

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

THE UZBEK STATE WORLD LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY

Qualification paper

**The theme: TYPES OF MOOD IN THE ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN
LANGUAGES**

Written by the student: Sobirov Eldor
Group: 423
Reviewer:

Tashkent-2016

Contents:

Introduction.....	2
CHAPTER I	
General view of English types of mood.....	7
1.1 The Category of Mood.....	9
1.2 The mood in different linguists' point of view.....	25
1.3 The indicative mood.....	14
CHAPTER II	
The subjunctive mood.....	
2.1 The problems subjunctive mood.....	25
2.2 Foreign linguist' speculation about subjunctive mood.....	22
2.3 Mood from the point of Russian linguist.....	31
CHAPTER III	
The Imperative Mood.....	
3.1 General overview of imperatives.....	42
3.2 The inner nature of imperatives.....	45
Conclusion.....	50
Bibliography.....	49

Introduction

Development of a science as a whole and a linguistic science, in particular is connected not only to the decision of actually scientific problems, but also with features internal and foreign policy of the state, the maintenance of the state educational standards which are to the generators of progress providing social, economic society. It forms the society capable quickly to adapt in the modern world¹.

Conditions of reforming of all education system the question of the world assistance to improvement of quality of scientific-theoretical aspect of educational process is especially actually put. Speaking about the 20th anniversary of National Independence President I.A.Karimov has declared in the program speech “Harmoniously development of generation a basis of progress of Uzbekistan”; “... all of us realize, that achievement of the great purposes put today before us, noble aspirations it is necessary for updating a society”. The effect and destiny of our reforms carried out in the name of progress and the future, results of our intentions are connected with highly skilled, conscious staff the experts who are meeting the requirements of time².

The Qualification paper under review is devoted to the analysis and validation of the types of mood in the English Russian language and designed to contrast all types in both languages English and Russian. The topic represents an important area of investigation as demand for modern methods of teaching English learners of Russian language, and this qualification paper I am going to share the information about points of views of English and Russian grammarians. It is very interesting for me to know how English linguists understand problem of The Types of Mood and way Russian ones

¹ Каримов И.А. Наша высшая цель –независимость и процветание Родины, свобода и благополучие народа// Доклад на первой сессии Олий Мажлиса Республики Узбекистан второго созыва от 22.01.2000.-Т.: Узбекистан.2000.Т.8.-С.322-340.

² И.А.Каримов Гармонично развитое поколение-основа прогресса Узбекистана. Ташкент. р. 156-168
3 Barkhudarov “Problems of modern linguistics”. P. 6

do it. I will also introduce the most important point of my diploma paper – the usage of the English Mood.

The Actuality of this Qualification Paper comprises that the given problem is very disputable among the linguists. There are different views of point on this matter and it needs to have an exact answer.

The Novelty of the qualification paper is defined by concrete results of the investigations, special emphases is laid on the categories of adjectives in discourse.

Hypothesis of this research is the linguistic phenomenon – the categories of adjectives in discourse will be thoroughly investigated according to modern methods. Comprehensive analysis will be used to achieve the aim and tasks put forward in the presented investigation.

The Aim of the Qualification Paper is to give the general approaches of the categories of adjectives in discourse.

Methodological bases of the research is Decrees of the President of Republic of Uzbekistan about development of languages, educations and sciences, the national program on a professional training, and also basic researches in the field of the theory of linguistics, in particular, theoretical grammar, typology and general linguistics.

The Theoretical Value of this paper is that it can be used as a theoretical material for theoretical grammar lectures on the themes, connected with the adjectives and specifically, on the grammar.

The Practical Value of a given research is that practical part of this work may be used in Practical Grammar lessons connected with parts of speech and their usage. If want to learn in what cases we should use all types of the English mood.

The object of my Qualification paper is to give a definition of three main types of mood.

The subject of my diploma paper is the English types of Mood in the works of foreign and Russian grammar schools as well as the main cases of the Subjunctive Mood usage.

The aim of my qualification paper is to compare different approaches to the problem of the Subjunctive Mood with the purpose of investigating the material available for me about the Subjunctive Mood from English and Russian sources.

The theme of my Qualification paper sounds as following: «Types of English and Russian mood in the English and Russian language». Before beginning of investigation in my theme, I would like to say some words dealt with the theme of my qualification paper. Mood is the grammatical category of the verb reflecting the relation of the action denoted by problems of types of mood.

The aim of my qualification paper is to compare different approaches to the problem of the Subjunctive Mood with the purpose of investigating the material available for me about the types of mood from English and Russian sources.

The verb to reality from the speaker's point of view. In the sentences *He listens attentively* – *Он слушает внимательно (Indicative mood)*; *Listen attentively* – *Слушай внимательно (Imperative mood)*; *You would have listened attentively if you had been interested* – *Ты бы слушал внимательно, если бы это тебя интересовало (subjunctive)*. As you can see we deal with the same action of listening, but in the first sentence the speaker presents the action as taking place in reality, whereas in the second sentence the speaker urges the listener to perform the action, or may be orders, and in the third sentence the speaker presents the action as imaginary or desire. These different relations of the action to reality are expressed by different mood-forms of the verb: listens, listen, would have listened.

Standing on such ground, I would like to point out tasks and aims of my work

1. The first task of my Qualification paper is to give definition to term «mood».

2. The second task is to give the classification of moods in the English language.

3. The last task of my work is to characterize each mood from grammatical point of view.

The Qualification paper under review is devoted to the analysis and validation of the types of mood in the English Russian language and designed to contrast all types in both languages English and Russian. The topic represents an important area of investigation as demand for modern methods of teaching English learners of Russian language , and this

In our opinion the practical significance of our work is hard to be overvalued. This work reflects modern trends in linguistics and I hope it would serve as a good manual for those who want to master modern English language. Also this work can be used by teachers of English language for teaching English grammar.

The present work might find a good way of implying in the following spheres:

1. In High Schools and scientific circles of linguistic kind it can be successfully used by teachers and philologists as modern material for writing research works dealing with English verbs.

2. It can be used by teachers of schools, lyceums and colleges by teachers of English as a practical manual for teaching English grammar.

3. It can be useful for everyone who wants to enlarge his/her knowledge in English.

After having proved the actuality of our work, I would like to describe the composition of it:

My work consists of four parts: introduction, the main part, conclusion and bibliography. Within the introduction part I gave the brief description of our Qualification paper. The main part of the work includes several items. There we discussed such problems as the number of moods in English, their classification, and etc. In the conclusion to our work we tried to draw some results from the

scientific investigations made within the present course paper. In bibliography part we mentioned some sources which were used while compiling the present work. It includes linguistic books and articles dealing with the theme, a number of used dictionaries and encyclopedias and also some internet source.

CHAPTER I

General view of English types of mood

1.1 The category of mood

There are many controversial and not thoroughly investigated points in the English grammar. Nevertheless, in my opinion one of the most difficult and not clear both from the point of view of its definition and description and from the point of view of its practical implementation in speech is the subject of the different types of the English mood. Even the name of this grammatical category seems ambiguous in term of its being approached and characterized by different outstanding linguists in our country and abroad.

Many grammarians enumerate the following moods in English, etc.: indicative, subjunctive, imperative, infinitive, and participle. O. Jespersen as it can be seen from «The Philosophy of Grammar» considers that infinitives and participles cannot be coordinated with the others, and we shall therefore in this chapter deal with the first three moods only. These are sometimes called fact-mood, thought-mood, and will-mood respectively. But they do not express different relations between subject and predicate. It is much more correct to say that they express certain attitudes of the mind of the speaker towards the contents of the sentence. No wonder this problem couldn't but arise my curiosity and language interest. I have made up my mind to consider the material compiled on this problem in different sources to clear up the point for myself and to have a better idea about the usage of the all the English moods in speech.

Mood is the grammatical category of the verb reflecting the relation of the action denoted by the verb to reality from the speaker's point of view. It is difficult to imagine a language without different types of mood. With a help of mood our speech becomes more concrete, brighter, more colorful. Mood is distinct from grammatical means or grammatical aspect, although the same word patterns are used for expressing more than one of these meanings at the same time in many languages, including English and most other modern Indo – European languages.

Mood is distinct from grammatical means or grammatical aspect, although the same word patterns are used for expressing more than one of these meanings at the same time in many languages, including English and most other Indo-European languages.

In the sentences *He listens attentively*; *Listen attentively*; *You would have listened attentively if you had been interested*, we deal with the same action of listening, but in the first sentence the speaker presents the action as taking place in reality, whereas in the second sentence the speaker urges the listener to perform the action,; and in the third sentence the speaker presents the action as imaginary.

