И. М. Подгайская, А. Г. Удинская, В. А. Дроздов

Основы теории английского языка

Modern English Studies: Theoretical Grammar, Lexicology, Stylistics

Учебное пособие

для студентов направлений подготовки
45.03.02 Лингвистика, 45.04.01 Филология
специальности 45.05.01 «Перевод и переводоведение»,
слушателей дополнительной профессиональной программы
профессиональной переподготовки «Перевод в сфере
общекультурной коммуникации (английский язык)»

Донецк 2019

О753
Основы теории английского языка = Modern English Studies: Theoretical Grammar, Lexicology, Stylistics: учебное пособие / И. М. Подгайская, А. Г. Удинская, В. А. Дроздов – Донецк: ДонНУ, 2019. – 123 с.

Рецензенты:

Никульшина Т. Н., доктор филологических наук, доцент, заведующая кафедрой «Иностранные языки» Автомобильно-дорожного института ГОУ ВПО «Донецкий национальный технический университет»
Педерсен А. А., кандидат филологических наук, доцент, заведующий кафедрой филологии ГОУ ВПО «Донбасская аграрная академия»

Учебное пособие направлено на ознакомление студентов с основными тенденциями развития английского языка на лексическом, грамматическом и стилистическом уровнях. Рекомендуется для студентов факультетов иностранных языков, изучающих английский язык как первый и как второй иностранный.

ПРЕДИСЛОВИЕ

Цель учебного пособия «Основы теории английского языка» состоит в повышении профессиональной компетентности студентов путем ознакомления их с основами теории английского языка. В пособии рассматриваются основные проблемы трёх разделов языкознания – теоретической грамматики, лексикологии и стилистики. Овладение материалом учебного пособия способствует расширению профессионального лингвистического кругозора студентов, необходимого для осуществления переводческой деятельности и подготовки выпускной квалификационной работы, а также обеспечивает их достаточным минимумом англоязычной специальной лексики.

Учебное пособие может использоваться для самостоятельной работы студентов в процессе подготовки к практическим занятиям, модульному контролю, зачёту или экзамену.

Пособие состоит из трёх разделов, посвященных основным вопросам теоретической грамматики, лексикологии и стилистики соответственно. Каждый из разделов включает изложение изучаемого материала, вопросы для самоконтроля и список использованной литературы.

В круг рассматриваемых вопросов теоретической грамматики входят особенности морфологической структуры английского слова, принципы классификации частей речи, понятия грамматического значения, грамматической формы и грамматической категории, семантические и грамматические характеристики английского глагола.

Среди проблем лексикологии рассматриваются особенности лексического значения слова, проблема полисемии, специфика словообразования в английском языке, этимологические основы и региональная вариативность словарного состава английского языка.

В рамках стилистики основное внимание уделяется стилистическому потенциалу английского языка, который реализуется в многочисленных лексических стилистических приёмах и морфологических экспрессивных средствах.

Учебное пособие рекомендуется для студентов направлений подготовки 45.03.02 Лингвистика, 45.04.01 Филология, специальности 45.05.01 «Перевод и переводоведение», изучающих английский язык как первый и как второй иностранный, а также для слушателей дополнительной профессиональной программы профессиональной переподготовки «Перевод в сфере общекультурной коммуникации (английский язык)».

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

1. THEORETICAL GRAMMAR

1.1. HISTORY OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR

Traditionally the history of English grammar is divided into the age of prescientific grammar and the age of scientific grammar.

1. The age of prescientific grammar (the end of the 16th century – 1900) is associated with:

– **early descriptive grammar** (describes language phenomena);

– **prescriptive grammar** (states strict rules of grammatical usage).

2. The age of scientific grammar dealing with scientific explanation of the grammar phenomena (the end of 19th century) is represented by:

– **prescriptive** and **explanatory** grammars (the appearance of H. Sweet's book in 1940's);

– **structural grammar** (gives a formalized description of language system as it exists without being concerned with questions of correct and incorrect usage);

– **transformational grammar** (shows how different sentences are derived from a few kernel sentences);

– **communicatively orientated grammar** (studies the theme-rheme integration in a sentence);

– **semantically orientated grammar** (concentrates on the semantic structure of sentences);

– **pragmatically orientated grammar** (focuses on the functional side of language units);

– **textual grammar** (studies the dependence of the text type on the type of sentence making it up and also explores the text as a whole and try to discover the lower units which constitute the given text).

There are three chief methods of explaining language phenomena:

• **historical grammar** (explains the phenomena of language by studying their history).

• **comparative grammar** (compares the grammatical phenomena with those of cognate languages);

- **general grammar** (is concerned with general principles which underlie the grammatical phenomena of all languages).

1.2. THE WORD AND ITS MORPHEMIC STRUCTURE

Morphology as a part of grammar deals with morphemic structure of words and their classes or parts of speech. The word is the largest unit of morphology. According to A. Smirnitsky, the **morpheme** is the smallest linear language unit possessing the most essential properties of a language unit, viz.: an outer form and some inner content or meaning. The notion of the morpheme includes **the root** of the word and its **affixes**: prefixes, suffixes and inflexions.

Morphemes may be classified according to the two main principles:

1. In accordance with the mode of their functioning morphemes may be free and bound.

Free morphemes are also called **word-morphemes**, they may function as separate words. The auxiliary verbs, modal and link-verbs and postpositives (*up*, *out*, *of*) are free morphemes or word-morphemes.

Bound morphemes include inflexions and all the word-building morphemes including inner inflexions and zero morphemes.

The inner inflexion is a vowel or a consonant change within a word to signal a grammatical meaning, e.g. a vowel change in the opposition *foot* [fu:t] vs *feet* [fi:t] is an inner inflexion to signal the plural number.

The zero morpheme or the meaningful absence of the inflexion in the word form *boy*, is a zero signal of singular number, common case.

2. In accordance with their meaning, morphemes may be classified into lexical, lexical-grammatical and purely grammatical morphemes.

Lexical morphemes (= root morphemes). These are roots of notional words. They coincide in form with underived words, e.g.: *boy, nice, go*.

Lexical-grammatical morphemes are derivational affixes. They may be free and bound. Derivational suffixes and prefixes are bound morphemes as they cannot be used separately from the root of the word. Modal verbs, link-verbs, postpositives (*up*, *of* and *out*) are free

morphemes. Lexical-grammatical morphemes may change the part of speech (*to teach – teacher*). They possess lexical meaning though it is a much less concrete than the lexical meaning of purely lexical morphemes, e.g. the lexical meaning of the prefix *re-* is 'to do something anew' (*to write – to rewrite*).

Grammatical morphemes are auxiliary verbs and inflexions. They may also be free and bound. Auxiliary verbs are usually free grammatical morphemes, while inflexions are the bound ones.

Bound grammatical morphemes are deprived of any lexical meaning of their own, they express only grammatical meaning (of tense, case, voice) and thus express some morphological categories. E.g.: the grammatical morpheme *-s* in the verb represents the grammatical categories of number and person.

Inner morphemes are also referred to bound grammatical morphemes. If the existence of the zero-morpheme is admitted, it will be one more bound grammatical morpheme. Zero-morphemes are suprasegmental morphemes just like word-stress is a suprasegmental word-building morpheme: e.g.: *to export* (v) – *export* (n). According to prof. M. Blokh, discontinuous grammatical morphemes of the kind: (*has … en*) may be called semi-bound morphemes.

There are also morphs and allomorphs. In speech **morphs** exist in the form of **allomorphs**. According to prof. L. Barkhudarov, a statistically predominant variant of a morpheme should be called a morph, (e.g. *-ed* and *-d* are two allomorphs of the same grammatical morpheme but the allomorph *-ed* is statistically predominant variant of the morpheme (i.e. a morph).

There are synthetic and analytical grammatical forms. **Synthetic forms** are such word-forms in which the lexical and grammatical morphemes are synthesized in one word, e.g. *boy-s*. **Analytical forms** of the word are those which consist of a root morpheme and one or more grammatical word-morphemes, e.g.: *we shall go*.

There are also **suppletive grammatical forms**, i.e. forms built of different roots, e.g.: *go – went*.

