, particles). Inflexions in analytical languages are very few due to their loss, their role is fulfilled by function words and words order. The main inflexions in Modern English are -s-, -ed-, -ing-, -en. Intonation

does not play an important role in English. It is used only in some cases as a means of forming a sentence. E.g. water, fire, but: Water! Fire! The word has a stress and intonation gives sense to it. In such cases intonation has only a sentence forming function.

2.4 Syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations between linguistic units

There exist intralinguistic relations between words and between word-forms. Intralinguistic relations of words and word-forms are basically of two main types: syntagmatic and paradigmatic.

Syntagmatic relations define the word or word-form when it is used in combination with other words in the flow of speech, oral or written. Syntagmatic relations appear when elements of one level of language enter the higher level of language, eg. phonemes into morphemes, morphemes into words, words into phrases, and so on. Syntagmatic relations are immediate linear relations between units in the string of speech. Paradigmatic relations are those that exist between individual grammatical forms of the word (eg. come, comes, came, will come, and so on) outside the string of speech. Paradigmatic relations define the word (word-form) through its interrelation with other grammatical forms of the same word. For example, the meaning of the form “got” can be fully understood only in comparison with other forms of the same set of forms (get, gets, getting).

Syntagmatic relations exist in speech, in real utterances, that is why they are described by the Latin formula as relations “in praesentia”. Paradigmatic relations exist in language, to be more exact, between the elements in the system of language. Paradigmatic relations cannot be directly observed in utterances, that is why they are referred to as relations “in absentia”. However, the members of paradigmatic relations appear in speech and thus enter the syntagmatic relations.

The Boundary Line Between morphology and syntax

The usual definition of morphology lies as follows. Morphology is the part of grammar that treats of the words, their structure, classification. Syntax is the part of grammar that treats of phrases and sentences. These definitions are based on the assumption that we can clearly distinguish between words and phrases. This, however, is far from being the case. E.g., we have the word “indestructibility”, which is obviously a word, long as it is. But what about “has been found”. This is evidently a phrase since it consists of 3 words and thus falls under the heading of syntax, but, on the other hand, it is a form of the word “to find” and thus should fall under the heading of morphology. It seems most advisable to include all such cases under morphology, considering the syntactical side of the formation to have been put, so to say, at the disposal of morphology.

The problem becomes more complicated if we take into account such formations as “has been often found”, where one word (often) comes to stand between two elements of the form of another word (find). Such formations will have to be considered both under morphology and under syntax. This means that morphology and syntax overlap here.

It may be said that, in a way, morphology is more abstract than syntax, as it does not study the connections between words actually used together in sentences, but connections between forms actually found in different sentences and extracted from their natural surroundings.

In another way, however, morphology would seem to be less abstract than syntax as it studies units of a smaller and of a more compact kind, whereas syntax deals with larger units.

The peculiar difficulty in the treatment of analytical verb forms, such as “have done” lies in the fact that they have both a morphological and a syntactical quality. They are morphological and facts in so far as they belong to the system of the verb in question, because the auxiliary verb adds nothing to the lexical meaning

expressed in the infinitive. But the same forms are facts of syntax as they consist of two or three or four elements and sometimes other word may come in between them. We are bound to admit that the formation “has ... come” is something of a syntactical formation.[40,11] The inevitable conclusion is that “has come” and other formations of this kind are simultaneously analytical verb forms and syntactical unities.

The Notion of the Grammatical Category and Grammatical Meaning

Grammatical category and grammatical meaning are considered to be basic notions in grammar. Grammatical meaning is a generalized meaning common to the words of the same class and which is expressed only through the grammatical form. The latter is a means of expression of grammatical meaning.

Traditional grammar viewed grammatical category as a set of words with different roots and different lexical meanings but having the same grammatical form and meaning E.g. pens, books, students, women, children, crises – all these words have one thing in common – they have the grammatical meaning of plurality, which is expressed through one and the same form.[6,87]

According to modern conception, the categorical meaning (e.g. the grammatical number, or meaning of number) unites the individual meanings of the correlated paradigmatic forms (e.g. singular – plural) and is exposed through them. The meaning of the grammatical category and the meaning of the grammatical form are related to each other. Modern grammarians view a grammatical category as a unity of meaning and form, i.e. as a system of expressing grammatical meaning by means of paradigmatic correlation of grammatical forms. The set of grammatical forms expressing a categorical function constitutes a paradigm. The paradigmatic correlations of grammatical forms are exposed by the so-called “grammatical oppositions.” The correlated elements (members of the opposition) must possess two types of features: common features and differential features. A grammatical category must be expressed by at least one opposition of forms. These forms are

ordered in a paradigm. Thus, what was considered a grammatical category by the traditional grammar according to the modern conception is nothing else but a form-class. E.g. pen, book, student, woman, child, crisis – this form-class is opposed to the second form-class: pens, books, students, women, children, crises. A grammatical category is a set of at least two form classes which are in the relation of opposition and mutual exclusion. The form-classes are opposed to each other both in meaning (grammatical meaning) and in form (marked and unmarked form-class), and thus constitute a grammatical category.

The unmarked form-class and its members have no positive marker (differential features) or possess zero marker (zero morpheme). There is also a difference in the semantic contents of the two form-classes: the unmarked (weak) form-class has more general meaning (is extensive), the marked (strong) form-class has more specialized meaning (more particular, and concrete). Morphological oppositions must reflect both the plane of expression (form) and the plane of content (meaning).