These different relations of the action to reality are expressed by different mood-forms of the verb: *listens*, *listen*, *would have listened*.

By the moods of a verb H. Sweet in his work «A new English Grammar (Part I)» understands grammatical forms expressing different relations between subject and predicate. Thus, if a language has special forms to express commands as distinguished from statements, we include the forms that express command under the term «imperative mood». Thus in English **come!** is in the imperative mood, while the statement **he comes** is in the «indicative» mood.

In English the only inflectional moods are the indicative and subjunctive. But the inflections of the English verb are so scanty that we need not be surprised to find that the distinction between indicative and subjunctive is very slight. The only regular inflection by which the subjunctive is distinguished from the indicative in English is that of the third person singular present, which drops the *s* of the indicative (*he sees*) in the subjunctive (*he see*). In the verb **to be**, however, further distinctions are made: indicative **I am, he is, he was**, subjunctive **I be, he be, he were**, although in the spoken language the only distinction that is still kept us is that between **was** and **were**. Consequently the sense of the distinction in function between subjunctive and indicative has almost died out in English, and use the subjunctive **were** only in combination with other mood-forms, the other subjunctive inflections surviving only in a few special phrases and constructions,

such as **God, save the Queen ! – (да, хранит Господь королеву!)** If where the subjunctive expresses wish, being thus equivalent to the Greek optative.

The few distinction that English makes between fact-statements and thought-statements are mainly expressed, not by inflections, but by auxiliaries (periphrastic moods), and by peculiar uses of tense-distinctions. The following are the auxiliary forms:

The combination of **should** and **would** with the infinitive – the **conditional mood**. The combination of **may** and its preterite **might** with the infinitive is called the **permissive mood**. The combination of the finite forms of the verb **to be** with the supine is called **compulsive mood**. We use tenses to express thought-statements in the hypothetical clauses of conditional sentences, as in **if I knew his address I would write him; if it were possible I would do it**. In the latter example the hypothesis is shown not only by the preterite tense, but also by the subjunctive inflection, which is really superfluous. When a thought-statement is expressed by a tense in this way, H. Sweet calls it a **tense-mood**. **Were** in **if it were** is a **subjunctive tense-mood**. As we see, in some conditional sentences all three ways of expressing thought-statement are used. G.O. Curme in the work «A Grammar of the English Language» considers moods as the changes in the form of the verb to show the various ways in which the action or state is thought of by the speaker³.

1.2 The mood in different linguists' point of view

We routinely say the word mood. But what does the term mood exactly designate? Before we proceed to the semantic analysis of the word mood, it is important to provide a concrete definition of the terms mood and modality, given the highly controversial topics in this field of research and the plethora of terms

³G.O.gurme “ A Grammar of the English Language”

which have been used in a different way by various scholars. In terms of morphology, mood is associated with the verbal paradigms.⁴

. In many cases, e.g. in ancient and many modern Indo-European languages, mood is understood as a verbal category marked by inflectional affixes added to the stem of a verb. In other languages, e.g. in agglutinating languages, suffixes may denote what modal verbs or mood endings denote in other languages and therefore mood can be understood as a separate suffix. In terms of semantic.

Mood could be equally described as the counterpart of the modal verbs in the domain of inflectional morphology. According to Palmer languages tend to exhibit either modal verbs or the typical mood indicative/subjunctive distinction; when they co-occur, it seems that these systems function at the expense of the other, e.g. the rise of the modal verbs in English was fostered by the simultaneous demise of the inflectional mood system. On these grounds, he suggests that “in general, the two are not likely to co-exist, or that, if they do, one will, in time, replace the other.”

The connection between modality and mood is not direct. First of all, the modality is a notional term, which can be analyzed in various ways while mood is an observable grammatical phenomenon. Secondly, modality is encoded in lexemes and it can be lexicalized in predicates while mood is either inflectional or (as it is the case in Modern Greek (MG) and other Balkan languages) it is marked by a mood particle preceding the verbal form. Third, the mood categories, such as the rudimentary indicative and subjunctive moods, cannot perfectly match with the modality categories.

By way of example, a non-dependent subjunctive may manifest root modality but a dependent subjunctive may also appear, as we will see, after epistemic predicates in some languages.

2The word mood is derived from the Latin word “modus” which means mode or maner⁵. There is no unity of opinion concerning the category of mood in

⁴ B. Illish. “The Grammar of Modern English”

⁵ N.A Slabodkina “A practical English grammar” p.217

English. Thus A.I. Smirnitsky, O.S. Akhmanova, M. Ganshina and N. Vasilevskaya find six moods in Modern English⁶ ('indicative', 'imperative', 'subjunctive I', 'subjunctive IF, 'conditional' and 'suppositional'), B.A. Ilyish, L.P. Vinokurova, V.N. Zhigadlo, I.P. Iva-nova, L.L. Iofik find only three moods – 'indicative', 'imperative' and 'subjunctive'. The latter, according to B.A. Ilyish appears in two forms – the conditional and the subjunctive. L.S. Barkhudarov and D.A. Shteling distinguish only the 'indicative' and the 'subjunctive' mood. The latter is subdivided into 'subjunctive I' and 'subjunctive IF. The 'imperative' and the 'conjunctive' are treated as forms outside the category of mood.

G.N. Vorontsova⁷ distinguishes four moods in English: 1) 'indicative', 2) 'optative', represented in three varieties ('imperative', 'desiderative', 'subjunctive'), 3) 'speculative', found in two varieties ('dubitative' and 'irrealis') and 4) 'presumptive'. In general the number of English moods in different theories varies from two to seventeen.

In this work the indicative, imperative and subjunctive moods are considered.

The difficulty of distinguishing other moods from the indicative in English is connected with the fact that, barring be, they do not contain a single form which is not used in the indicative mood. At the same time the indicative mood contains many forms not used in other moods. The subjunctive mood is richer in forms than the imperative mood.

So the meaning of the three moods are distinguished in the language structure not so much by the opposition of individual forms (as is the case in the opposeemes of other categories), as by the opposition of the systems of forms each mood possesses. By way of illustration let us compare the synthetic forms of the lexeme have in the three moods.

Indicative	Subjunctive	Imperative
------------	-------------	------------

⁶ M. Ganshina and N. Vasilevskaya “ Find Six Mood”

⁷ G.N. Vorontsova “Очерки по грамматике английского языка” 1960

have, has, had	have, had	Have
----------------	-----------	------

This is why it is difficult to represent the category of mood in opposeemes, like other categories.

In speech, the meanings of the three moods are distinguished not so much by the forms of the verbs, as by their distribution. of. When I need a thing, I go and buy it. We insist that he go and buy it. Go and buy it one of the most important differences between the indicative and the other moods is that the meaning of 'tense' does not go with the meanings of subjunctive mood and imperative mood. 'Tense' reflects the real time of a real action. The imperative and subjunctive moods represent the action not as real, but as desired or imagined, and the notions of real time are discarded. The meaning of 'perfect order' does not go with the meaning of imperative mood because one cannot require of anyone to fulfill an action preceding the request. But it is easy to imagine a preceding action. Therefore the system of the subjunctive mood includes opposites of order.

Aspect and voice opossums are characteristic of the systems of all moods, but the 'passive' and 'continuous' members of the opossums are very rarely used in the imperative mood. There are person opossums (though not systematically used) of only one type in the subjunctive mood system (should go – would go) and none in the imperative mood. The number oppose me was – were is sometimes realized in the subjunctive mood (colloquial). Opposites of the category of posteriority (shall go – should go; will go – would go) are typical only of the indicative.

One should however bear in mind that in the most Romance and Germanic languages (as well as in MG) the epistemic predicate THINK selects a declarative clause the verb of which is in the indicative mood. Even within Italian, the verb credere selects a dependent clause with its verb in indicative, if both the matrix and the embedded verbs are in the first person: In both cases (8-9), the label of the modality category of the predicate remains the same, namely epistemic, this is however not especially informative with regard to the mood of the dependent

clause; It rather implies that there is a subtle nuance in the mood selection, which is definitely associated with the degree of certainty (“more” or “less” epistemic) of the speaker but it is not conditioned solely by the modality category itself.

Similarly, the indicative is often considered “to be the mood of main assertions and non-modalized (or less modalized) embedded clauses” however, the indicative does emerge in epistemic constructions, e.g. in sentences like “It is possible that he is in London” whereas a French equivalent employs the subjunctive in the dependent clause: Il est possible qu'il le fasse (fasse 3Sg.Subj.Pres < faire “to do”) “It is possible that he “ll do it”. Obviously, this suggests, once again, that the use either of indicative or of subjunctive should be explored not (only) in the type of modality but in the degree of modality.