Some forms are homonymic: the grammatical morpheme *-s* may express the grammatical meaning of the plural number (of nouns), or the meaning of the third person, singular (for verbs).

Some morphemes are **polysemantic**: they express several grammatical meanings at a time, e.g.: the inflexion *-s* in the word-form *he read-s* signals to meanings of a) singularity; b) third person; c) common aspect; d) indicative mood; e) non-perfect.

1.3. PRINCIPLES OF CLASSIFICATION OF WORDS INTO PARTS OF SPEECH

The words of a language, depending upon various 1) semantic, 2) formal and 3) functional (on the level of sentence and word-combination) criteria are divided into grammatical classes (sets) traditionally called **parts of speech**.

Grammatical combinability of words in word-combinations is also considered.

1. **The criterion of meaning** (= semantic criterion) presupposes the evaluation of the general implicit lexical-grammatical meaning (i.e. the meaning of 'thingness, substance' for nouns, that of 'action, process' for verbs) which is characteristic of all the words constituting a given part of speech.

2. **The criterion of form** presupposes some specific inflexional and word-building (= derivational) features of the words constituting a given part of speech. E.g. we can identify the noun by its derivational suffixes (*-hood*, *-dom*).

3. **The functional criterion** concerns the syntactic role of words in the sentence typical of this or that part of speech. E.g. the function of the noun is the function of subject or object.

4. **Grammatical combinability**: e.g. the noun is characterised by its left-hand and right-hand combinability with verbs.

In accord with the above criteria the English words are classified into notional and functional ones (on the upper level of classification). On the lower level of classification words are classified into the noun, the adjective, the verb, the preposition, the conjunction etc.

It is known that the distribution of words between parts of speech may differ with different authors, depending upon what criterion they take as the main guide. Thus, Henry Sweet, the author of the first scientific grammar of English, suggested the classification based only on the formal criterion. He classified English words into the **declinables** (words capable of receiving word-changing inflexion: the

noun, the verb, the adjective, some pronouns) and the **indeclinables** (the preposition, the conjunction, the adverb, the interjection).

H. Sweet's classification is imperfect: he united essentially different words into one class. Thus, the adverbs (included into the indeclinables) may be used in the function of a part of a sentence, while the conjunction cannot.

The modern linguistics has worked out another principle of word-class identification based on the syntactic principle only. This characterisation is more important and universal because it shows the distribution of words between parts of speech (sets) in accord with their functional destination.

The principles of syntactic (syntactical-distributional) classification of English words were worked out by L. Bloomfield and his followers Z. Harris and especially Ch. Friez who classified words on the study of their combinability by means of substitution testing. As a result 4 main "positions" of notional words in English sentences were singled out: the position of the noun, those of the verb, the adjective, the adverb. Words, standing outside the position in the sentence are function words which are subdivided by him into 15 groups totaling 154 words.

But Ch. Freiz's classification is very cumbersome and has some serious drawbacks. There are also the classifications of G. Trager and H. Smith, O. Jespersen, H. Gleason, J. Sledd, W. Francis, Ch. Hockett.

Thus, only if we apply several principles of classification at a time we may achieve more or less reliable results.

M. Steblin-Kamensky once aptly put it: "Distributing words in accordance with parts of speech, we do nearly the same, when summing up what we know about the people surrounding us, we would say that among them there are blond (fair-haired) people, mathematicians, professors but there are also clever people".

Not all words of a language may be squeezed into the Procrustean bed of classification. E.g. response words *yes, no*, the word *please* are out of the present day classification into the parts of speech.

1.4. GRAMMATICAL MEANING, GRAMMATICAL FORM, GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY

Grammatical meaning is closely interwoven with lexical meaning. Tradition says that the difference between grammatical and lexical meaning lies in the degree of the inherent abstraction. Lexical meaning is considered to be concrete, grammatical meaning – abstract [H. Sweet].

There no gainsaying the fact that grammatical meaning is usually more abstract than lexical, for it concerns itself not with concrete meanings of separate words, but with meanings characteristic of whole classes of words, e.g. the grammatical meaning of number is characteristic of nouns, the grammatical meaning of aspect is characteristic of verbs, etc.

In the opinion of M. Steblin-Kamensky, however, it is not a higher degree of abstraction that differentiates grammatical meaning from lexical meaning, for lexical meaning also represents a generalized reflection of reality. Some lexical meanings, according to M. Steblin-Kamensky, are even more general than grammatical meanings. Compare the lexical meaning of the word *time* and the grammatical meanings of verbal tenses (Present, Past, or Future).

What is more, the same meanings (e.g. the meanings of 'definiteness -indefiniteness') can be represented differently in different languages. In English, they are grammatical (articles serve the purpose of their realization). In Russian, they are lexical because in Russian there are no constant grammatical means to express the meanings of 'definiteness-indefiniteness'.

Other linguists (e.g. V. Nikitevich) hold that the difference between grammatical and lexical meanings lies in their content. Lexical meaning is naming, grammatical meaning is relational: it expresses the relations between words in sentences.

Grammatical meaning is really opposed to lexical meaning as relational to naming. But if one follows M. Steblin-Kamensky and goes deeper into it, he will see that grammatical meaning does not always express relations in the proper sense of the word. Let us take the grammatical meaning of number in nouns. It does not realize any

relations; it only actualizes a certain property common to things, namely plurality.

According to another current conception, the difference between grammatical and lexical meanings lies in the form of their expression: lexical meaning is rendered by words and word combinations, grammatical meaning – by forms of words, stress, word order, etc.

But there exist words that convey purely grammatical meanings, e. g. auxiliary verbs, articles, and other function words.

In view of the fact that language is an immediate actuality of thought, M. Steblin-Kamensky suggests that grammatical and lexical meanings should be differentiated with regard to thought. Lexical meanings form the basis of thought; hence, they are independent. Grammatical meanings organize thought; hence, they are dependent on the lexical meanings they accompany.

Since grammatical meanings only help organize thought, the question arises whether they reflect any regulations of extra linguistic reality. The majority of linguists think that grammatical meanings are heterogeneous in this respect. The first classification of grammatical meanings goes back to A. Shakhmatov who singled out three types of grammatical meanings.

First, grammatical meanings are based on the phenomena of extra linguistic reality, e.g. the meaning of number in nouns that reflects the existing distinctions between one and more than one.

Second, grammatical meanings are based on the subjective attitude of the speaker to the phenomena of extra linguistic reality, e,g. the meaning of mood in verbs. The indicative mood presents the action as real; the imperative and the conjunctive – as something desired, probable, or problematic.

Third, grammatical meanings are predetermined linguistically, e.g. the singular or plural form of the demonstrative pronouns *this* and *that* depends on the singular or plural form of the following nouns. Cf.:

this house – these houses (R. Murphy),
this room – these rooms (R. Murphy).

The classification will only profit if every stage of analysis is based on one principle. At the first stage, we classify grammatical meanings in accordance with the presence or absence of extra linguistic basis into those that reflect extralinguistic reality and those that have nothing to

do with extralinguistic reality. At the second stage, grammatical meanings that reflect extralinguistic reality are further subdivided in accordance with the presence or absence of subjective evaluation of the speaker into subjective- objective and objective.

Each part of speech has a specific set of grammatical meanings. The English noun, for instance, has the grammatical meanings of number and case, the adjective – the grammatical meanings of degrees of comparison.

However, in view of the fact that parts of speech possess the structure of a field, with a compact core and a diffuse periphery, the grammatical meanings characteristic of a certain part of speech are not obligatory to be found in all the words of the given par of speech. They are always common to the words forming the centre of this or that part of speech, i.e. the words that possess the lexical-grammatical meaning of the part of speech in question. Thus, the grammatical meaning of number is characteristic only of countable nouns that denote things in the proper sense of the word. Uncountable nouns, which have the grammatical meaning of "thingness", lack the grammatical meaning of number.

Grammatical meaning is always realized in this or that form.

The logicians identify **grammatical form** with sound form. A. Potebnya has proved that sound changes do not always bring about changes in grammatical meaning, e.g.: *купи сахара / сахару*. The sound forms are different (а, у); the inherent grammatical meaning is the same. It is the meaning of the accusative case.