Every grammatical category is the expression of some general idea, some logical category. Thus, the grammatical category of number falls under the wider logical category – the category of quantity, the grammatical category of tense is the linguistic expression of the logical time.

But in actual language which is always an imperfect instrument of expressing human thoughts the grammatical and logical categories do not always correspond to one another. Thus, in the word group “a ten pound note” compared with “ten pounds” plurality is not expressed grammatically by any inflection, but it is inferred from the meaning of “ten.” In such a word-group as “many a man” the divergence between the grammatical and the corresponding category is still stronger: “many” shows that more than one is meant, “a man” is a regular expression of the singular number.

The verb is the most complex part of speech. It performs the central role in the expression of the predicative function of the sentence, in this way establishing the connection between the situation named in the utterance and reality. The complexity of the verb is also due to the fact that it falls into two different sets of forms: the finite forms and the non-finite forms.

The general categorial meaning of the verb is process presented dynamically. This holds true not only about the finite verbs, but also about the non-finite verbs. In the sentence the finite verb performs the function of the verb-predicate, expressing the categorial features of predication, that is, time, aspect, voice and mood.

The non-finite verb performs different functions according to its intermediary nature (subject, object, adverbial modifier, attribute). Still, in their self-dependent use they perform a potentially predicative function, constituting secondary predicative centers on the sentence, e.g.

On coming home he turned on TV-set.

He came home and turned on TV-set.

From the point of view of their structure, verbs may be: simple – to go, take, read. These stems are not numerous. Sound-replacive: food-feed, blood-to blood. Stress-replacive: import – to impórt, présent – to presént. Both the sound-replacive and the stress-replacive types are non-productive. Expanded: these are the verbs expanded with the help of suffixes and prefixes e.g. broad-to broaden, go-undergo, understand-misunderstand. Composite (compound) which correspond to the composite non-verb stems: blackmail-to blackmail. The phrasal verbs: to have a smoke, to give a laugh.

From the point of view of meaning, verbs fall into two groups: verbs of full nomination value (notional verbs) and verbs of partial nominative value (semi-notional and functional verbs).[23,98]

To semi-notional and functional verbs refer auxiliary verbs, modal verbs, semi-notional verbal introducer verbs, link-verbs. The essence of semi-notional verbal introducer verbs is seen if we compare the following sentences: “He began to read” and “He began the reading of the book.”

All the notional verbs can be divided into actional and statal. Actional verbs present the subject as an active doer. To this subclass belong such verbs as “do”, “to make”, “go”, “read”, “write.” Statal verbs denote the state of their subject. To this subclass belong such verbs as “be”, “live”, “stand”, “to see”, “to know.” A third subclass could be also distinguished which is made up of verbs expressing neither action nor state, but “processes.” As representative of processual subclass the following verbs may be pointed out “consider”, “support”, “pen”, “thaw.”

From the point of view of aspective semantics, the verbs can be of the following 2 types:

1. durative, i.e. continue”, “last”, “live”, “exist”
2. terminate, “finish”, “close”, “stop”, “solve”

The verbs of the first class can be also called “unlimitive” as they present a process as not limited. The verbs of the second class can be also called “limitive” as they present process as potentially limited. Some verbs can be of double aspective nature, or of “mixed” lexical character. These are capable of expressing either a “terminative” or “non-terminative” meaning depending on the context. For example, “I knew it at once”- (term. verb), but “I knew it very well” (durative) “I stood at the head of the stairs” (dur.), “He went and stood by the window” (term.)

Verbal Valency. Transitive and Objective Verbs

The combining power of words in relation to other words is called their syntactical “valency.” The valency of a word is realized when a given word is actually combined with another word, that is its valency adjunct.

The syntactical valency falls into two types: obligatory and optional. The obligatory valency is realized for the sake of grammatical completion of syntactical construction (e.g. we saw a house in the distance).

The optional valency may or may not be realized depending on the concrete information to be expressed in the sentence (we saw a house in the distance)

The notions of verbal transitivity and objectivity should be also considered.

Verbal transitivity is the ability of the verb to take a direct object. Verbal objectivity is the ability of the verb to take any object, be it direct, or prepositional. Transitive verbs are opposed to intransitive verbs; objective verbs are opposed to non-objective verbs (subjective verbs).

Besides, there are also bi-complemetative objective verbs such as :

- 1) taking direct and indirect object (addressee object), to give, to bring, to show.
- 2) taking 2 direct objects: to teach, to ask, to excuse, to forgive.
- 3) taking 2 prepositional objects (to argue, to consult)
- 4) taking a prepositional object and an addressee object (to remind of, to tell about)

The System of Verbal Categories

The verb is the only part of speech in Modern English that has developed a complex morphological system based on a series of categories. In this respect it may be said that the verb plays a central role in the morphology of English. The complicated character of the verbal system has given rise to a lot of controversies about the structural formation of the finite verb categories.

The problem of the grammatical categories is connected with a number of difficulties, which is accounted for, in the first place, by the analytical character of the modern English language, and also by a great number of unmarked homonymous forms. While analyzing the verbal categories, very often difficulties

arise whether to consider certain constructions as analytical forms of the verb or not, or whether one and the same unmarked form of the verb represents different forms (categories) which are homonymous or one form having different meanings (the problem of homonymy and polysemy).