Modality is a kind of continuum and therefore, any effort to align every modality phenomenon with a precise modality category is erroneous. Thus, mood analysis demands a more fine-grained terminology, based on semantic features. Nevertheless, I think that, since mood is defined as an aspect of modality, one should not overlook this topic, as it is the case in many (syntactic and historical) treatments of mood distribution. What is more, we now have a common ground concerning the terms that I have defined up to now.

1.3 The Indicative Mood

The indicative mood is the basic mood of the verb. Morphologically it is the most developed system including all the categories of the verb. Mood is distinct from grammatical means or grammatical aspect, although the same word patterns are used for expressing more than one of these meanings at the same time in many languages, including English and most other modern Indo – European languages.

Semantically it is a fact mood. It serves to present an action as a fact of reality. It is the «most objective» or the «least subjective» of all the moods. It conveys minimum personal attitude to the fact. This becomes particularly manifest in such sentences as Water consists of oxygen and hydrogen where consists denotes an actual fact, and the speaker's attitude is neutral. We shall now proceed to the analysis of the grammatical categories of the indicative mood system.

The category of tense is a system of three-member opposes such as writes – wrote – will write, is writing – was writing – will be writing showing the relation of the time of the action denoted by the verb to the moment of speech.

The time of an action or event can be expressed lexically with the help of such words and combinations of words as yesterday, next week, now, a year ago, at half past seven, on the fifth of March, in 1957, etc. It can also be shown grammatically by means of the category of tense.

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

a) Lexically it is possible to name any definite moment or period of time: a century, a year, a day, a minute. The grammatical meaning of 'tense' is an

abstraction from» only three particular tenses: the 'present', the 'past' and the 'future*.

b) Lexically a period of time is named directly (e. g. on Sunday). The grammatical indication of time is indirect: it is not time that a verb like asked names, but an action that took place before the moment of speech.

c) As usual, the grammatical meaning of 'tense' is relative. Writes denotes a 'present' action because it is contrasted with wrote denoting a 'past' action and with will write naming a 'future' action. Writing does not indicate the time of the action because it has not tense opposites. Can has only a 'past tense' opposite, so it cannot refer to the past, but it may refer to the present and future (can do it yesterday is impossible, but can do it today, tomorrow is normal).

Note. By analogy with can, must has acquired the oblique meaning of 'present-future' tense, but sometimes it refers to the past.

It is usual to express the notions of time graphically by means of notions of space. Let us then imagine the limitless stretch of time – a very long railway along which we are moving in a train.



Let us further suppose that the train is now at station C. This is, so to say, the present. Stations A, B and all other stations passed by the train are the past, and stations D, E and all other stations the train is going to reach are in the future.

It would seem that the present is very insignificant, a mere point in comparison with the limitless past and future. But this point is of tremendous importance to the people in the train, because they are always in the present. When the train reaches station D, it ceases to be the future and becomes the present, while station C joins the past.

In reality, and accordingly in speech, the relation between the present, the past and the future is much more complicated. The present is reflected in speech not only as a mere point, the moment of speaking or thinking, but as a more or less long period of time including this moment. Compare, for instance, the meanings of the word now in the following sentences:

1. A minute ago he was crying, and now he is laughing.
2. A century ago people did not even dream of the radio, and now we cannot imagine our life without it.

The period of time covered by the second now is much longer, without, definite limits, but it includes the moment of speaking.

In the sentence The Earth rotates round the Sun we also deal with the present. But the present in this case not only includes the present moment, but it covers an immense period of time stretching: in both directions from the present moment.

Thus the 'present' is a variable period of time including the present moment or the moment of speech.

The 'past' is the time preceding the present moment, and the 'future' is the time following the present moment. Neither of them includes the present moment.

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

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

This is the case in the Russian sentences:

Он работает на заводе.

Он работал на заводе.

Он будет работать на заводе.

The same in English:

He works at a factory.

He worked at a factory.

He will work at a factory.

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

E.g.

он работает на заводе

Он сказал, что он работал на заводе

он будет работать на заводе

он работает на заводе

Он скажет, что он работал на заводе

он будет работать на заводе

Here the tenses of the principal clauses *сказал* and *скажет* are used absolutely, while all the tenses of the subordinate clauses are used relatively. The present tense does not refer to the present time but to the time of the action *сказал* in the first case and *скажет* in the second. The future tense *он будет работать* does not indicate the time following the present moment, but the time following the moment of the action *сказал* in the first case and *скажет* in the second. The same holds true with regard to the past tense.

In English such relative use of tenses is also possible with regard to some future moment⁸.

He works at a factory.

Он работает на фабрике.

He will say that he worked at a factory.

Он скажет, что работал на фабрике.

He will work at a factory.

Он будет работать на фабрике.

⁸ М.М. Галиинская "Иностранные языки в высшей школе" вып. 3. Москва. 1964

But as a rule, this is impossible with regard to a moment in the past, as in

He works at a factory.

He said that he worked at a factory.

He will work at a factory.

Instead of that an Englishman uses:

He worked at a factory.

He said that he had worked at a factory.

He would work at a factory.

Why is the first version impossible, or at least uncommon? Because the tenses of *works*, *worked*, *will work* cannot be used relatively with regard to the past moment indicated by the verb *said* (as it would be in Russian, for instance). In English they are, as a rule, used absolutely, i.e. with regard to the moment of speech.

Therefore a 'present tense' verb may be used here only if the time of the action it expresses includes the moment of speech, which occurs, for instance, in clauses expressing general statements (*He said that water boils at 100° C*), in clauses of comparison (*Last year he spoke much worse than he does now*), and in some other cases.

Similarly, a 'future tense' verb may be used here if the action it expresses refers to some time following the moment of speech.

E. g. *Yesterday I heard some remarks about the plan we shall discuss tomorrow.*

The past tense of *worked* in the sentence *He said that he worked at a factory* also shows the past time not with regard to the time of the action of saying (as would be the case in the Russian sentence *он сказал, что работает на заводе*), but with regard to the moment of speech.

Since English has special forms of the verb to express 'precedence' or 'priority' – the perfect forms – the past perfect is used to indicate that an action preceded some other action (or event) in the past. *He said that he had worked at a*

factory. But both in the principal and in the subordinate clause the tense of the verb is the same – the past tense used absolutely.

Summing up, we may say that a 'past tense' verb is used in an English subordinate clause not because there is a 'past tense' verb in the principal clause, i.e. as a result of the so-called sequence of tenses, but simply in accordance with its meaning of 'past tense'.

The category of posteriority is the system of two-member opposemes, like *shall come – should come, will be writing – would be writing*, showing whether an action is posterior with regard to the moment of speech or to some moment in the past.

As we know, a 'past tense' verb denotes an action prior to the moment of speech and a 'future tense' verb names a posterior action with regard to the moment of speech. When priority or posteriority is expressed in relation to the moment of speech, we call it absolute. But there may be relative priority or posteriority, with regard to some other moment. A form like *had written*, for instance, expresses an action prior to some moment in the past, i.e. it expresses relative priority. The form *should enter* expresses posteriority with regard to some past moment, i.e. relative posteriority.

The first member of the opposeme *shall enter – should enter* has, the meaning of 'absolute posteriority', and the second member possesses the meaning of 'relative posteriority'.

These two meanings are the particular manifestations of the general meaning of the – category, that of 'posteriority'.

The grammemes represented by *should come, would come* are traditionally called the future in the past, a name which reflects their meaning of 'relative posteriority'. But there is no agreement as to the place these grammemes occupy in the system of the English verb.

Some linguists regard them as isolated grammemes, outside the system of morphological categories. Others treat them as some kind of 'dependent future tense' and classify them with those 'finite verb forms' which depend on the nature

of the sentence. A.I. Smirnitsky tries to prove that they are not 'tense forms' but 'mood forms', since they are homonymous with the so-called 'conditional mood forms'.

Cf. *I thought he would come. I think he would rain if he did not say that .*

In our opinion none of these theories are convincing.

1. The grammemes discussed are not isolated. As shown above they belong to the morphological category of posteriority.

2. They are not «tense forms». In the sentences

I know Dilnoza will come.

I knew Dilnoza would come.

I had known Dilnoza would come.

neither *will come – would come*, nor *knew – had known* is a tense opposeme, because the difference between the members of the opposemes is not that of tense. The members of the first opposeme share the meaning of 'future' tense, those of the second opposeme – the meaning of 'past tense'. The only meanings the members of the first opposeme distinguish are those of 'absolute' and 'relative' posteriority. The members of the second opposeme distinguish only the meanings of 'perfect.' – 'non-perfect' order.