Neither can we identify grammatical forms with form-building components as N. Nekrasov does. The main drawback of this conception is that outwardly dissimilar forms can render identical grammatical meanings, and vice versa: different grammatical meanings can find expression in similar forms, Cf.:

Who did they arrest? – Whom did they arrest? (M. Swan).

Its me. – It's I. (M. Swan).

He drinks like a fish. – Have you any soft drinks? (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English).

Besides, if we looked upon grammatical form as a form-building component, we would be bound to recognize the existence of formless words and even of formless languages. This conclusion is quite

naturally drawn by F. Fortunatov. It is theoretically wrong. Form represents inner organization of content. It follows from it that there are no formless grammatical meanings.

It goes without saying that grammatical forms are heterogeneous. They comprise form-building component, auxiliary elements, word order, intonation, and many other means.

In other words, **the grammatical form** is the sum total of all the formal means constantly employed to render this or that grammatical meaning. K. Pike and A. Bondarko qualify the sum total of grammatical meanings used to convey a certain grammatical meaning as a **grammeme**. For instance, the present tense grammeme comprises the zero exponent for the first and second persons singular and plural and the third person plural and the inflection *-(e)s* for the third person singular. (A zero exponent represents meaningful absence of any outward sign which serves the purpose of rendering some grammatical meaning when opposed to forms with positive inflections). The past tense grammeme comprises the inflection *-(e)d* for regular verbs and vowel change, consonant change, etc. for irregular verbs. The future tense grammeme comprises the analytical combination of the infinitive with the auxiliary verb *will*.

Homogeneous grammemes, i.e. grammemes possessing a common generalized grammatical meaning, build up a grammatical category. Thus, the generalized grammatical meaning of tense, lying at the basis of the present, past, and future tense grammemes, generates the grammatical category of tense.

According to A. Bondarko, the notions "grammatical form', "grammeme" and "grammatical category" build up a three-level hierarchy. The grammatical form constitutes the lowest ladder on the rank scale, then comes the grammeme as a unity of homogeneous grammatical forms, then – the grammatical category as a unity of homogeneous grammemes.

A. Smirniitsky points out the following **characteristics of the grammatical form**.

First, it never characterizes the word as a whole. Otherwise, we would have to speak not of grammatical, but of lexical-grammatical categories. Take, for instance, the category of gender in Russian, where nouns do not change in accordance with the existing genders but as

whole units refer to this or that concrete gender. Cf.:

стол – (zero exponent) – masculine,

девочка – (the inflection -u) – feminine,

окно – (the inflection -o) – neuter.

Second, one and the same form can render the meanings of different grammatical categories, e.g.: *The sun rises in the east* (M. Vince., K. McNicholas), where the inflection *-s* shows that the verb *rise* is in the third person, singular number, present tense, indicative mood, non-continuous aspect, active voice.

Third, but one form cannot combine in itself two meanings of one and the same grammatical category. Thus, no form exists which could simultaneously render the meanings of two cases or two numbers That's why we say that the present perfect is a tense form, but one of the members of a specific grammatical category of phase. If perfect were a tense form, we would have a unity of two tenses in one form (Present and Perfect in Present perfect, Past and Perfect in Past Perfect, Future and Perfect in Future Perfect), which is clearly out of the question.

Fourth, there are no isolated grammatical forms. Each grammatical form makes part of this or that grammatical category.

Grammatical categories are singled out on the following conditions.

1. When the generalized grammatical meaning is to be found in this or that modification in all the constituents. Thus, the opposition of the singular and the plural numbers (*a pen – pens*) lies at the basis of the grammatical category of number because both forms comprise numerical characteristics: oneness – in the singular, more than oneness – in the plural.

In the case of *to see* (Infinitive) – *seeing* (Participle I) – *seen* (Participle II), we also deal with forms of one word. Nevertheless, they cannot be regarded as constituting a specific grammatical category since they do not possess any grammatical meaning characteristic of all the three members.

2. When the generalized grammatical meaning has constant grammatical forms of its expression. For instance, we speak about the grammatical category of aspect in verbs because its generalized grammatical meaning of showing the way in which the action develops

is usually expressed in two ways: continuous and non-continuous forms, e.g.: *Where are the children? – They are playing football. They always play football after school* (V. Evans).

3. When there are at least two constant grammatical forms of expressing the grammatical meaning in question. Isolated grammatical forms do not constitute grammatical categories because the grammatical category is the general in the particular. Prof. A. Smirnitsky writes apropos of this, «No language can be found with one grammatical person or one case. One person or one case is nothing but the absence of the grammatical category of person and case in the language. Every grammatical category must be represented by at least two forms».

In other words, grammatical categories represent systems of grammemes with homogeneous generalized grammatical meaning.

A. Bondarko regards the grammatical category not only as a system but also as a property, a property of a certain part of speech. For instance, the grammatical category of number is a property of the noun; the grammatical category of tense is a property of the verb, etc.

1.5. SEMANTIC AND GRAMMATICAL PECULIARITIES OF THE ENGLISH VERB

The category of Aspect

Aspect is a verbal grammatical category showing the way in which the action develops. The majority of linguists speak of two aspects: continuous and non-continuous.

There are two sets of forms in the modern English verb which are contrasted with each other on the principle of use or non-use of the pattern "be + Participle I": *writes – is writing; has written – has been writing; will write – will be writing, wrote – was writing.*

These two sets of forms clearly belong to the same verb *write.* What is the basic difference between *writes* and *is writing*? The definition of the meaning of *is writing* given in different grammar books, is that it denotes an action proceeding continuously at a definite period of time, within certain time limits.

On the other hand, *writes* denotes an action not thus limited, but either occurring or everlasting, without any notion of lasting duration at a given moment.

The basic difference between the two sets of forms appears to be this: an action going on continuously during a giving period of time, and an action not thus limited and not described by the very form of the verb as proceeding in such a manner.

How should this essential difference in meaning between the two sets of forms be described? It is a difference in the way the action is shown to develop.

This is the grammatical notion described as the category of aspect with reference to the Slavonic languages and to Old Greek in which the category is clearly expressed.

As is well known not all verbs are commonly used in the form of "*be* + Participle I". Verbs denoting a) abstract relations (e.g. *belong*), b) sense perception or c) emotion (e.g. *see*, *hear*, *hope*, *love*, *like*, *fear*) seldom appear in this form.

But examples are there: *It was as if she were seeing herself in the first time.* What is meant here is a sense perception (*were seeing*) going on (involuntarily) for some time. It is not a momentaneous action. The form "*be* + Participle I" is very appropriate here.

Some more examples.

1) *Both were visibly hearing every word of the conversation and ignoring it at the same time.* Let's replace indefinite forms in the following variant: *Both visibly heard every word of the conversation and ignored it at the same time.* The descriptive character of the original text has disappeared after the substitution.

2) *Mr. March was looking absent and sober again.* A temporary state of things is meant.

The two aspects dwelt above may be described by the terms **common aspect** and **continuous aspect**.

Different interpretations.

1. O. Jespersen treated the type *is writing* as a means of expressing **limited duration**.

2. A similar view by prof. N. Irtenyeva, who thinks that the basic meaning of the type *is writing* is that of a **simultaneity of an action with another action**. These views are plausible for some cases for a

complex clause when *is writing* in the subordinate clause and *writes* in the main clause. This can only be found when the narration refers to the past time e.g.: *Once she <u>was</u> in the car and Andrew <u>was behind</u> her, her sense of freedom <u>left</u> her.*

But the view propounded by these authors does not "fit" in with the use of the present *is writing* which is never used in a complex sentence of that structure. In sentences with the present tenses like: *What is he doing? He is writing* there is no other action with which *is writing* could be simultaneous or to which it could be a time frame. Prof. N. Irtenyeva says that in such a case the action expressed by the *is writing* type is **simultaneous with the act of speech**.

But the act of speech is not mentioned in the speech. Besides, simultaneity with the act of speech is the definition of the present tense and not of the type *is writing* as such. Thus this view which does not take into account the category of aspect does not appear to be convincing.