In connection with the study of the verbal expression of time and aspect, the great controversy is going on as to the temporal or aspective nature of the verbal forms of the indefinite, continuous, perfect, and perfect-continuous series.

There are lots of mutually opposing views regarding both the content and the number of the voice. The problem of the subjective mood may be called one of the most difficult problems in the theory of grammar.

Another difficulty arises in connection with the forms of the English verb, having no positive morphological markers (with zero inflections). As compared with other languages (synthetic, such as Russian or American), the number of such forms in English is very great.

The verb system has come under the most intensive analysis undertaken by contemporary linguistics. In the course of these studies the oppositional nature of the categorical structure of the verb was formulated. The paradigmatic system of the expression of verbal functional semantics was competently described. The categorical system of the English verb is based on oppositional criteria worked by Soviet and foreign scholars. The verbal system includes the categories of person, number, time (tense), aspect, perfect, voice, and mood. Only finite verbs can have these 7 verbal categories. E.g. He speaks good English.

1. tense – Pr. Ind.
2. aspect – non-cont.
3. perfect – non-perfect
4. voice – active voice

5. person – 3rd person

6. number – singular

7. mood – indicative

Non-finite verbs (verbides) have only 3 categories: 1. Aspect; 2. Perfect; 3. Voice. The existence of the category of tense is universally recognized. However, the opinions of the scholars differ as to the number of theses in English. The divergences of viewpoints are accounted for by drawbacks of the traditional grammar. Traditional grammar confused tenses category with that of aspect (phase) and the category of perfect continuous and perfect forms were considered to be tense forms.

Another drawback of the traditional grammar was that it confused the notions of time and tense. Time as well as space is the basic form of the existence of matter. It is independent of human perception. Time is reflected by man through his perception and intellect and finds its expression in his language.

The Grammatical category of tense is nothing else but the linguistic expression of time. Tense is one of the typical functions of the finite verb, because of the meaning of process finds its realization only if presented in certain time conditions.

It is natural that time as the universal form of consecutive change of things is appraised by the individual in reference to the moment of his immediate perception of the world reality. This moment is constantly shifting in time and serves as the demarcation line between the past and the future. Thus, tense as the linguistic expression of time is relative. It is always correlated with the moment of immediate perception or “present moment.”

As to the general definition of this category, there is no need to look for a special one for the English language, since the basic features of the category appear to be the same in English as in other languages. The category of tense may be defined as

a verbal category that reflects the objective category of time and expresses on this background the relations between the time of the action and the time of utterance.

The main division of objective time is clear enough: past, present and future. However, it does not mean that tense systems of different languages are identical. On the contrary, there are wide divergences in this respect. According to a well-established tradition, practical grammar distinguishes 16 tense-aspect forms in English, which fall under 4 classes – Indefinite, Continuous, Perfect and Perfect Continuous, each embracing 4 tenses – present, past, future and Future in the Past.

But not all scholars find this system satisfactory. Indeed, if tense is to be defined as linguistic expression of time, that is to say as the form of the verb which serves to denote time relations existing in reality, only 3 forms can be recognized in English as tense forms – the Present, the Past, and the Future.

2.5 The Problem of the Future Tense in English

Some scholars express doubt as to the existence of the Future tense in English. This view was held by such a recognized authority of English grammar, of the older generation of the 20th century as Otto Jespersen. The reason why Jespersen denied the existence of the Fut. t. in English was that English Future is expressed by the combination of the words shall, will with the Infinitive. The controversial point about such combination is whether they really constitute the categorical expression of the verbal tense, namely the Future tense, or they are just modal phrases with the Indefinite. In fact, the verbs shall and will originally belonged to the group of the so-called preterit present with modal meaning of obligation and volition. The adherents of this view hold that the verbs “shall” and “will” retain their modal meanings in all their uses.

In our times quite a few scholars, among them successors of descriptive linguistics, consider these verbs as part of the general set of modal verbs, “modal auxiliaries”, expressing the meaning of capability, probability, obligation and the like. A well-grounded objection against the inclusion of the construction “shall, will + infinitive” in the tense system of the verb was advanced by L. S. Barkhudarov. The combination in question can express both the future time and the past time (the form Future in the Past) which hardly makes any sense in terms of a grammatical category. Indeed, the principle of the identification of any grammatical category demands that the forms of the category should be mutually exclusive.

In analyzing the English Future tenses the modal factor naturally should be taken into consideration. A certain modal coloring of the meaning of the future cannot be denied, especially in the form of the first person, but as it is widely known, the expression of the future in other languages is also connected with modal semantics. The future action, unlike general feature of reality. In other words, a future action is not something real existing at the moment of utterance, but it is only planned or anticipated or desired for the time to come.

Thus, the expression of a future action is always connected with some modal shade of meaning. This meaning becomes more prominent in the typically cases expressing intention or desire, such as “I will do it” and promise or command on the part of the speaker in cases like “you shall, he shall be punished, - I promise.”

These rules apply to refined British English. In American English “will” is described as expressing modality. However, this does not fully agree with the existing linguistic facts. In British English very often “will” is used with the first person without any modal connotation. E.g. I will call for you and your young mom at 7 o'clock. When we wake up, I'll take him up and carry him back.[40;76]

Thus we cannot agree with the scholars denying the existence of the future tense in English, taking into consideration all that was said above.