3. The grammemes in question are not 'mood forms'. As we know all the grammemes of the subjunctive mood (with the exception of *be*) are homonymous with those of the indicative mood. So the fact that *would rain* is used in both moods proves nothing.

The examples produced by A.I. Smirnitsky clearly show the difference between *would rain* in the sentence *I thought it would rain* and in the sentence *I think it would rain, if it were not so windy*. The first *would rain* is opposed to *will rain* (*I think it will rain*) and denotes a real action following some other action in the past (*I thought...*). In other words, it possesses the meanings of 'indicative' mood and 'relative' posteriority. The second *would rain* cannot be opposed to *will rain*. It denotes an imaginary action simultaneous with or following the moment of

speech (*I think...*). Hence, it has the meanings of 'non-perfect' order and 'subjunctive mood'.

The category of person in the Indo-European languages serves to present an action as associated by the speaking person with himself (or a group of persons including the speaker), the person or persons addressed, and the person or thing (persons or things) not participating in the process of speech. (Cf. with the meanings of the personal pronouns.) Thus in Russian it is represented in sets of three-member opposites such as:

читаю – I read, читаешь – you read, читаем – he/she reads
читаем – we read, читаете – you read, читают – they read

The conjugation of the present tense is more complicated in the Russian language than in the English, that is because the Russian language is one of the inflectional languages. As I have shown in the example the verb read in the present simple of indicative mood takes its own endings and we can't drop personal pronouns or a subject, but it is possible to omit subject in the English language. It is impossible because the English conjugation has only two forms – read and reads while the Russian language has its own endings according to which we can identify the attitude who it is directed to.

There are two conjugations in the Russian language 1st and 2nd conjugations. Various verbs are related to one of the two conjugations;

To the first conjugation we refer the verbs which have – ать, ять, endings in infinitive forms:

<i>Работать</i>	<i>to work</i>
Я работаю	I work
Ты работаешь	You work
Он, Она, Оно работает	He, She, It works
Мы работаем	We work
Вы работаете	You work

Они **работают**

They work

Стрелять

to shoot

Я **стреляю**

I shoot

Ты **стреляешь**

You shoot

Он, Она, Оно **стреляет**

He, She, It shoots

Мы **стреляем**

We shoot

Вы **стреляете**

You shoot

Они **стреляют**

They shoot

Let us have a look at different group of verbs, which are conjugated in the second conjugation;

Unlike are the verbs which have – **ить** endings in infinitive form:

Любить

to love

Я **люблю**

I love

Ты **любишь**

You love

Он, Она, Оно **любит**

We love

Мы **любим**

We love

Вы **любите**

You love

Они **любят**

They love

But there are plenty of verbs, which are exception: **жить, пить, бить, ждать** and so on. **Я живу, ты живёшь, он живёт, мы живём, вы живёте, они живут; я пью, ты пьёшь, он пьёт, мы пьём, вы пьёте, они пьют;** These verbs don't obey the rules which I have mentioned. The present simple and the present continuous tense in the Russian language have the same form endings, but carry different meaning .

Likewise in Modern German we have

gehe – gehst – geht

gehen – geht – gehen

In Modern English the category of person has certain peculiarities⁹.

1. The second member of the opposemes

speak – speakest – speaks

am – art – is

is not used colloquially. It occurs in Modern English only in poetry, in solemn or pathetic prose with a distinct archaic flavour, e.g.:

Kind nature, thou art

to all a bountiful mother. (Carlyle).

The category of person is practically represented by two-member opposemes: *speak – speaks, am – is*.

2. Person opposemes are neutralized when associated with the 'plural' meaning.

A.I. Smirnitsky thinks that owing to the presence of the plural personal pronouns (we, you, they) person distinctions are felt in the plural of the verb as well.

E. g. we know – you know – they know.

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

Thus if we overlook the archaic *writest* or *speakest*, we should say that in all verbs (but the defective verbs having no person distinctions at all: he can, she may) the person opposer is found only in the singular, and it consists of two members (*speak – speaks*), the third person with a positive morpheme being opposed to the first person with a zero morpheme.

3. Person distinctions do not go with the meaning of the 'past tense' in the English verb, e. g. I (he) asked... (cf. the Russian *Я (он/ты) спросил*).

4. As regards all those groups of grammemes where the word-morphemes shall and should are opposed to the word-morphemes will, would, one

⁹ Ch. Barber. Linguistic change in present – Day English. Edinburg. 1964

has to speak of the first person expressed by forms with *shall* (*should*) as opposed to the non-first person expressed by the forms with *will* (*would*): The person distinctions in such opposemes (*shall come* – *will come*) are not connected-with number meanings.

The indicative mood is the most frequent mood which is used in any languages, because it has three main tenses past future and simple, while the imperative mood has present time: **Farida, go home!** – **Farida иди в дом!** **Farida идёт домой** - **Farida goes home.** There two types of the future in the indicative tense of the Russian language: простое будущее (perfect future) и сложное будущее (imperfect future). Alisher will be reading a book or Alisher will read a book. (Алишер будет читать книгу или Алишер прочитает книгу) in the first example we have a tense which is coincides with future continuous: an action will be going at particular time, it will be lasting, but will not be completed, or the action will be repeated but in простое будущее the action will be started and finished without lasting long and the result will be seen.

In the past tenses of indicative in the Russian language there is no conjugation in the past. There is a category of number in the past tenses. In Uzbek language there is a conjugation in the past tenses. In the English and Russian languages there no such categories.

These distinctions, however, are being gradually obliterated through the spreading of *-ll* and the extensive use of *will* and *would* for *shall* and *should*.

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

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

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

Accordingly the category of number is but scantily represented in Modern English.

Some verbs do not distinguish number at all because of their peculiar historical development: / (we) can..., he (they) must..., others are but rarely used in the singular because the meaning of 'oneness' is hardly compatible with their lexical meanings, e. g. to crowd, to conspire, etc.

It is natural, therefore, that in Modern English the verb is most closely connected with its subject, which may be left out only when the doer of the action is quite clear from the sentence.

CHAPTER: II THE SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD

2.1 The problems of subjunctive mood

The problems of subjunctive mood, sometimes called conjunctive mood, have mood as several uses in dependent clauses. The function of the subjunctive mood is to represent something, not as an actual reality, but as formed in the mind of the speaker as a desire, wish, volition, plan, conception, thought; something with more or less hope of realization, or, in the case of a statement, with more or less belief, sometimes subjunctive (the subjugated < syntactically sub – ordinate mood) implies that the subjunctive is the mood of subordinated clauses (an idea deriving from the antiquity that has been maintained in the modern relevant literature despite the fact that the mood can (under certain semantic conditions) occur in main clauses as well. with little or no hope or faith.

The various meanings may be classified under two general heads – the optative subjunctive and the potential subjunctive. The optative subjunctive represents something as desired, demanded, required. The potential subjunctive marks something as a mere conception of the mind, but at the same time represents it as something that may probably be or become a reality or on the other hand as something that is contrary to fact. H. Whitehall in the work «Structural Essentials of English» says that Mood (or mode) establishes the speaker's or writer's mood about the actuality of a happening. The indicative mood indicates that what he says must be regarded as a fact, i.e., as having occurred or as occurring; the so-called subjunctive mood implies that he is doubtful or uncertain about its occurrence. Although the subjunctive is gradually dying out of the language, English is rich in devices for expressing one's psychological moods toward happenings that are imaginary. Our apparatus for expressing mood suggests that in the use of verb word-groups, the speaker's or writer's mental attitudes are of great importance.

Many grammarians enumerate the following moods in English, etc.: indicative, subjunctive, imperative, infinitive, and participle. O. Jespersen as it can be seen from «The Philosophy of Grammar» considers that infinitives and

participles cannot be coordinated with the others, and we shall therefore in this chapter deal with the first three moods only. These are sometimes called fact-mood, thought-mood, and will-mood respectively. But they do not express different relations between subject and predicate. It is much more correct to say that they express certain attitudes of the mind of the speaker towards the contents of the sentence. The grammatical status of imperative sentences is puzzling, syntactically and semantically.