3. Prof. I. Ivanova recognizes the existence of the category of aspect in English, but treats it in the peculiar way. According to prof. I. Ivanova, the form *is writing* is an aspect form of the continuous aspect but *writes* is not an aspect form at all. She calls it **a purely tense form**.

Concerning this view it must be said that it agrees with the view put forward above: The distinction between *writes* and *is writing* is a distinction of aspect. But prof. I. Ivanova denies the existence of common aspect. This seems rather a difference of wording than of essence. No aspect seems something like another version of common aspect (=an unmarked member of the opposition).

The difficulty of formulating the meaning of the common aspect is one more case of distinction between a marked and non-marked member of an opposition.

The continuous aspect is marked both in meaning and in form (be + Participle I), whereas the common aspect is non-marked both in meaning and in form. Thus the theory of common and continuous aspect may be upheld.

4. V. Arakin completely denies the existence of the category of aspect in English.

The category of Tense

The category of tense may be defined as a verbal category which reflects the objective category of time and expresses on this background the relations between time of the action and the time of the utterance.

The main divisions of the objective time are three: past, present and future. However tense systems of different languages are far from identical.

The diapason of grammatical meanings – differentiating meanings of time within the category of tense, i.e. the number of tenses is great: from 16 to two.

Sixteen tenses. Attribution of different meanings to all 16 tense forms is a stage left in history a long time ago from which only names of these verb forms have survived. At present they represent tenses as an 8-, 7-, 6-, 4-, 3- and 2-tense system.

Eight-tenses system was propounded by I. Ivanova. The idea of **temporal centre** lies in the basis of her tenses system model. By the temporal centre she understands the moment of the Past and Future tense forms. The introduction of the concept of a temporal centre brought about the idea of the system which includes independent and dependent elements. **Independent elements** are represented by all the Present tenses, because all of them are correlated with the moment of speech, the Future and the Past Indefinite forms which are also directly connected with the moment of speech.

But the Past Indefinite is at the same time **a dependent member**. It becomes dependent when it is used as a dependent past in the rules of the Sequence of tenses. All the rest of the tense forms are dependent forms because they are correlated with only their temporal centres.

Thus, the dependent Past forms include: the Past Continuous, Past Perfect, Past Perfect Continuous, all the Future-in-the-Past forms because their centre lies in the past.

Dependent Future forms include: the Future Continuous, Future Perfect, Future Perfect Continuous forms directly related with the temporal centre of the future.

The introduction of the idea of the "temporal centre" made it possible to represent the category of tenses as an 8-tense system.

At the same time according to B. Ilyish, in the 8-tense system produced by prof. I. Ivanova, the Future-Indefinite-in-the-Past, the Future-Continuous-in-the-Past, the Future-Perfect-in-the-Past, the Future-Perfect-Continuous-in-the-Past do not easily fit into the system of tenses represented by a straight line running out of the past into the future. With references to these tenses it may be said that the past is a new centre of the system. The idea of temporal centres propounded by prof. I. Ivanova as an essential element of the English tense system seems fully justified in analysing the Future-in-the-Past tenses.

However, Ivanova's category of tense model is also vulnerable in the way that the principle of introducing temporal centres has not been brought to the logical end. This principle being properly applied, it would be required to introduce one more temporal centre – the temporal centre Future-in-the-Past (or that of depend Future). The point is that the actions expressed by the Future-Continuous-in-the-Past, Future-Perfect-in-the-Past, the Future-Perfect-Continuous-in-the-Past forms are as a matter of fact, directly connected with a special temporal centre, and only though the medium of it they are connected with the temporal centre of the past, which is directly connected with the moment of speech.

In this way this model includes not one but two degrees of dependence.

Seven-tenses system. According to prof. N. Irtenyeva the system of English tenses is divided into 2 halves: that of tenses centering in the present, and that of tenses centering in the past.

Tenses centring in the present	Tenses centring in the past
The Present Indefinite	The Past Indefinite
The Present Perfect	The Past Perfect
The Present Continuous	The Future-in-the-Past
The Present Perfect Continuous	The Past Continuous
The Future	The Past Perfect Continuous

The right-hand half is characterized by specific features: a) the root vowels (e.g. *sang* vs *sing*); b) the suffix *-d* (or *-t*) (e.g. *looked, had sang, would sing*).

The view has much to recommend it. It has the advantage of reducing the usual threefold division of tenses (past, present and future) to a twofold division (past and present). However the cancellation of the Future as a tense in its own right (по праву) would seem to require a more detailed justification.

Six-tenses system. A. Korsakov propounded a 6-tense system. He establishes a system of absolute and anterior tenses (=are what we call tenses of perfect correlation), and of static and dynamic tenses (=are what we call tenses of the continuous aspect).

Tenses here represent a linear system, the components of which reflect not only 3 natural phases of time (past, present and future). Besides these meanings they convey also the so-called before-present, before-past and before-future. This model does not give room to the Future-in-the-Past.

The evaluation of this system in its relation to other views provided by E. U and N. KorUbina et alia is as follows: from the theoretical point of view this model is of no interest because it ignores the facts of language directly connected with the problem under consideration but which do not go in the Procrustean bed of the model, they are forcefully fitted or adapted to produce conformity.

Three-tenses system. A 3-tenses system (Present, Past and Future) was worked out by A. Smirnitski. He considered that Future-in-the-Past forms are conditional mood forms and not tense forms. According to A. Smirnitski, in their meaning we can see a certain similarity which provides grounds for identifying their categorical appurtenance. From the purely formal point of view Future-in-the-Past forms are absolutely identical with the Conditional mood forms. In this case the arguments put forward by A. Smirnitski are unconvincing and weak.

B. Ilyish most likely regarded the system of English tenses as a 3-tenses system. His attitude to the Future-in-the-Past is not clear. Whether it is included into this system or it is left out beyond the system but is connected with it as a part of a more general system was left unanswered.

Two-tenses system. In 1924 some doubts were expressed about the existence of a Future tense in English because it is expressed by the phrase "*shall / will* + Infinitive". According to O. Jespersen *shall* and

will preserve some of their original modal meanings (*shall* – an element of obligation and *will* – an element of volition). Thus, according to O. Jespersen, English has no way of expressing pure futurity.

Attempts to represent the English system of tenses as a strictly dichotomous one are characteristic of L. Barkhudarov who denied the existence of a Future tense and Future-in-the-Past tense in English either, and V.F. Mauler.

L. Barkhudarov gives the following arguments of "*shall* / *will* + Infinitive" being modal and not an analytical form:

1. Combination "*shall* / *will* + Infinitive" formally does not differ from "*can* + Infinitive", "*may* + Infinitive". It is impossible to single out a grammatical form, relying only on the meaning, if this meaning does not have a special form of expression. But according to their meaning "*shall* / *will* + Infinitive" cannot be separated from other modal constructions. Verbs *shall* / *will* always retain modal meanings.

2. The meaning of the Future tense is not always expressed by "*shall* / *will* + Infinitive". There are many different ways of expressing futurity:

The train is leaving in 5 minutes.

I am going to help you.

I can do it tomorrow.

In this way "*shall* / *will* + Infinitive" are different from Perfect or Continuous forms which are the only way of expressing the corresponding meanings.

3. Combinations "*shall* / *will* + Infinitive" do not fit the above definition of analytical forms based on discontinuous morphemes.

4. A strong argument against "*shall* / *will* + Infinitive" being analytical forms is the existence of Future-in-the-Past (= *should* / *would* + Infinitive). One and the same form cannot belong to two simultaneously (future and past).

V. Mauler (L. Barkhudarov's post-graduate student) in his doctoral, basing on 40 000 strong sampling for "*shall* / *will* + Infinitive" showed that only in 5% of *shall* usage, *shall* realized its temporal meaning of futurity while in 95% cases it was modal.

So in English there is no categorical form of the Future.

The category of Perfect

Among the various views on the essence of the Perfect forms in Modern English the following three main trends should be mentioned:

1. The category of Perfect is a peculiar tense category like present or past (O. Jespersen).

2. It is peculiar aspect category (G. Vorontsova). She described it as retrospective, resultative and successive.

3. It is neither tense, nor aspect, but a specific category different from both (A. Smirnitsky). It is the category of time correlation.