The Category of Aspect

This category, which is also called the aspective category of development, is constituted by the opposition of two form-classes, the unmarked or weak form class and the marked or strong form-class represented by the continuous aspect. If we take “write, wrote, will write, has written, had written” and oppose to the forms “is writing, was writing, will be writing, has been writing, had been writing” we will see that the first set is opposed to the second not by lexical meaning of the verb, but by the grammatical meaning. The first set denotes an action not limited by time limits, while the second set of forms denotes an action going on continuously within certain time limits.

Forms of the second set are usually called or termed as the continuous forms, the term “continuous” being very appropriate for the phenomenon, which is described by them. The aspective meaning of the verb, as different from its temporal meaning, reflects the inherent mode of the realization of the process irrespective of its time. The categorical meaning of the continuous is “action in progress.” As to the set of the first type these forms are described by the term, “common”, non-continuous, because their intrinsic meaning is very indefinite and leaves room for various uses of this aspect. The common aspect may denote:

- 1) momentary action, like - He dropped his book.
- 2) usual, habitual, repeated action (I always go to the office at 8)
- 3) an action going on for a long period of time. E.g. he lived in London from 1960 to 1978
- 4) an action out of time (not limited by any time limit). E.g. the sun rises in the morning.

The semantic contents of the continuous aspect are: duration – the action already begun but not finished yet. The concreteness of the action – the action limited by a certain period of time. Comp. I work at the Institute (unlimited time); I am working at my new book (limited time).

All the terminative verbs in the common aspect have the meaning of habitual recurrent general action. E.g. He gets up at 6. While all the durative verbs used in the common aspect have the meaning of an action not limited by any time limits. E.g. He loves children.

On the other hand, the use of the durative verbs in the continuous aspect is restricted, because they can be used in this aspect only with emphatic force. E.g. You are always finding faults with me. She is constantly wanting money from him.

It is clear that these are the cases of the unusual use of the continuous form. They do not fit in the definition of the continuous form. In these examples the continuous form has the peculiar shade of meaning – the emphatic meaning and the action is represented as going on without interruption and that gives the sentence additional, emotional coloring. In these cases the action is represented as if never ceasing, that is to say it is meant to be unlimited by time. These are the cases when the continuous meaning is neutralized. E.g. He is constantly grumbling.

These are exaggerated statements where the form of the continuous aspect is used with emotional shade of meaning. This is the so-called stylistic application of the continuous forms. The stylistic effect is brought about due to the descriptive value of the continuous forms. The following fact should be mentioned. In all books on practical grammar it is mentioned that the stative verbs denoting abstract relation (to belong, to consist, to possess), verbs denoting mental activity (to know, to understand) and verbs denoting sense perception or emotion (to see, to hear, to fear) are not used in the continuous form.

E.g. It was as if she was seeing herself for the first time

Don't shout, I'm hearing you quite well.

Yet, such use of the continuous form is quite common in modern English, quite appropriate. In such cases the action is interpreted as a momentary action and the continuous form shows that the action is taking place for the sometime and is not a

mere a statement of the fact. This application is also due to the descriptive character of the continuous form. The continuous aspect of the link verb “to be” shows a person’s behavior in a concrete situation, but not his general character.

E.g. I think, you are being unjust (at this moment). You are being damn and fool.

The continuous aspect shows that it is not a permanent characteristic feature, but it is peculiar only to the particular case.

E.g. He is being honest (in general, he is not honest, but now he is honest).

I’ll be seeing him tomorrow.

The linguistic implication of these uses of the continuous is indeed very peculiar. It amounts to de – neutralizing the usually neutralized continuous. Here we have an emphatic reduction of the continuous serving the purpose of speech expressiveness.

Different Interpretation of the Category of Aspect

For a long time the continuous aspect was not recognized at all as a separate grammatical category and all the continuous forms were treated as different tenses of the continuous group.

The evolution of views on connection with interpretation of the continuous forms has undergone three stages.

The traditional analysis placed them among the tense-forms of the verb, defining them as expressing an action going on simultaneously with some other action. This temporal interpretation of the continuous was developed in the works of H. Sweet and O. Jespersen. In point of fact, the continuous usually goes with a verb which expresses a simultaneous action, but the timing of the action is not expressed by the continuous as such.

A further demonstration of the essentially non-temporal meaning of the continuous is its regular use in combination with the perfect, i.e. its use in the verb-form perfect continuous.

At the second stage of the interpretation of the continuous, the form was understood as rendering a blend of temporal and aspective meanings. This view was developed by I. P. Ivanova.

The combined temporal-aspective interpretation of the continuous introduced comprehensively grounded basis for the idea of aspective meaning in the grammatical system of English. Besides, it demonstrated the actual connection of time and aspect in the integral categorial semantics of the verb.

The Category of Mood

The category of mood is the most controversial category of the verb. The relation of this category to other categories, the number of moods – all this has received different presentations of this category given by different scholars seems to be the same with slight modifications. Mood is the grammatical category of the verb reflecting the relation of the action denoted by the verb to reality from speaker's point of view. In other words, the category of mood expresses the character of connection between the process denoted and the actual reality either presenting the process as a fact that really happened, happens or will happen or treating it as imaginary phenomenon, that is to say that subject of a hypothesis, speculation, desire.

Mood expresses the outer interpretation of the action as a whole, the introduction of it as actual or imaginary.

The relation of the action to reality is otherwise termed "modality." Thus, mood and modality are closely interrelated but not identical. Mood is a narrower notion. Modality is a wider notion and it may be expressed not only by grammatical means (mood), but also by lexical means (modal verbs, modal words, and phrases, parenthetical clauses and by intonation).