We routinely say that the subjunctive is a mood. But what does the term mood exactly designate? Before we proceed to the semantic analysis of the subjunctive mood, it is important to provide a concrete definition of the terms mood and modality, given the highly controversial topics in this field of research and the plethora of terms which have been used in a different way by various scholars. In terms of morphology, mood is associated with the verbal paradigms. In many cases, e.g. in ancient and many modern Indo-European languages, mood is understood as a verbal category marked by inflectional affixes added to the stem of a verb. In other languages, e.g. in agglutinating languages, suffixes may denote what modal verbs or mood endings denote in other languages and therefore mood can be understood as a separate suffix.

In terms of semantics The Turkish verbal form semantically corresponds to an English modal verb+ bare infinitive construction or to a Mod. Greek impersonal verb + na-subjunctive construction (поЭрез лб рЪщ...: (рйри на рбо) “I have to go”). Even if it is dubious whether this category should be called mood or not, it is self-evident that the Turkish suffix, like mood or modal verbs, is an instantiation of modality, which we will examine in this chapter.

However, since these forms are part of the verbal paradigm of Turkish, it does not seem inappropriate to call them moods as well. Cf. also Lewis (1967: 132ff) on

the so called subjunctive (-optative) in Turkish. mood is considered to be a grammatical instantiation of modality

In general, modality can be defined as the linguistic facet that “is concerned with the status of the proposition that describes the event”¹² or (in a more precise way) as the category “covering indications either of a kind of speech act or of the degree of certainty with which something is said” As a matter of fact, modality is better reflected on its sub sets a epistemic modality is associated with the speaker’s degree of certainty or attitude to the truth value or factual status of the proposition”

2.2 Foreign linguists’ speculations about the Subjunctive Mood.

As we shall further see there is no unity on the Subjunctive Mood among the world famous foreign grammarians. I would like to dwell on the views of the most outstanding linguists.

By the moods of a verb H. Sweet in his work «A new English Grammar (Part understands grammatical forms expressing different relations between subject and predicate. Thus, if a language has special forms to express commands as distinguished from statements, we include the forms that express command under the term «imperative mood». Thus in English **come!** is in the imperative mood, while the statement **he comes** is in the «indicative» mood. In English the only inflectional moods are the indicative and subjunctive. But the inflections of the English verb are so scanty that we need not be surprised to find that the distinction between indicative and subjunctive is very slight. The only regular inflection by which the subjunctive is distinguished from the indicative in English is that of the third person singular present, which drops the **s** of the indicative (he sees) in the subjunctive (he see). In the verb **to be**, however, further distinctions are made: indicative **I am, he is, he was**, subjunctive **I be, he be, he were**, although in the spoken language the only distinction that is still kept us is that between **was** and **were**. Consequently the sense of the distinction in function

between subjunctive and indicative has almost died out in English, and use the subjunctive **were** only in combination with other mood-forms, the other subjunctive inflections surviving only in a few special phrases and constructions, such as **God, save the Queen!**, where the subjunctive expresses wish, being thus equivalent to the Greek optative.

The few distinction that English makes between fact-statements and thought-statements are mainly expressed, not by inflections, but by auxiliaries (periphrastic moods), and by peculiar uses of tense-distinctions. The following are the auxiliary forms:

The combination of **should** and **would** with the infinitive – the **conditional mood**. The combination of **may** and its preterite **might** with the infinitive is called the **permissive mood**. The combination of the finite forms of the verb **to be** with the supine is called **compulsive mood**.

We use tenses to express thought-statements in the hypothetical clauses of conditional sentences, as in **if I knew his address I would write him; if it were possible I would do it**. In the latter example the hypothesis is shown not only by the preterite tense, but also by the subjunctive inflection, which is really superfluous. When a thought-statement is expressed by a tense in this way, H. Sweet calls it a **tense-mood**. **Were** in **if it were** is a **subjunctive tense-mood**. As we see, in some conditional sentences all three ways of expressing thought-statement are used¹⁰. G.O. Curme in the work «A Grammar of the English Language» considers moods as the changes in the form of the verb to show the various ways in which the action or state is thought of by the speaker. Examples include discussing imaginary or hypothetical events and situations, expressing opinions or emotions, or making polite requests (the exact scope is language-specific).

A subjunctive mood exists in English, though it is used in English much less

¹⁰Curme in the work “A Grammar of the English Language”. 1988

than in many other Indo-European languages. In English, this mood has, for some uses, become something of a linguistic fossil. An example of the subjunctive mood is "I suggest that Paul *eat* an apple". The sentence refers to an event which may or may not take place. Contrast this with the indicative verb of the sentence "Paul will eat an apple", in which the verb "will eat" states an unambiguous fact. Another way of expressing the suggestion is "I suggest that Paul should eat an apple".

Other uses of the subjunctive in English are archaisms, as in "And **if he be** not able to bring a lamb, then he shall bring for his trespass..." Statements such as "I will ensure that he leave immediately" often sound archaic or overly formal, and have been almost completely supplanted by constructions with the indicative, like "I will ensure that he leaves immediately".

Some Germanic languages distinguish between two types of subjunctive moods, for example, the *Konjunktiv I* and *II* in German or the *present* and *past subjunctive* in English. Note that the latter distinction is not about the actual time at which something happens (or doesn't happen). The conditional version of "John eats if he is hungry" is (subjunctive part boldfaced):

English: *John would eat if he **were** hungry.*

Russian: *Джон поел бы, если **бы** он был голоден.*

German: *Johannes **ä**ße, wenn er hungrig **wäre**.*

Polish: *Jan jadłoby, gdyby **zgiodniał**.*

Spanish: *Juan comería si **tuviera** hambre.*

Italian: *Giovanni mangerebbe se **avesse** fame.*

French: *Jean mangerait s'il **avait** faim.*

The subjunctive mood figures prominently in the grammar of the Roman languages clauses. This point commonly causes difficulty for English speakers learning these language. In certain other languages, the dubitative or the conditional moods may be employed instead of the subjunctive in referring to doubtful or unlikely events.

As we shall further see there is no unity on the Subjunctive Mood among the world famous foreign grammarians. I would like to dwell on the views of the most outstanding linguists. By the moods of a verb H. Sweet in his work «A new English Grammar (Part I)» understands grammatical forms expressing different relations between subject and predicate.

Thus, if a language has special forms to express commands as distinguished from statements, we include the forms that express command under the term «imperative mood». Thus in English **come!** is in the imperative mood, while the statement **he comes** is in the «indicative» mood. In English the only inflectional moods are the indicative and subjunctive.

But the inflections of the English verb are so scanty that we need not be surprised to find that the distinction between indicative and subjunctive is very slight. The only regular inflection by which the subjunctive is distinguished from the indicative in English is that of the third person singular present, which drops the **s** of the indicative (he sees) in the subjunctive (he see). In the verb **to be**, however, further distinctions are made: indicative **I am, he is, he was**, subjunctive **I be, he be, he were**, although in the spoken language the only distinction that is still kept us is that between **was** and **were**.

Consequently the sense of the distinction in function between subjunctive and indicative has almost died out in English, and use the subjunctive **were** only in combination with other mood-forms, the other subjunctive inflections surviving only in a few special phrases and constructions, such as **God, save the Queen!**, where the subjunctive expresses wish, being thus equivalent to the Greek optative.

The few distinction that English makes between fact-statements and thought-statements are mainly expressed, not by inflections, but by auxiliaries (periphrastic moods), and by peculiar uses of tense-distinctions. The following are the auxiliary forms: The combination of **should** and **would** with the infinitive – the **conditional mood**.

The combination of **may** and its preterite **might** with the infinitive is called the **permissive mood**. The combination of the finite forms of the verb **to be** with the supine is called **compulsive mood**. We use tenses to express thought-statements in the hypothetical clauses of conditional sentences, as in **if I knew his address I would write him; if it were possible I would do it**. In the latter example the hypothesis is shown not only by the preterite tense, but also by the subjunctive inflection, which is really superfluous. When a thought-statement is expressed by a tense in this way, H. Sweet calls it a **tense-mood**. **Were** in **if it were** is a **subjunctive tense-mood**. As we see, in some conditional sentences all three ways of expressing thought-statement are used. G.O. Curme in the work «A Grammar of the English Language» considers moods as the changes in the form of the verb to show the various ways in which the action or state is thought of by the speaker.

2.3 Mood from the point of of Russian linguists

Curme in the work «A Grammar of the English. The category of mood in the present English verb has given rise to so many discussions, and has been treated in so many different ways, that it seems hardly possible to arrive at any more or less convincing and universally acceptable conclusion concerning it. Indeed, the only points in the sphere of mood which have not so far been disputed seem to be these: there is a category of mood in Modern English; there are at least two moods in the modern English verb, one of which is the Subjunctive. These points were discussed not only by English grammarians, but Russian grammarians too.