In Modern English there are forms of Present Perfect, Past Perfect and Future Perfect.

To answer the question whether the Perfect can be a **tense category**, we must consider its relation to the Past, Present and Future as firmly established tense categories. This relation is as follows:

a) if the Perfect were a tense category, the Present Perfect would be a union of two different tenses – the Present and the Perfect;

b) the Past Perfect would be likewise a union of two different tenses – the Past and the Perfect;

c) the Future Perfect would be likewise a union of two different tenses – the Future and the Perfect.

If a form belongs to a tense category (say, the Present), it cannot simultaneously belong to another tense category since two categories in one form collide and destroy each other. So, the view that the Perfect is a special tense category has been disproved.

To find out whether the Perfect can be an **aspect category** we must consider its relations to the aspects already established: the Common and the Continuous aspects.

We can only recollect that in Modern English there are such pairs as:

is writing – has been writing	Present Continuous – Present Perfect Continuous
was writing – had been writing	Past Continuous – Past Perfect Continuous
will be writing – will have been writing	Future Continuous – Future Perfect Continuous

All these forms belong to the Continuous aspect, so the difference between them cannot be based on any aspect category. They cannot be said to differ on an aspect line. Otherwise they would at the same time belong to one aspect and to different aspects.

Hence the conclusion is unavoidable that the Perfect is not an aspect.

So, the Perfect then is bound to be some **special grammatical category** different from both tense and from aspect. This view was formulated by A. Smirnitsky in a posthumous article «Перфект и категория временной отнесенности». Prof. A. Smirnitsky calls this new category as **the category of time correlation**. The opposition in such pairs is as follows:

writes – has written	*is writing – has been writing*
wrote – had written	*was writing – had been writing*
will write – will have written	*will be writing – will have been writing*

Prof. A.I. Smirnitsky proposed to use terms non-Perfect – Perfect. But the definition of the meaning of the category presents some difficulty. Its essence appears to be precedence: an action expressed by a Perfect form precedes some moment in time.

The opposition between Perfect – non-Perfect forms is shown to be that between marked and unmarked item. The Perfect forms marked both in meaning (denoting precedence) and in morphological characteristics (“*have* + Participle II”). The non-Perfect forms unmarked both in meaning (precedence is not limited) and in morphological characteristics (the collocation “*have* + Participle II” is not used).

If this view is taken, the system of the verbal categories is illustrated by the forms:

– Present: *writes, is writing, has written, has been writing*
– Past: *wrote, was writing, has written, has been writing*
– Future: *will write, will be writing, will have written, will have been writing*

and is based on 3 groups of notions, viz.:

– tense (Present – Past – Future): *writes, wrote, will write*
– aspect (Common – Continuous): *writes, is writing*
– correlation (non-Perfect – Perfect): *wrote, had written.*

The aspect and correlation are double or dichotomic opposition, while the tense opposition is triple or trichotomic.

Secondly, 2 oppositions may occur together:

a) in *writes – was writing* there are tense and aspect simultaneously;

b) between *wrote – will have written* there are simultaneously the opposition of tense and correlation;

c) between *wrote – had been writing* there are simultaneously the opposition of aspect and correlation;

d) all three oppositions may occur simultaneously: between *writes – has been writing* there are simultaneously the opposition of tense, aspect and correlation.

It stands to reason, one opposition can be shown in a line, two oppositions can be represented on a plane, three oppositions can be represented in the shape of a 3-dimentional solid – a parallelepiped.

The category of Voice

There are 2 main definitions of the voice.

1. The category of voice expresses the relation between the subject and the action (I. Ivanova).

2. The category of voice expresses the relation between the subject and the object n the one hand, and the process on the other hand (M. Blokh).

The category of voice in Modern English is based on a binary opposition between active and passive. This has never been disputed by anybody. But views may differ concerning other voices. This opposition may be illustrated by a number of parallel forms, involving different categories of aspect, tense, correlation and mood, e.g.:

invite – is invited
is inviting – is being invited
invited – was invited
has invited – has been invited
should invite – should be invited

From the point of view of form, the passive voice is the marked member of the opposition. Its characteristic is the pattern "*be +*

Participle II". The active voice is unmarked. Its characteristic is the absence of that pattern.

The **active voice** signals that the action denoted by the predicate verb is performed by the referent of the grammatical subject of the sentence and passes onto the referent of the grammatical object. In symbolic notation it is: S → O.

The **passive voice** expresses reception of the action by the referent of the grammatical subject. In symbolic notation it is: S ← O.

The problem of voice is connected with that of **intransitive verbs**. In Modern English the passive voice is used much more often than in Russian since not only transitive but many intransitive (prepositional) objective verbs can be used in the passive voice:

They admired her → She was admired by them.
They laughed at him → He was laughed at.

With the verbs capable of taking 2 grammatical objects at a time the speaker can put any of the objects in the position of the subject of the corresponding passive tenses, e.g.:

I gave the book to the boy →   *1) A book was given to the boy.*
                                    2) The boy was given the book.

However, some forms of the active voice find no parallel in the passive voice: viz. the forms of the Future Continuous, Present, Past, Future Perfect Continuous (e.g. *will be inviting, had been inviting, will have been inviting*).

There are some non-passivisable verbs which find no parallel in the passive, e.g.: *cost, belong, resemble.*

In Modern English even an adverbial modifier of place of an active construction sometimes may become the grammatical subject or a passive construction, e.g.:

Nobody lived in the house → The house was not lived in.

Not all grammatical forms of the "*be* + Participle II" pattern may be treated as passive forms. Sometimes they represent the **compound nominal predicate** in the active voice, e.g.

The window was broken at the moment. (Here the Participle II has become an adjective. This is the compound nominal predicate).

The window was broken by a boy. (This is a simple verbal predicate, passive).

In the above examples we observe the phenomenon of **the neutralization of the opposition** (difference) between the morphological form of the passive voice and the syntactical form of the compound nominal predicate with the pure link-verb *to be*. Only a living content can de-neutralize the categorical status of the predicate in such cases, i.e. show whether the predicate is a simple verbal predicate or a compound nominal predicate.

Thus, the context may have both the 'voice-suppressing", "statalizing" effect and "voice-stimulating" or "processualizing" effect. As a rule, action-modifying adverbials, prepositional objects serve as contextual stimulators, also some forms of the predicate-verb itself, viz.: the Future, Continuous, and Perfect forms because they denote actions, not states.

The big problem is the problem of the existence of the so-called **medial voices**, voices other than the active or passive voice. In addition the following 3 voices have been suggested: the reflexive voice, the reciprocal voice and the middle voice.

The **reflexive voice** (*he dressed himself; he found himself in the darkness* – here the subject is at the same time its own object of the action. In symbolic representation – SPO)

The **reciprocal voice** (*we greeted each other*).

If we recognize the forms of the reflexive and reciprocal voice, then we must treat the reflexive and reciprocal pronouns as voice auxiliaries (i.e. as word-morphemes), but they can hardly be treated as voice auxiliaries because they still remain positional parts of the sentence (namely: direct objects, presenting their lexical meanings). So, such forms can hardly constitute new "voices", though they are grammatically relevant.

The same problem concerns the existence / non-existence of the **middle voice** in Modern English (*the door opened* as distinct from *I opened the door*).

The meaning of the verbs in the above examples in not active, since the actions expressed by them do not pass from the subject to an object. On the contrary, these actions are confined to the referents of the grammatical subjects which are at the same time their own objects

of the actions (S = O), i.e. the actions are represented here as if going on their own accord, within themselves.

In this connection B. Ilyish proposed to give a broader definition to the active voice so as to cover by the definition cases like *He sells books; The book sells well.*

He proposed to give a new name to the newly defined voice – **the common voice.** According to B. Ilyish; such a definition would cover under one name all the above cases of active-passive use of the verbal forms.

M. Blokh holds the point of view that the middle voice uses of the above verbs are cases of neutralizing reduction of the voice opposition.