Comp.

Ind. Mood Subj. Mood

It is true If it were true

It can't be true It couldn't be true

Perhaps, it's true I wish it were true

It's true, I believe I demand that it be true

There is not unity concerning the number of moods in English. Thus, A. I. Smirntitsky, O. S. Akhmanova, M. Ganshina and N. Vasilevskaya find six moods in modern English – Indicative, Imperative, Subjunctive I and II, Suppositional and Conditional.

B. Ilysh, I. Ivanova, L. Iafic, V. Kaushanskaya find only 3 moods in English - Indicative, Imperative, Subjunctive. M. Y. Bloch, L. S. Barkhudarov and D. A. Shteling distinguish only the Indicative and the Subjunctive mood. The imperative is treated as forms outside the category of mood. C. N. Vorontsova distinguish 4 moods in English – Indicative and 3 oblique moods. The main division that has been universally recognized is the division of moods into 2 groups, the one which represents an action as real, that is to say as actually taking place (the Indicative) and the one which represents it as non-real (imaginary, conditional, possible, probable).

Indicative Mood

The Indicative mood is the basic mood of the verb. Morphologically it is the most developed system including all the grammatical categories of the verb.

Semantically it is a “fact” mood/the terminology of H. Swell). It serves to present an action as a fact of reality. It is the most objective and the least subjective of all the moods. It conveys minimum personal attitude to the fact. This is particularly manifested in sentences of the type “Magnet attracts iron.”

It should be noted that the mention of the speaker or writer who represents the action as real is most essential. If we limit ourselves to saying that the Indicative mood is used to represent real actions we should arrive at the conclusion that whatever is stated by anybody in a sentence with the predicate in the indicative mood is always true. But the speaker may be mistaken or else telling a deliberate lie. The point is that Grammar does not deal with the truth or untruth of the statement, from the meaning of this category is used by the speaker as the meaning of correspondence to reality.

Some doubt about the meaning of the indicative mood may arise if we take into account its use in conditional sentences of the type. E.g. “I’ll speak to him if I meet him.” In this sentence the action denoted by the verb in the Indicative mood is represented not as a fact, but merely as a possibility (I may meet him and may not). [6,132] However, the conditional meaning is expressed by the conjunction “if” and the meaning of the verb as such remains.

The Imperative Mood

There are essential peculiarities distinguished the imperative mood and they have given rise to doubts as to whether the imperative can be referred to moods at all. This needs a comment on what we mean by mood. A serious difficulty connected with Imperative is the absence of any specific morphological characteristics, since all verbs including the verb “to be” it coincides with the Infinitive. This fact gave some scholars a right to exclude the imperative from the system of moods. Besides, in all verbs except “to be” the form of the imperative coincides with the Present Indicative except 3rd person singular.

E.g. Go! Be quiet! (It coincides with the indicative. Here we have grammatical homonymy). If we accept the definition of mood given above there would be no ground to deny that the imperative is a mood. The problem is what mood it is, direct or oblique.

M. Ganshina and M. Vasilevskaya consider that the imperative is a direct mood. The scholars who object to this viewpoint consider that it is an oblique mood, since its meaning is not that of a real action desired by the speaker. This can be easily shown by transformations.

E.g. be off- I demand that you be off.

Do be careful with the paper- My request is that you be (should be) careful. Though the system of the imperative mood does not contain person distinction, it cannot be said that there is no meaning of person implied in the form of this mood. On the contrary, the speaker addresses his order or request to a definite person, the second person. This makes it unnecessary to use the subject expressed by the pronoun. (Usually indefinite or personal pronoun is used).E.g. Somebody switch on the light. You get out of here! Don't you do it!

2.6 The Problem of the Analytical Imperative

Some scholars are of the opinion that modern English possesses analytical forms of the imperative mood for the first and third persons built up with the help of the semantically weakened, unstressed "let" + pronoun in the objective case. E.g. Let him come. Let us go there.

G. Vorontsova give a detailed analysis of these constructions to prove that they are analytical forms of the Imperative. The objections to this viewpoint are:

1) If we admit the existence of the analytical imperative, we will have to admit that the subject may be expressed by a pronoun in the objective case.

2) The basic meaning of the imperative is to urge, to induce the listener to fulfill an action denoted by the notional verb. The construction with “let” is devoid of this basic meaning of the imperative, the meaning of inducement, especially in sentences of the type. “Let me do it” (kind of suggestion)

3) The imperative mood forms its negative forms with the auxiliary “do” + not. E.g. “Don’t go there”, “Let him not go there” (the second is a suggestion, advice).

All these and the fact that the verb “let” has its own lexical meaning (though weak) show – that “let” has not established itself as a morpheme of the analytical imperative mood. Consequently, the analytical imperative does not exist in English.

The Oblique Mood

The problem of the subjunctive, conditional, suppositional or whatever other name we may choose to give these moods is a very difficult one. The main difficulty is the absence of a direct relation between meaning and form. Sometimes the same form has two or more different meaning depending on the content or vice versa. The same modal meaning is expressed by two different forms. Compare: I think we should come here again tomorrow (“should come” is equal to “ought to come here”). It means another thing in the sentence “If I knew that he needs me I should come to see him” (here “should come” denotes a conditional action, i.e. an action depending on certain conditions). It means another thing in “How queer (strange) that we should come at the very moment when you were talking about us” (here “should come” denotes an action which has actually taken place). Here “should come” is a form of suppositional mood and “should” is here a modal auxiliary.