Academician V. Vinogradov¹¹ in his work «Russian Language» gave the definition of the category of mood: «Mood expresses the relation of the action to reality, as stated by the speaker.» The relations between meaning and form will be expressed by two different series of external signs.

¹¹ Vinogradov. "Russian language" Москва 1875

The first of these two points may be illustrated by sequence **we should come**, which means one thing in the sentence **I think we should come here again tomorrow**; it means another thing in the sentence **if we knew that he wants us we should come to see him**, and it means another thing again in the sentence **How queer that we should come at the very moment when you were talking about us!** In a similar way, several meanings may be found in the sequence **he would come** in different contexts.

The second of the two points may be illustrated by comparing the two sentences, **I suggest that he go** and **I suggest that he should go**, and we will for the present neglect the fact that the first of the two variants is more typical of American, and the second of British English. Matters are still further complicated by two phenomena where we are faced with a choice between polysemy and homonymy. One of these concerns forms like **lived, knew**, etc. Such forms appear in two types of contexts, of which one may be exemplified by the sentences, **He lived here five years ago**, or **I knew it all along**, and the other by the sentences **If he lived here he would come at once**, or, **If I knew his address I should write to him**.

In sentences of the first type the form obviously is the past tense of the indicative mood. The second type admits of two interpretations: either the form **lived, knew**, etc. are the same forms of the past indicative that were used in the first type, but they have acquired another meaning in this particular context, or else the forms **lived, knew**, etc. are forms of the past indicative but are basically different. There is another peculiar complication in the analysis of mood.

The question is, what verbs are auxiliaries of Mood in Modern English? The verbs **should** and **would** are auxiliaries expressing unreality. 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**. Is the group **may hear** some mood form of the verb **hear**, or is it a free combination of two verbs, thus belonging entirely to the field of

syntax, not morphology? The same question may be asked about the verb **may** in such sentences as **May you be happy!** Where it is part of a group used to express a wish, and is perhaps a mood auxiliary. We ought to seek an objective criterion which would enable us to arrive at a convincing conclusion.

All these considerations, varied as they are, make the problem of mood in Modern English extremely difficult to solve and they seem to show in advance that no universally acceptable solution can be hoped for in a near future. Those proposed so far have been extremely unlike each other. Owing to the difference of approach to moods, grammarians have been vacillating between two extremes – 3 moods (indicative, subjunctive and imperative), put forward by many grammarians, and 16 moods, as proposed by M. Deutschbein. Between these extremes there are intermediate views, such as that of Prof. A. Smirnitsky, who proposed a system of 6 moods (indicative, imperative, subjunctive I, subjunctive II, suppositional, and conditional), and who was followed in this respect by M. Ganshina and N. Vasilevskaya¹². If we look through the meaning of the mood forms, we obtain the following headings:

Meaning	Means of expression
Inducement (order, request, prayer, and the like) Possibility (action thought of as conditionally possible, or as purpose of another action, etc.) Unreal condition Consequence of Страницы:	

¹² M. Ganshina and N. Vasilevskaya .comparing typology1998

unreal condition **come (!)** (no ending, no auxiliary, and usually without subject, 2nd person only) **(he) come** (no ending, no auxiliary)

Should come (should for all persons) **may come (?)** **came, had come** (same as past or past perfect indicative), used in subordinate clauses **should come** (1st person) **would come** (2nd and 3rd person)

We would thus get either four moods, or three moods, or two moods. The choice between these variants will remain arbitrary and is unlikely ever to be determined by means of any objective data. If, on the other hand, we start from the means of expressing moods we are likely to get something like this system:

Meaning	Means of expression
Inducement	come (!) (no ending, no auxiliary, and usually without subject)
Possibility	(he) come (no ending in any persons, no auxiliary)
Unreal condition	came, had come
Unlikely condition	Should come (for all persons)
Consequence of unreal condition	should come (1st person)
Wish or purpose	would come (2nd and 3rd person)
	may come (?)

In this way we should obtain different system, comprising six moods, with the following meanings:

Inducement

Possibility

Unreal condition

Unlikely condition

Consequence of unreal condition

Wish or purpose

A similar problem concerns the groups «should + infinitive» and «would + infinitive». Two views are possible here. If we have decided to avoid homonymy as far as possible, we will say that a group of this type is basically a tense (the future-in-the-past), which under certain specified conditions may express an unreal action – the consequence of an unfulfilled condition.

If we endorse one of the views, that is, if we take the temporal and the modal groups «should (would) + infinitive» to be homonyms, the patterns themselves will not change. The change will affect the headings. We shall have to say, in that case, that the patterns serve to distinguish between two basically different forms sounding alike. Again, just as in the case of **lived** and **knew**, this will be a matter of interpreting facts, rather than of the facts as such. To sum up the whole discussion about categories of the verb found in conditional sentences, the simplest view, and the one to be preferred is that we have here forms of the indicative mood in a special use. Another view is that we have here forms of special moods, and that they are distinguished from each other according to the category of correlation.

Mood is distinct from grammatical means or Grammatical aspect, although the same word patterns are used for expressing more than one of these meanings at

the same time in many languages, including English and most other modern discussion of this.

The conditional mood is used for speaking of an event whose realization is dependent upon another condition, particularly, but not exclusively, in conditional sentences. In Modern English, this type of modality is expressed periphrastic construction with the form *would* + infinitive, (e.g. *I would buy*), and thus is a mood only in the broad sense and not in the more common narrow sense of the term "mood".

In other languages, verbs have a specific conditional inflection. In German, the conditional mood is identical to one of the two subjunctive moods (*Konjunktiv II*, see In the Romans languages, the conditional form is used primarily in the apodosis (main clause) of conditional clauses, and in a few set phrases where it expresses courtesy or doubt. The main verb in the protasis (dependent clause) is usually in the subjunctive or in the indicative mood. However, this is not a universal trait: among others in German (as above), Finnish and Romanian (even though the last is a Romance language), the conditional mood is used in both the apodosis and the protasis. A further example is the sentence "I would buy a house if I earned a lot of money", where in Finnish both clauses have the conditional marker *-isi-*: *Ostaisin talon, jos ansaitsisin paljon rahaa*. In Polish (as well as in eastern Slavic languages) the conditional marker *-by* also appears twice: *Kupiibym dom, gdybym zarabiał dużo pieniędzy*.

Because English is used as a lingua franca, a common error among second-language speakers is to use "would" in both clauses, e.g. *"I would buy if I would earn...". "Would" can, however, correctly be used after "if" in sentences such as "If you **would** only **tell me** what is troubling you, I might be able to help" (i.e. "if you were willing to tell me...")

Mood is distinct from grammatical means or grammatical aspect , although the same word patterns are used for expressing more than one of these

meanings at the same time in many languages, including English and most other modern Indo – European languages.

Probably the only thing linguists are unanimous about with regard to the subjunctive mood is that It represents an action as a 'non-fact', as something imaginary, desirable, problematic, contrary to reality. In all other respects opinions differ. To account for this difference of opinion it is necessary to take into consideration at least two circumstances:

1) The system of the subjunctive mood in Modern English has been and still is in a state of development. There are many elements in it which are rapidly falling into disuse and there are new elements coming into use.

2) The authors describing the subjunctive mood often make no distinction between language and speech, system and usage. The opposition of the three moods as systems is mixed up with detailed descriptions of the various shades of meaning certain forms express in different environments.

The development of the modal verbs and that of the subjunctive mood – the lexical and morphological ways of expressing modality – have much in common.

The original 'present tense' forms of the modal verbs were ousted by the 'past tense' forms (may, can). New 'past tense' forms were created (could, might, must, ought). The new 'past tense' forms must and ought have again superseded their 'present tense' opposites and are now the only forms of these verbs.

The forms be, have, write, go, etc., which were originally forms of the 'present tense', 'subjunctive mood' grammemes, have suffered a similar process and are now scarcely used in colloquial English. They have become archaic and are found as survivals in poetry, high prose, official documents and certain set expressions like Long live..., suffice it to say..., etc. The former 'past tense subjunctive' has lost its 'past' meaning, and its forms are mostly used to denote an action not preceding the moment of speech.

The new analytical forms with *should* have replaced the former present subjunctive in popular speech. Compare the archaic *Take heed, lest thou fall* (Maxwell) and the usual

Take heed, lest you should fall.

In American English where many archaic features are better preserved (Cf. *gotten* for *got*) the former present tense forms are more common.