The category of Mood

The category of mood is an explicit verbal category expressing the relation of the action denoted by the predicate to the reality, as stated by the speaker. Presumably, according to A. Smirnitsky, in Modern English there are the Indicative mood (which express an action as a real one or planned as a real), the Imperative mood (which does not express an action but it expresses a request, an order or inducement to do it) and the Oblique moods (which express the hypothetical action, i.e. non-real, desirable, presupposed, contradicting the reality): the Subjunctive I, the Subjunctive II, the Suppositional mood, the Conditional mood.

The Indicative mood expresses an action as a real one or planned as real, it has no special form of expression and it includes the Indefinite, Continuous, Perfect and Perfect Continuous verb forms in all temporal spheres and in two voices. H. Sweet calls it a fact mood. Its modal meaning of reality can be considered as a zero category of modality (according to V. Vinogradov) compared to more specific modal meanings of the Imperative or the Subjunctive mood forms. According to form and meaning, it is a non-marked, weak member of the opposition.

The Imperative mood does not express an action but it expresses a request, order to do it. Therefore, the Imperative mood does not include tense and phase forms. A set phrase *have done with it!* ('Хватит! Перестань! Достаточно!') can hardly be considered as an opposition to the form *do it!*.

Not typical of the Imperative mood are the Continuous forms either. It has no expressed category of person and number though it is usually addressed to the 2nd person.

The Imperative mood is close to the Infinitive in form and meaning. Both do not express an action. The Infinitive names an action, while the Imperative mood calls to the action.

In this connection the number of authors do not single out the Imperative mood. They consider that it does not exist and that the Infinitive is used instead.

This is an erroneous point of view due to the existence of the negative forms of the Imperative mood and the Infinitive, viz.: *don't go – not to go*. The presence of the analytical form *don't go be* makes us include the Imperative mood into the set of other moods.

NB! Specific information makes the Imperative mood close to the Interjection. Compare: *come here!* (the lexical meaning of *come* is retained here – 'подойди!') and *come, now!* (the lexical meaning of movement is lost – 'успокойся, ну хватит, перестань').

A vexed problem is made by forms *let us go* 'пойдемте, давайте пойдем'. In the above form the verb *let* is more devoid of lexical meaning than in *let him go* 'пусть идет', where the verb *let* retains its lexical meaning 'to allow'.

Besides, direct address to those present is more felt in the form *let us go/do it* unlike in *let him go*.

In addition there is a close connection between *let* and *go* in *let us go*. On the other hand, the oblique case of pronounce *us, him* in *let us/him go* testifies to the fact that these are indirect objects to the verb *let*. And this denotes that *let* is not an auxiliary verb and consequently *let us go*, *let him go* are not analytical constructions.

The analysis of the forms *let us / him go* shows that there is a new shade of meaning as compared to the Imperative mood. In *let us go* there is a new shade of meaning – that of 'invitation to the action', while in *let <u>him</u> go* there is a shade of 'permission, non-interference' into the action.

Besides, the form *let me go* does not always have the meaning of the Imperative mood, e.g. *let me do it* can be characterised as offering your services.

All the above helps to understand that combinations of the kind *"let us go"* can hardly be considered as full-fledged analytical forms of the Imperative mood, though they are involved into the sphere of the Imperative mood.

The Subjunctive (and the Oblique) moods. According to I. Krylova, Ye. Gordon in Modern English there are 11 models of Oblique moods. They can be classified into 4 classes:

1. *Should/would* according to persons; *'d* – for all persons.

2. *Would* for all persons (e.g. *I wish you would do it*). The isolation of this system of forms does not take place because in the entire system of the English verb there is a tendency the unification of the auxiliary verb. Here we have specialization in meaning – the form expresses the desirable action in future in relation to another action.

3. *Should* for all persons (e.g. *It's cruel I should make him suffer so! + may /might, can/could*).

4. Synthetic forms *be, did, were* for all persons.

The problem of the number of moods in English is the most controversial problem. There is one point clear: there are at least two moods in English, one of them being the Indicative mood. A lot of opinions are as to the number of the Oblique moods.

The polar points of view are those by M. Deutschbein (who found 16 moods in English). Foreign linguists didn't clearly distinguish between Subjunctive mood as a system of the forms of the verb and other lexical means of expressing modality.

H. Sweet singled out the Conditional mood (*should/would see*), Permissive mood (*may/might see*), the Compulsive mood (*was/were to see*), the Tense mood (=cases of homonymy with the Indicative mood). The last one (unlike the previous ones) was singled out not in accordance with meaning.

G. Grume singled out 2 subtypes in the Subjunctive mood – a) Optative Subjunctive (synthetic forms *I knew, I were* + combinations with modal verbs) and b) Potential Subjunctive (*may come* + other combinations with modal verbs).

L. Barkhudarov (who held that there are no Oblique moods at all in English, on the assumption that the mood auxiliaries *should, would* still preserve their modal meanings of *obligation* and *volition* and may be used in free word combinations like any full-fledged verbs. As for *If I*

knew and *If I had known* L. Barkhudarov considers: they are the Past Indefinite and the Past Perfect in special contextual environment).

A. Smirnitsky distinguished four Oblique moods in English: the Subjunctive I, the Subjunctive II, the Suppositional mood, the Conditional Mood.

6) I. Khlebnikova finds five Oblique moods: the Conditional mood (*should / would go*), the Subjunctive mood (which includes all the synthetic mood forms), the Oblique moods which do not constitute one system (e.g. however *it might be*, for fear that it *would cause* trouble).

G. Vorontsova finds three Oblique moods: Optative (Imperative, Desiderative, Subjunctive); Speculative (Dubitative, Irrealis); Presumptative.

Such controversy of views is due to absence of direct correspondence between the form and meaning of the Oblique mood forms. The same form renders different grammatical meanings: cf. *I insist that you should go* (Suppositional); *If I knew about it I should go* (Conditional); *I should go there* (modal phrase).

One and the same meaning may be rendered by different grammatical forms. e.g.: *It is necessary that you should go there* (the Suppositional); *It is necessary that you go there* (the Subjunctive I).

Depending upon the criterion the grammarian takes as a basis for his / her classification of moods, (s)he will arrive at different results. M. Deutschbein took the criterion of form for his classification of moods, while A. Smirnitsky considered form and meaning of the predicate.

Is the form *knew* the same or different grammatical form in: *I knew everything* and *If I knew about it*.

If we assume that they are different forms, we shall have to admit that we deal with homonymy here.

I knew everything (Indicative);
If I knew about it (Subjunctive II).

But if we assume that they are the same Indicative mood form in a special function or syntactical environment, we shall have to admit that we deal with the polysemy of the form *knew*. So, it is a matter of **subjective opinion** of the student since so far there are no objective criteria to solve the problem of homonymy or polysemy in such cases.

Professor V. Plotkin completely denies the existence of the category of mood in English.

Here is a case of neutralization of an opposition between Future-in-the-Past and the Conditional mood, e.g.: *She hinted that the play would be improved by cutting.*

As a matter of fact, in English there is no system of the Subjunctive mood forms, but there is a set of synonymic but not always interchangeable forms. Their mutual non-interchangeability is determined by the fact that the usage of certain individual forms is disturbed in accordance with the syntactical structure and some of them are used only in definite lexical surroundings (i.e. they have their own distribution). Beyond the definite structure, the form itself and by itself is not an indicator of this or that Subjunctive mood variety. The Subjunctive mood forms are always homonymous with Indicative mood forms, excepting, e.g.:

He be, he go I / he were.

Eventually, this homonymy of forms was the reason for the fact that in English the forms came to be fastened and attached to certain syntactic structures

Check yourself issues:

1. How is the history of grammar traditionally divided?
2. What trends are found in scientific grammar?
3. What methods help to explain language phenomena in the field of grammar?
4. What is morpheme?
5. What main principles underlie the classification of morphemes?
6. What kinds of morphemes are distinguished according to the mode of their functioning?
7. What morphemes are found according to their meaning?
8. According to what criteria are the English words classified into parts of speech?
9. What classes are English words classified into on the upper and the lower level of classification?