Matters are still more complicated by two phenomena we are faced with – a choice between polysemy and homonymy. Compare: 1. He lived here five years ago, and 2. if he lived here he would come at once. In the first sentence “lived” denotes a

real action and it is the past tense of the indicative mood, while in the second sentence the meaning of “lived” admits of two interpretations:

1. either the form “lived” is the same form of the past indicative, but it has acquired another meaning in this particular context.
2. or else the form “lived” is the form of some other mood which denotes imaginary action, and which is homonymous with the past indicative. Some scholars accept the first point of view and call such cases “tense-mood” forms or imaginative use of tenses.[23,88] But others call such cases non-factual use of tenses. These scholars are of the opinion that in instances like this the meaning of modality is brought about by the very use of the past indicative instead of the present indicative in the context of the present.

There is another difficulty in the analysis of mood. The question is what verbs are auxiliaries of mood in Modern English. The verbs “should”, “would” are auxiliaries expressing unreality (what system of moods we may adopt). But the question is less clear with the verb “may” when used in such sentences as, “Come closer that I may hear what you say”, or “May you be happy!” Is the group “may hear” some mood form of the verb “to hear” or is it a free syntactical combination of a modal verb + infinitive.

2.7 Fundamentals of Syntax.

The course of grammar of the English language is divided into two basic sections: morphology and syntax. Morphology, as it is already known, studies the grammatical forms of words, parts of speech. Syntax, which is sometimes called “elder brother of morphology deals with sentences and combinability of words, classification and combinability of phrases. Thus, there are two units of syntax – the phrase – the minimal unit and the sentence – the highest unit and correspondingly two levels of syntax – the level of phrase, which is also called minor syntax, and the level of sentence, also called major syntax.

According to a modern point of view, the relation between morphology and syntax is not always so simple as that. In this view we should distinguish between 2 angles of research: 1) the elements dealt with; from this point of view grammar consists of morphology and syntax. 2) the way these elements are studied; from this point of view there exists paradigmatic and syntagmatic study. Thus, we get 4 divisions:

- 1) paradigmatic morphology (vertical relations)
- 2) syntagmatic morphology
- 3) paradigmatic syntax
- 4) syntagmatic syntax (horizontal relations)

Of these 4 items the first and the fourth require no special explanation; the two other items require special comment.

1) Syntagmatic morphology is the study of the combinability of parts of speech. E.g. I can go (can is used only with infinitive, we cannot use it with other parts of speech but infinitive). Whenever we speak of parts of speech we remain within the sphere of morphology. Thus, the statement that an adjective is used to modify a noun, an adverb – to modify a verb is a statement of syntagmatic morphology.

2) Paradigmatic syntax is a part of grammatical theory which did not appear in the traditional systems.

E.g. My friend has come. Has my friend come? My friend will have come. My friends have come. My friends have not come.

All these sentences are variations of one and the same sentence – the paradigm of the sentence. Still, it should be mentioned, that from the point of view of communications, “My friend has come” and “My friends have not come” are different sentences as they express different combination.

Syntactic Connections of Words

Performing their semantic functions, words in an utterance form various syntagmatic connections with one another. One should distinguish between the following groupings.

1) notional word + notional word (notional phrases). Such phrases denote complex phenomena and have self-dependent nominative function (phrases with secondary predication, complexes with the verbals are also included here) E.g. a sudden trembling, strangely familiar, hurrying along the street, to lead to a cross-road

2) notional word + functional word

These combinations are equivalent to separate words by their nominative function. Since function words express abstract relations, they are not self-dependent. E.g. as a rule, with difficulty, but a moment, and Jimmy. Such phrases are called formative combinations. They are synsemantic, that's to say dependent on the context.

3) function word + function word

Such phrases are analogous to separate functional words. They are used as connectors and specifiers of notional elements of various status. E.g., from under, apart from, from out of, up to. Such phrases are functional phrases. They constitute a limited group supplementing the corresponding one-item function words as different from notional phrases which form open groups of various semantic destination.

The first group-notional phrases – fall into 2 mutually opposite types by their grammatical and semantic properties.

1) Combinations in which words are related to one another on an equal rank, so that neither of them serves as a modifier of the other. Depending on this feature such combinations are termed equipotent.

E.g. My colleagues and I will be present at the meeting.

Here both “my colleagues” and “I” can be used subject of the sentence separately taken.

In “My colleague will be present” my colleague is not equipollent as “my” cannot be used as a subject in the sentence.

2) Combinations formed by words which are not syntactically equal, one of them plays the role of modifier to the other. These combinations are termed dominational. The function of the adjunct is different from that of the whole phrase.

My colleague will be present at the meeting.

Attribute	Subject
-----------	---------

According L. Bloomfield, such phrases are endocentric (containing a head-word or contra). The endocentric group has the same distribution as one of its members. In terms of substitution, the head word of the endocentric group functions in the same way as the whole phrase.

Subordination (junction) is a type of syntactical connection when the syntactical function of the whole group is different from the syntactical function of one of the IC-s (immediate constituents) that is adjunct. E.g.

A tall boy came in. A tall came in. A boy came in.

The IC the syntactical function of which coincides with the syntactical function of the whole group is the head; The IC the syntactical function of which is different from the syntactical function of the whole group is the adjunct of the phrase.