E. g. *She demanded furiously that the old man. be left alone. (Dreiser).*

Some new elements have come and are still coming into the system of the subjunctive mood. In Old English the subjunctive mood system did not contain any 'person' opposeemes. They were introduced later together with *should* and *would*, but these distinctions are observed only in a few types of sentences.

With the loss of the – *en* suffix of the plural the subjunctive mood system lost all number opposeemes in Middle English. At present such opposeemes are being introduced together with the word *was* as opposed to *were*.

E. g. *You'd be glad if I was dead. (Bennett).*

Barring the archaic 'present tense' forms, the subjunctive mood system of Modern English makes use of those forms which express a 'past tense' meaning in the indicative mood system. Since they are not opposed to the 'present tense' and 'future tense' grammemes, they have no 'tense' meaning. What unites them is the meaning of 'irreality' as opposed to the meaning of 'reality' common to all the indicative mood grammemes.

Having no 'tense' opposeemes the subjunctive mood system makes extensive use of 'order' opposeemes. The 'perfect' forms are used to express an action imagined as prior to some other action or event.

E. g. *The Married Woman's Property Act would so have interfered with him if he hadn't mercifully married before it was passed. (Galsworthy).*

The 'perfect' forms, naturally, express actions imagined as prior to the event of speaking, i. e. actions imagined in the past.

E.g. *If I had known that, I s h o u I d have acted differently. It is strange t/iat he s h o u I d have spoken so.*

The non-perfect forms do not express priority. The action they denote may be thought of as simultaneous with some event or even following it. The order of the action in such cases is expressed not by the form of the verb but by the whole situation or lexically.

Cf. I wish he were here now. I wish he were here tomorrow. Even if he came tomorrow that will be too late. (Ruck).

The 'passive voice' and 'continuous aspect' meanings are expressed much in the same way as in the indicative mood system.

E. g. In a moment he would have been drowned. (Braddon).

She sat not reading, wondering if he were coming in... (Galsworthy).

The various shades of meaning subjunctive mood grammemes may acquire in certain environments, and the types of sentences and clauses they are used in, are not part of the morphological system of moods and need not be treated here. Still an, exception can be made.

Some linguists I think that would help in the sentence *If he were here he would help us* represents a separate mood called 'conditional'.

The arguments are as follows:

1. The form would help expresses 'dependent unreality': the realization of the action depends on the condition expressed in the subordinate clause (If-clause).
2. It is 'mainly used in the principal clause of a complex sentence with a subordinate clause of unreal condition'.
3. Should is used for the first person and would for the other persons.

Let us analyze these arguments.

1. If the meaning of 'dependent unreality' is to be treated as the meaning of a separate mood, then the meaning of 'dependent reality' in a similar sentence *If he is here, he will help us* must likewise be regarded as the meaning of a separate mood which is to be distinguished from the indicative mood. The meaning of tell in the sentence *If you see her tell her to come* can also be defined as 'dependent urging' and be regarded as the meaning of a separate mood distinct from the imperative mood.

2. The second argument deals with speech environment and is of little value since the same authors produce examples of the 'conditional mood' in different types of sentences.

Would you mind my opening the window?

I should like to speak to you, etc.

3. The third argument is justly rejected by G.N. Vorontsova who produces many literary examples to show that 'would-Forms' are used with the first person as often as 'should-forms'.

E. g. If I had held another pistol in my hand /would have shot him. I would love to think that you took an interest in teaching me... I wish I had a lot of money, I wouldn't live another day in London. (Galsworthy).

Besides, the popular use of forms with – 'd instead of should and would shows the obliteration of 'person' distinctions.

4. The name conditional hardly fits, seeing that the forms with should–would are as a rule not used in conditional clauses. They are mostly used in principal clauses or simple sentences, which distinguishes their distribution from that of forms without should – would used almost exclusively in subordinate clauses.

E. g. After all, if he lost it would not be he who paid. (Galsworthy).

Under normal conditions Winifred would merely have locked the door. (lb).

The difference between the two sets of opposemes

had written (order)

wrote were written (voice)

were writing (aspect)

should have written (order)

should write would be written (voice)

should be writing (aspect)

would write (person, irregular)

Is thus a matter of usage. That does not exclude, of course, «the possibility of a language category with speech significance (cf. the categories of case, voice). Hence the necessity of further investigation.

What unites all the grammemes above and distinguishes them from the homonymous grammemes of the indicative mood as a system is

- 1) the meaning of «non-fact», the presentation of the action as something imaginary,
- 2) the system of opposeemes, as contrasted with that of the indicative mood.

CHAPTER III

The Imperative Mood

3.1 General overview of imperatives

The imperative mood represents an action as a command, urging, request, Mood is distinct from grammatical means or grammatical aspect , although the same word patterns are used for expressing more than one of these meanings at the same time in many languages, including English and most other modern languages, exhortation addressed to one's interlocutor[^]). It is a direct expression of one's will. Therefore it is much more 'subjective' than the indicative mood. Its modal meaning is very strong and distinct. A tripartite division of major speech acts is reflected in their linguistic form. This division is subsumed under the concept of imperative.

The form of a statement is declarative, and that of a question is interrogative. A command corresponds to the imperative mood. Just as there can be covert questions, one can express a command without using a dedicated form. It is not uncommon for a linguistic term to have a counterpart in the real world. The idea of 'time' in the real world translates into 'tense' when expressed in a language. 'Time' is what our watch shows and what often passes too quickly; 'tense' is a grammaticalised set of forms we have to use in a particular language. Not every time distinction acquires grammatical expression in the language: the possibilities for time are unlimited, and for tense they are limited. Along similar lines, 'evidentiality' is a linguistic category whose real-life counterpart is information source. Similarly, an 'imperative' is a category in the language, while a 'command' is a parameter in the real world.

Languages of the world have limited means of expressing imperatives. The possibilities for commands are immense, and open-ended. 'Imperative' and 'command' (or directive speech act) do not always refer to the same thing. Go away! is a command, and is imperative in form. But I can say the same thing jokingly to someone without meaning to chase them away —this will be reflected

in my tone of voice or intonation. And one can command without using an imperative. A question *Why don't you go away?*, or a stern statement *You will go away*, or just one word *Away!* serve the same purpose. Imperatives may cover entreaties and requests: *Let me go to the party!* and *Try and behave!*

Advice and instructions are often cast in the form of an imperative — *Don't repeat other people's mistakes!* Or *Mix two spoonfuls of water with flour.* Imperatives may also express invitations: *Meet the Joneses!* Or principles and life mottos: *Publish or perish!* Or may have an anti-command', or a mock-command meaning. A 'recipe for disaster' may be cast in an imperative. A spoofy passage on how to destroy your festive season contains mock commands —which tell you what not to do unless you want your Christmas time to turn into a disaster: *Drive to somewhere terrible for a holiday. Stay in three motels with plumbing that gargles and screams all night. Break out in acne. Get food poisoning (from Burjars and Burrige Conditions, threats and ultimatums may be cast in the form of an imperative: Buy from that shop and you will regret it, or Be quiet or I'll send you to bed. Saying Take care! Or Fare thee well! are not commands; these are conventional speech formulae, part of our linguistic repertoire.*

Imperative forms in English (and perhaps in many other languages with just one dedicated imperative) are versatile in their meanings. Jespersen put it, they may 'range from brutal commands through many intermediate steps (demands, injunctions, implorations, invitations) to the most modest and humble prayer(entreaty, supplication).'

In many languages imperatives stand clearly apart from other clause types in their grammatical properties. Imperative mood is the commonest way of expressing commands¹³, and a multitude of related meanings, in the languages of the world. In some languages, imperatives may give the impression of simplicity in form. In other languages, they can also be dauntingly complex. Non-

¹³ Иванова. И. П, Буракова. В.В, Почешово Г. Г « Теоритическая грамматика современного английского языка – мю1981. Стр 285

imperative forms —statements, questions, exclamations —are frequently co-opted to express varied overtones of command-like meanings, intruding into the imperative domain. We will be referring to these as command strategies. One does not need an imperative to express a command. A glance, a gesture, or a picture can do the job. Some pictorial command strategies are (note the red colour as an additional mark of warning and prohibition):

The imperative mood is morphologically the least developed of all moods. In fact, the grammeme write, know, warn, search, do, etc. is the only one regularly met in speech (as to don't write, do write). The 'continuous' and 'passive' opposites of this grammeme (be writing, be searching, etc; be known, be warned, etc.) are very rare.

E.g. Be always searching for new sensations. (Wilde). Be warned in time, mend your manner. (Shaw).