10. How is grammatical meaning of the word defined in Modern linguistics?

11. What is the difference between grammatical and lexical meanings?

12. What approaches to the definition of grammatical form exist?

13. What is a grammeme? Who introduced this term?

14. What characteristics of grammatical form are discussed by A. Smirnitsky?

15. What conditions are grammatical categories singled out on?

16. What grammatical categories does the English verb possess?

17. What is aspect category of the English verb?

18. What aspects are distinguished by the majority of linguists?

19. What are alternative points of view?

20. How can the category of tense be defined?

21. How many English tenses are distinguished by linguists?

22. What are the arguments of *"shall / will* + Infinitive" being a modal form and not an analytical form?

23. What main trends concerning the essence of the Perfect forms in Modern English should be paid special attention to?

24. What is the essence of the category of Perfect?

25. What are the main definitions of the voice?

26. What binary opposition underlies the category of voice in English?

27. What is meant by medial voices?

28. What does the category of mood express?

29. How many mood forms are distinguished by linguists in English?

30. Why is the problem of the number of moods in English the most controversial one?

Literature:

1. Александрова, О. В. Современный английский язык. Морфология и синтаксис : учеб. пособие для студентов вузов, обучающихся по направлению 031000 и специальности 031001 – Филология. – Иностр. язык. – Москва : Академия, 2007. – 219 с.

2. Алєксєєва, І. О. Курс теоретичної граматики сучасної англійської мови : [навч. посіб.]. – Вінниця : Нова кн., 2007. – 327 с.

3. Бархударов, Л. С. Очерки по морфологии современного английского языка. – М. : Высш. шк., 1975. – 156 с.

4. Бархударов, Л. С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. – Изд. 2-е. – М. : Изд-во ЛКИ : URSS, 2008. – 199 с.

5. Блох М. Я., Семенова Т. Н., Тимофеева С. В. Практикум по теоретической грамматике английского языка. - М.: «Высшая школа», 2010. – 471 с.

6. Блох, М. Я. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка : Учеб. для студентов ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. – 3-е. – М. : Высш. шк., 2000. – 382 с.

7. Блох, М. Я. Теоретические основы грамматики : Учеб. для студентов вузов, обучающихся по лингвист. специальностям. – 3-е изд. – М. : Высш. шк., 2002. – 160 с.

8. Воронцова Г. Н. Очерки по грамматике английского языка. – Москва : Изд-во лит. на иностр. яз., 1960. – 399 с.

9. Гуревич, В. В. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. Сравнительная типология английского и русского языков : учебное пособие. - 5-е изд. - Москва : Флинта : Наука, 2008. – 168 с.

10. Ильиш Б. А. The structure of Modern English (Строй современного английского языка). – Л.: Просвещение, 1971. – 365 с. (на англ. языке).

11. Кобрина Н. А., Корнеева Е. А. и др. Грамматика английского языка. Морфология. Синтаксис. СПб.: Изд-во «Союз», 2006. – 348 с.

12. Мороховская, Э. Я. Основы теоретической грамматики английского языка : [учеб. пособие для фак. иностр. яз. вузов]. – Киев : Вища шк., 1984. – 287 с.

13. Навчальний посібник з теорії англійської мови : для студ., які вивч. англ. як другу іноземну мову / [уклад.: С. Т. Богатирьова, Т. Я. Волкова, Н. М. Косенко]. – Донецьк : ДонНУ, 2005. – 130 с.

14. Прибыток, И. И. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка : учеб. пособие для студентов вузов, обучающихся по направлению 031000 и специальности 031001 «Филология». – Москва : Академия, 2008. – 383 с.

15. Старикова, Е. Н. Лингвистические чтения : аспекты теории грамматики / Е. Н. Старикова и др. – Киев : Вища школа, 1984. – 185 с.

2. LEXICOLOGY

2.1. WORD-MEANING. TYPES OF WORD-MEANING

Meaning is a component of the word through which a concept is communicated thus enabling this word to denote real objects, qualities, actions and abstract notions. It is a specific kind of content produced by the reverberation of objective reality in the human consciousness which constitutes the inner (semantic) structure of linguistic units with respect to which their material form is the outer (or phonetic) structure (O. Akhmanova). Thus, meaning is a certain reflection in our mind of objects, phenomena or relations that makes the so-called inner facet of the linguistic unit whereas the sound-form functions as its outer facet.

Word-meaning is not homogeneous but is made of various components the combination and the interrelation of which determine to a great extent the inner facet of the word. These components are usually described as types of meaning. The main types of meaning that are readily observed in words and word-forms are the **grammatical**, **lexical** and **part-of-speech** (or **lexical-grammatical**) **meanings**. The main concern of Lexicology is the lexical meaning of the word.

The grammatical meaning is defined as the expression in speech of relationship between words. It is more abstract and more generalized than the lexical meaning. It is the component of meaning recurrent in identical sets of individual forms of different words, as, for example, the tense meaning in the word-forms of the verbs *asked, thought, walked*; the case meaning in the word-forms of the nouns *girl's, boys', night's*; the meaning of plurality which is found in the word-forms of the nouns *flowers, winters, joys, tables, children, sheep*.

In modern linguistic science it is commonly held that some elements of grammatical meaning can be identified by the position of the linguistic unit in relation to other linguistic units, i.e. by its distribution. Word-forms *speaks, reads, writes* have one and the same grammatical meaning as they can all be found in identical distribution, e.g. they can collocate with the pronouns of the 3rd person Singular (*he, she, it*) and adverbs like *well, badly, today, always*, etc.

The part-of-speech meaning (**lexical-grammatical meaning**) is the generalized meaning rendered by the word-class a certain word belongs to. There are major word-classes (nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs) and minor word-classes (articles, prepositions, conjunctions, etc.).

The part-of-speech meaning has two aspects: lexical and grammatical (hence another term to denote this type of word-meaning – "lexical-grammatical meaning"). From the lexical point of view the part-of-speech meaning for a noun is thingness or substantiality (*table, love, gold*), for a verb it is action (*to build*) or state (*to adore*); adjectives denote properties of nouns (*beautiful*), and adverbs – properties of verbs (*quickly*).

The grammatical aspect of part-of-speech meaning is conveyed as a rule by a set of forms. For example, if the word is used to denote thingness (i.e. it is a noun), it is bound to possess a set of forms expressing the grammatical meaning of number (*table – tables*) and case (*boy – boy's*).

The part-of-speech meaning of the words that possess only one form, e.g. prepositions, some adverbs, etc. is observed in their distribution only: *to come in* (*here, there*); *in* (*on, under*) *the table.*

The lexical meaning is defined as the component of meaning proper to the word as a linguistic unit, i.e. recurrent in all the forms of this word and in all possible distributions of these forms (R. Ginzburg, N. Rayevskaya and others). For example, the word-forms *build, builds, built, are building, have been built* possess different grammatical meaning of tense, person, continuous aspect, passivity of the action, but in each of these forms one can observe one and the same semantic component denoting the process of construction which is identified as their lexical meaning.

The definitions of lexical meaning introduced by various linguists differ in detail but agree in the following: they point out that the lexical meaning is the individual material meaning of each separate word denoting certain concept by means of a definite language system. Cf.:

– the lexical meaning is the material meaning of the word, i.e. the meaning of the material part of the word as distinct from its formal, or grammatical part (O. Akhmanova);

– the lexical meaning is the meaning of the main material part of the word which reflects the concept the given word expresses and the basic properties of the thing (phenomenon, property, state, etc.) the word denotes (E. Mednikova);

– the lexical meaning is the realization of concept or emotion by means of a definite language system (I. Arnold);

– the lexical meaning of the word is the same throughout the paradigm, i.e. all the word-forms of one and the same word are lexically identical (R. Ginzburg and others);

– the lexical meaning is the semantic invariant of the grammatical variation of a word (M. Nikitin).

The difference between the lexical and the grammatical components of meaning is not to be sought in the difference of the concepts underlying the two types of meaning, but rather in the way they are conveyed.

e.g. The concept of plurality may be expressed either by the lexical meaning of the word *plurality* (the state of being plural or the state of being numerous, a large number or quantity) or by the grammatical meaning, i.e. in the forms of various words irrespective of their lexical meaning, e.g. *clouds, trees, women* etc. The concept of relation may be expressed by the lexical meaning of the word *relation* (an aspect or quality that can be predicated only of two or more things taken together, something perceived or discovered by observing or thinking about two or more things at the same time) and also by any of the prepositions, e.g. *in, on, under*, etc., e.g. The book is *on / in / under the table*.