The syntagmatic relation between the IC-s is dominational, that’s to say the IC-s are syntactically unequal, one of them dominates the other. In the substitution test the deletion of one of the IC-s (the adjunct) should not lead to the change of the syntactical connection between other words in the same sentence. E.g. He is a good boy. He is good (the structure of the sentence is changed). He is a boy (the main

structure of the sentence is kept). Coordination is a type of syntactical connection, when the syntactical function of the whole group is identical with the syntactical function of each IC.

The predicative connection of words uniting the subject and the predicate (which is also called nexus) builds up the basis of the sentence. The syntagmatic relation between the IC-s is domination. But this domination is reciprocal, the subject dominates the predicate is determining the reason of the predication, while the predicate dominates the subject determining the event predication, that's to say ascribing to a person some action, state or quality. The difference in the meaning between the elements of predication underlines the mutually opposite direction of domination – thus mutual dependence – and exposes its dialectic essence. The domination of the subject over the predicate is exposed in agreement (the predicate agrees with the subject in number and person). E.g. I come. He comes.

The predicate domination over the subject is demonstrated by the correspondent noun phrase which places the predicate in the position of the headword and the subject – in the position of the adjunct. E.g. The train arrived → The arrival of the train. Alongside of fully predicate groups of the subject and the finite verb-predicate, there exist in language partially predicative grouping – formed by a combination of a non-finite verbal form with a substantive element. Such are infinitival, gerundial and participial constructions. Comp. The pupil understands his mistake (mutual domination) → the pupil'(s) understanding his mistake → the pupil understanding his mistake.

In such predicative constructions, which are also called semi-predicative or potentially-predicative, there is no formal domination of the subject (no agreement), but the two directions of domination remain by virtue of the very predicative nature of the syntactic connection. Thus, predication, as a type of syntactical connection, exists in 2 forms – complete predication (primary predication), incomplete predication (secondary, or semi-predication, or potential predication, or partial predication).

Conclusion on chapter II

The words of language, depending on various formal and semantic features, are divided into grammatically relevant classes. The traditional grammatical classes of words are called “parts of speech.” The course of grammar of the English language is divided into two basic sections: morphology and syntax. Morphology, as it is already known, studies the grammatical forms of words, parts of speech. Syntax,

which is sometimes called “elder brother of morphology deals with sentences and combinability of words, classification and combinability of phrases.

The grammatical signals of analytical languages are follows: word order is fixed in analytical languages and it is very important because of the loss of inflexions. E.g. The hunter killed the bear. The bear killed the hunter. The existence of a large number of functional words, like auxiliary words and form words (prepositions, conjunctions, articles, particles). Inflexions in analytical languages are very few due to their loss, their role is fulfilled by function words and words order. The main inflexions in Modern English are -s-, -ed, -ing-, -en. Intonation does not play an important role in English. It is used only in some cases as a means of forming a sentence. The predicative connection of words uniting the subject and the predicate (which is also called nexus) builds up the basis of the sentence. The syntagmatic relation between the IC-s is domination.

Conclusion

The problem of parts of speech is one that causes great controversies both in general linguistic theory and in the analysis of separate languages. The term "parts

of speech" (as well as the corresponding terms in Russian, German, French, and other languages), though firmly established, is not a very happy one. What is meant by a "part of speech" is a type of word differing from other types in some grammatical point or points. There is the question about the mutual relation of the criteria. One cannot be sure in advance that all three criteria will always point the same way. Then, again, in some cases, one of them may fail (this especially applies to the criterion of form). Under such circumstances, it may prove necessary to choose between them, i.e. to attach to one of them greater value than to another. It will also be seen that the theory of parts of speech, though considered by most scholars to be a part of morphology, cannot do without touching on some syntactical problems, namely on phrases and on syntactical functions of words.

The problem of parts of speech caused much difficulty both in general linguistics and in the analysis of separate languages. Though it has been studied for more than 200 years, the criteria for defining parts of speech have not been worked out yet. Traditionally grammar gave a semantic definition of parts of speech, taking into account only meaning. However, only meaning cannot be a reliable criterion for defining parts of speech because different parts of speech may have the same meaning and vice versa. E.g. the nouns "books", "tables", "students", denote objects and there are nouns as "flight", "movement", "arrival", which do not denote objects but belong to nouns. We see that meaning cannot be the only criterion for defining parts of speech. The structural school of linguistics does not take into account meaning only but only form. Form alone cannot be a reliable criterion either because many parts of speech especially in English may have the same form, e.g. water-to water, silk (adj.) - to silk. Moreover, if we take into account only form, then such unchangeable words as article, particle should be referred to only part of speech.

In order to get a full insight into language, one has to consider its organization, its mechanism, or, as is accepted to term, its structure and system. The term "structure" is sometimes related to the elements, forms, constructions of language

and their meanings. At the same time, by the term “structure” they often mean the relations and interconnections between the elements of language, or one complex which is made up of the elements and relations as well as connections between them. System is referred to as one complex unity of interrelated and interconnected elements, while structure represents inner relations between the elements, or the inner organization of the complex unity.

Language as a system is divided into elements on different levels. The biggest is the division into such “elements” as phonetics, lexis, word formation, morphology, and syntax. These are the basic parts of language mechanism.