Though the system of the 'imperative' mood does not contain 'person' opposeemes, it cannot be said that there is no meaning of 'person' in the imperative mood grammemes. On the contrary, all of them are united by the meaning of 'second person' because it is always to his interlocutor (the second person) that the speaker addresses his order or request expressed with the help of – imperative mood forms. Thus the meaning of «second person» is a lexico-grammatical meaning common to all the imperative mood grammemes. This meaning makes it unnecessary to use the subject you with predicate verbs in the imperative mood. But sometimes you is used for emphasis, as in *Don't you do it!*

Some linguists are of the opinion that Modern English possesses analytical forms of the imperative mood for the first and the third person built up with the help of the semantically weakened unstressed let, as in *Let him come, Let us go,* etc.

To be on the safe side, we shall assume that the if-constructions are analytical words in the making.

3.2 The inner nature of imperatives

'Imperative' and 'command' (or directive speech act) do not always refer to the same thing.

Go away! is a command, and is imperative in form. But I can say the same thing jokingly to someone without meaning to chase them away —this will be reflected in my tone of voice or intonation. And one can command without using an imperative. A question Why don't you go away?, or a stern statement You will go away, or just one word Away! serve the same purpose.

Imperatives may cover entreaties and requests: Let me go to the party!and Try and behave!

Advice and instructions are often cast in the form of an imperative — Don't repeat other people's mistakes! Or Mix two spoonfuls of water with flour. Imperatives may also express invitations: Meet the Joneses! Or principles and life mottos: Publish or perish!

Or they may have an anti-command', or a mock-command meaning. A 'recipe for disaster' may be cast in an imperative. A spoofy passage on how to destroy your festive season contains mock commands —which tell you what not to do unless you want your Christmas time to turn into a disaster: Drive to somewhere terrible for a holiday. Stay in three motels with plumbing that gargles and screams all night. Break out in acne. Get food poisoning (from Burjars and Burrige).

Conditions, threats and ultimatums may be cast in the form of an imperative: Buy from that shop and you will regret it, or Be quiet or I'llsend you to bed. Saying Take care! Or Fare thee well!

Imperative forms in English (and perhaps in many other languages with just one dedicated imperative) are versatile in their meanings Jespersen put it, they may 'range from brutal commands through many intermediate steps (demands,

injunctions, implorations, invitations) to the most modest and humble prayer (entreaty, supplication).'

In many languages imperatives stand clearly apart from other clause types in their grammatical properties. Imperative mood is the commonest way of expressing commands, and a multitude of related meanings, in the languages of the world. In some languages, imperatives may give the impression of simplicity in form. In other languages, they can also be dauntingly complex.

Non-imperative forms —statements, questions, exclamations —are frequently co-opted to express varied overtones of command-like meanings, intruding into the imperative domain. We will be referring to these as command strategies.

One does not need an imperative to express a command. A glance, a gesture, or a picture can do the job. Some pictorial command strategies are (note the red colour as an additional mark of warning and prohibition):

G.N. Vorontsova¹⁴ gives a detailed analysis of these constructions to prove that they are analytical forms of the imperative:

1) Sentences like *Let's let newspaper reporters take a crack at her (Gardner)* prove that unlike the second let which is a notional verb the first let is devoid of lexical meaning.

2) It is quite possible to treat the objective case pronouns in the sentences *Let me be frank, Let him look out, Let them both see*, as the subjects.

3) An order can be addressed not only to the second person but to the third person as well.

Compare: *Someone make an offer – and quick! (Barr).*

Let someone make an offer.

4) The recognition of the let-constructions as the analytical forms of the imperative would make the imperative a developed morphological system.

All these considerations are serious enough. Still there are some objections to these constructions being regarded as analytical forms of the imperative.

¹⁴ Г.Н.Воронцова. «Очерки по грамматике английского языка» м 1960

1. There is some difference in meaning between *Go!* and *Let him go*. In the second case no direct urging is expressed as it is typical of the imperative mood.

2. Cases like *Do not let us ever allude to those times*, with the word-morpheme *do*, alongside of such sentences as *Let it not be doubted that they were nice, well-behaved girls* (Bennett), without the word-morpheme *do*, show that *let* has not yet established itself as a word-morpheme of the imperative mood.

To be on the safe side, we shall assume that the if-constructions are analytical words in the making.

The most straightforward command is that directed to the addressee. An imperative always implies a command to second person. Such addressee-oriented, or 'canonical', imperatives (in a 'narrow sense') may stand apart from other verbal forms in a language. They are commonly expressed by the bare root, or stem of the verb. The shortest word in Latin, *i!* 'you (sg) go!' is the second person singular imperative of the. Such short and snappy forms may give an impression of superficial simplicity —as if the imperatives were, in some sense, poor relations of their declarative and interrogative counterparts. This simplicity is often a mere illusion, as we will show throughout this paper, and throughout the workshop.

Imperatives may be oriented towards other persons —third person and first person. In agreement with Aikhenvald (2010), they are called 'non-canonical' imperatives.

All imperative forms may form one paradigm —this is what justifies considering them together. An example in Table 1 comes from Yemsa, an Omotic language from Ethiopia. The second person singular form is the shortest of all and the least formally marked. All plural imperatives (except for first person) bear a plural marker. These kind of imperatives are usually addressed to all in general for example: NO SMOKING! NO PARKING!

In the Russian language this types of command is expressed by the bare infinitive with the help of participle II i.e (страдательное причастие прошедшего времени): НЕ КУРИТЬ! ПАРКОВКА ЗАПРЕЩЕНА!

Just a few languages of the world have a special verbal form for the interrogative mood. Most languages have a dedicated set of imperative forms. But others do not. Another verbal category is then 'coopted' to express an imperative. A command and a non-command meaning of the same form will be distinguished by context, and by prosodic and other clues (intonation, or an eye-gaze).

A declarative verb marked for imperfective aspect is a conventional way of expressing commands in the absence of dedicated command forms in Athabaskan languages.

The two meanings can presumably be differentiated by intonation. This usage reminds us of a cross-linguistic tendency to use declarative clauses as an option for directive speech acts. In many languages, including English, saying *You are going home now* can be understood as a stern command. In English, a language with a specialised imperative, this directive use of a non-directive verb form is part of a plethora of command strategies (see §7). A primarily non-directive form can be employed as a conventionalised command; this is atypical path for the development of dedicated imperatives.

A language may have a dedicated imperative form just for second person singular. A second person plural imperative is 'coopted' from another set of verbal forms. In Supyire, a Gur language from Mali (Carlson 1994: 520-6), the dedicated imperative which consists of requests. In languages lacking a special set of imperative-only forms, commands can also be expressed with present tense forms or forms unmarked for tense; future forms, forms of various modalities or with irrealis.

Conclusion

In the conclusion of my work, I would like to say some words according the done investigation. The main research was written in the main part of my course paper. So here I'll give content of it with the description of question discussed in each paragraph.

The main part of my work consists of following items:

- **«The Category of Mood»** Here I gave the definition to the term MOOD, described views of well-known linguists on this problem (number of moods in modern English)

- **«The Indicative Mood»**

«The Imperative Mood» In these three paragraphs I determined three types of mood of English verb, which are accepted by all linguists, also I described when these moods can be used and how can be translated into Russian (examples are given in the text).

Standing on such ground I will add that investigation in the questions dealt with English verbs and their category of mood is not finished yet, so we will continue it while writing our qualification work.

I hope that my course paper will arise the sincere interest of students and teachers to the problem of adjectives in contemporary English.

Bibliography

1. B. Ilyish, The Structure of Modern English.
 2. V.N. Zhigadlo, I.P. Ivanova, L.L. Iofik» Modern English language» (Theoretical course grammar) Moscow, 1956 y.
 3. Gordon E.M. The Use of adjectives in modern English.
 4. М.М. Галииская. «Иностранные языки в высшей школе», вып. 3, М., 1964.
 5. Г.Н. Воронцова. Очерки по грамматике английского языка. М., 1960
 6. O. Jespersen. Essentials of English Grammar. N.Y., 1938
 7. Иванова И.П., Бурлакова В.В., Почепцов Г.Г. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. – М., 1981. – 285 с.
 8. Ch. Barber. Linguistic change in Present-Day English. Edinburgh, 1964
 9. The Structure of American English. New York, 1958.
 10. World Book Encyclopedia Vol.1 NY. 1993 pp.298–299
 11. Internet <http://madrasati2010.bravehost.com/adj.htm>
 12. Internet <http://www.vestnik.vsu.ru>
 13. Internet:<http://www.englishclub.com/grammar/verbs/theory.htm>
 14. Inbternet:http://www.englishlanguage.ru/main/verbs_mood.htm
 - 15.
-