Each system is a set of elements related to one another by a common function. The lowest level of lingual segment is phonemic. The phoneme has no meaning; its function is purely differential. It differentiates morphemes and words as material bodies. Since the phoneme has no meaning, it’s not a sign. The sentence is the smallest communicative unit, e.g. It rains. This is a sentence since it contains information. The function of the sentence is predicative. A unit of a higher level usually contains one or more units. But the combination of units of a certain level does not make a unit of higher level unless it acquires the properties of a higher level. The combination of morphemes only is not a word, it names nothing. The combination of the words “of the teacher” is not a sentence, it communicates nothing. The common function of the linguistic signs of all levels is to give expression to human thoughts (the main function of the language).

The systemic nature of grammar is more evident than that of the other levels, since grammar is responsible for the very organization of utterances.

Bibliography

1. Karimov I. A. Cementing the achieved results, to consistently aspire towards new goals.- T.:Uzbekistan, 2006-52p.
2. Грамматика английского языка (на английском языке) // Под ред. В.Л. Каушанской. – 4 е изд. – Л., Просвещение, 1973. –с. 319 .
3. Грамматика современного английского языка: A new university English grammar// Учебник для студ. высш. учеб. заведений // Под ред. А.В. Зеленщикова, Е.С. Петровой. – М., СПб.: Academia, 2003. –с 640.
4. Abbott G., D. McKeating, J. Greenwood, and P. Wingard. The teaching of English as an international language. A practical guide// London,1981,-154p.
5. Azar B. Sh. Fun with grammar. New York, 2000-87p.
6. Bennett, William Arthur., Aspects of Language and language teaching// London-New York., Cambridge univ. press// 1968-136p.
7. Bybee, Joan L, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World.// University of Chicago Press, 1994-176p.
8. Comrie Bernard, Tense. Cambridge University Press.1985-144p.
9. Downing Angela and Philip Locke. Viewpoints on Events. Tense, Aspect and Modality.// A University Course in English Grammar, Prentice Hall International.2001- 350p.
10. Elaine Tarone and George Yule., Focus on Language Learner.; Oxford univ.// 1991-243p.
11. Ersoz Aydan. The Internet TESL Journal, Vol. VI, No. 6, June 2000.

12. Fries, Charles Carpenter., Teaching and Learning English as a foreign language.; The univ. of Michigan press, 1964.
13. Griffith,S. “Teaching English Abroad”; Oxford,1991.
14. Gardner B., Gardner F. classroom English. Oxford university press, 2000.
15. Hornby A. The Teaching of Structural Words and Sentence Patterns. London, 1959-102p.
16. Harmer Jeremy. The practice English language teaching. London-New York; Longman,1991-98p.
17. Hubbard, P., H. Jones, B. Thornton, and R. Wheeler. A training course for TEFL. Oxford// Oxford University Press,1983.
18. Horwitz E.K., Horwitz, M.B., and Cope, J.A.. Foreign language classroom anxiety. The Modern Language Journal 70 (2), 1986.
19. Jack C. Richards and Theodore S. Rogers., Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.; Cambridge univ. press, 1986.
20. John W. O. Methods That Work. Boston, USA, 1993.
21. Klippel F. Keep Talking. Cambridge university press, 2000.
22. Lee Su Kim. Creative Games for the Language. Class Forum Vol. 33 No 1, January - March 1995.
23. Locke J. “An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding”.,Cambridge.,1988-233pp.
24. Michael H. Long, Jack C. Richards., Methodology in TESOL. A book of Readings. USA., 1987-89p.
25. Mindt, D. An Empirical Grammar of the English Verb// Modal Verbs. 1995-302p.

26. Mill J. S. "A System of Logic". The Hague: Mouton.,2001-332pp.
27. Rivers, Wilga M., Speaking in many tongues: Essays in foreign-language teaching.// 3rd ed.// Cambridge, 1983-231p.
28. Saeed, J. I. "Semantics". Oxford: Blackwell.,2003-321pp.
29. Wall A. "A – Z discussion", Cambridge.U.\\press 2004.
30. Zandvoort, R. A Handbook of English Grammar. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.,1996-342p.
31. www.teachingenglish.org.uk.
32. www.englishclub.narod.ru.
33. <http://englishprograms.state.gov/forum>.
34. www.englishraven.com/methodology.html.
35. www.cal.org/resources/.../rodgers.html.
36. en.wikipedia.org/.../Language_education.
37. esl.fis.edu/teachers/support/method.htm.
38. www.sk.com.br/sk-revie.html.
39. journals.cambridge.org/jid_LTA.
40. exchanges.state.gov/englishteaching/forum/.../docs/06-44-2-b.pdf.
41. eca.state.gov/forum/vols/vol44/no2/p2.htm.
42. Internet:<http://www.englishclub.com/grammar/articles/theory/the>.
43. Internet:<http://www.englishlanguage.ru/main/studyarticles>.
44. Internet:<http://www.esllessons.edu/mainpage/lessonplans/articles.htm>.

45. Internet: [http://www.freesays.com/languages/S. Hal How to Learn English grammar.htm](http://www.freesays.com/languages/S_Hal_How_to_Learn_English_grammar.htm).

46. Internet: <http://www.yandex.narod.ru/filolog.ru/grammarunitswww.yl-sig.com/.../ten-helpful-ideas-for-teaching-english-to-young-learners-joan-khan-shin/>.

47. ebookey.org/.../Ten-Helpful-Ideas-for-Teaching-English-to-Young-Learners/.

48. [www2.nau.edu/~jar/Methods grammar.html](http://www2.nau.edu/~jar/Methods_grammar.html).