Lexical and grammatical meanings of the word are interconnected. They both make up the word-meaning as neither can exist without the other.

Proceeding from the semantic analysis we observe that lexical meaning is not homogeneous and may be analyzed as including denotational and connotational components.

The denotational meaning is the component of lexical meaning that gives objective information about an object of reality (a thing, phenomenon, notion, process etc.) referred to as a referent or a denotatum (sing. *denotatum* [ˌdiːnɔ'teɪtəm], pl. *denotata* [ˌdiːnɔ'teɪtə]). It is

the conceptual content of a word. To denote is to serve as a linguistic expression for a concept or as a name for an individual object (I. Arnold).

Users of a language cannot have any knowledge or thought of the objects or phenomena of the real world around them unless this knowledge is ultimately embodied in words which have essentially the same meaning for all speakers of that language. It is the denotational meaning that makes communication possible. Communication becomes possible because the denotational meaning establishes correlation between the word and the object which is denoted by this word and thus appears to be essential for conveying the bulk of the information for the language speakers.

Denotational meaning is usually reflected in a dictionary definition of the word: e.g. *to sing* 'to produce musical tones by means of the voice'; *street* 'a road in a city, town, or village, usually with houses along it'. It is segmented into semantic components (the so-called semes): e.g. in the denotational meaning of the word *man* 'an adult human male' three semes are observed: that of an age ('adult'), sex ('male') and belonging to human beings ('human').

The second component of the lexical meaning is the **connotational component** that reflects additional shades of meaning – the so-called connotations. Connotation is the pragmatic communicative value the word receives depending on where, when, how, by whom, for what purpose and in what context it may be used. There are four main types of connotations: stylistic, emotional, evaluative and expressive.

Stylistic connotation is connected with **stylistic reference** of the word which depends upon the situation in which the word is uttered, upon the type and purpose of communication, upon the speech style in which the word is used.

The greater part of the vocabulary is made up of neutral words possessing no stylistic connotation and suitable for any communicative situation. Against the background of neutral words one can distinguish two smaller groups – literary and colloquial words.

This may be best illustrated by comparing words almost identical in their denotational meaning, e.g. *parent – father – dad*. In comparison

with the word father which is stylistically neutral, *dad* stands out as colloquial and *parent* is felt as literary.

The stylistic reference of colloquial words is clearly observed when we compare them with their neutral synonyms, e.g. *chum – friend, rot – nonsense, kid – child*, etc. This is also true of literary words, such as, e.g. *to presume – to suppose, to anticipate – to expect, to apostrophize – to address*, etc.

Literary words are not stylistically homogeneous. Besides general literary (bookish) words which are used by all the members of the language-speaking community (e.g. *concourse, commence, confrontation, embargo*) one may single out various special literary words whose usage is restricted by various circumstances. Here belong: terms (*oxygen, proton, morpheme, suffix*), archaisms (*feudal lord, armour, thyself, brethren*), poetic words and expressions (*hapless 'unlucky', harken 'hear', staunch 'firm' youthful morn, sacred beauty*), barbarisms and foreignisms (*de jure, de facto, vis-à-vis, chef-doeuvre*), literary neologisms (*underwriter, offshore, moderator, avatar, clarifier*).

Colloquial words are not homogeneous stylistically either. They include general colloquial words, i.e. the words of everyday communication (*dorm, champ, GBS* (*George Bernard Shaw*), *starlet, kitchenette, guy, crony, awfully* 'very', *stand out*) and special colloquial words used by certain groups of people. The latter fall into: slang words and phrases ('money': *beans, dough, brass, dibs, bread, cabbage, cake, greenbacks, greenies, potatoes, century*), vulgarisms (*stinkpot, blast off, shit, bloody*), jargonisms (e.g. criminal cant: *hook* 'a pickpocket', *keister* 'a suitcase', *tool* 'a pistol or gun', *jigglers* 'skeleton keys', *to crack* 'to force a safe open'), dialectal words (e.g. Cockney: *toff* 'a person of the upper class', *up the pole* 'drunk') and colloquial coinages, i.e. neologisms (*boot-sale* 'selling from the boot of the car'; *backsters* 'beach sandals with thick soles'; *hipster* 'trousers or a skirt with the belt on hips').

Evaluative connotation may show speaker's approval or disapproval of the object spoken of (*hovel* vs *house*; *gang* vs *group*), emotional connotation conveys the speaker's emotions (*mummy* vs *mother*; *starlet* vs *star*). Both evaluative and emotional connotations may be positive, negative (derogatory) and neutral. As a rule these connotations go hand in hand with one another and in many cases it is

difficult to draw clear distinction between them that is why they are often termed by linguists as emotional-evaluative connotations.

Expressive connotations communicate information about the degree of intensity (*ask* vs *beg* vs *beseech*; *large* vs *tremendous*). Such connotations may be more expressive, less expressive or non-expressive at all.

Emotional-evaluative and expressive connotations form the part of the connotational meaning of the word which is called by some linguists "**the emotive charge** of the word" (R. Ginzburg).

The emotive charge is an objective inherent semantic feature proper to words as linguistic units. It can be identified on the language level, i.e. when the word is taken outside any context: *magnificent* – positive, *bad* – negative, *small* – neutral; *love* is less expressive than *worship*, but more expressive than *like* since the words denote different depth of the feeling. Thus, the emotive charge is connected with the notions of evaluation, emotionality and expressivity.

The emotive charge should not be confused with **emotive implications** (also emotional-evaluative and expressive) that the word may acquire in speech. Emotive implication is a subjective property of the word as it greatly depends on the personal experience of the speaker, the mental imagery the word evokes in him. It is true for an individual speaker only. Emotive implication is otherwise termed as adherent connotation. It can be identified on the speech level only, i.e. in the context the word is used. Thus, words seemingly devoid of any emotional element may possess in the case of individual speakers strong emotive implications as may be illustrated, e.g. by the word hospital. What is thought and felt when the word *hospital* is used will be different in the case of an architect who built it and is proud of his work, the invalid staying there after an operation, or the man living across the road.

Consider different emotive implications of the word *університет* when it is used by a lecturer, by the first-year student who has just entered it and by some senior student early in the morning on Monday.

Emotive charge and emotive implications together constitute the **emotive element** of the connotational meaning of the word.

Stylistic connotations on the one hand and emotional-evaluative and expressive connotations on the other hand are closely connected

and to a certain degree interdependent. As a rule stylistically coloured words, i.e. words belonging to all stylistic layers except the neutral one are observed to possess either emotional, or evaluative, or expressive connotation or even the combination of them.

That can be proved by comparing stylistically labelled words with their neutral synonyms. The colloquial words *daddy, mummy* are more emotional than the neutral *father, mother*; the English slang words *mum, bob* are undoubtedly more expressive than their neutral counterparts *silent, shilling*; the poetic *yon* and *steed* carry a noticeably stronger emotive charge than their neutral synonyms *there* and *horse*.

2.2. POLYSEMY. THE SEMANTIC STRUCTURE OF A POLYSEMANTIC WORD. CONTEXT

Most words convey several concepts and thus possess the corresponding number of meanings. The ability of words to have more than one meaning is described by the term **polysemy.**

A word having several meanings is called **polysemantic,** words having only one meaning are called **monosemantic.** Monosemantic words are few in number. These are mainly scientific terms. The bulk of English words are polysemantic.

The number of sound combinations that human speech organs can produce is limited. Therefore at a certain stage of language development the production of new words by morphological means becomes limited, and polysemy becomes increasingly important in providing the means for enriching the vocabulary. **The process of enriching the vocabulary does not consist merely in adding new words to it, but, also, in the constant development of polysemy**.

The system of meanings of any polysemantic word develops gradually, mostly over the centuries. **The complicated process of polysemy development involves both the appearance of new meanings and the loss of old ones.** Yet, the general tendency with English vocabulary at the modern stage of its history is to increase the total number of its meanings and to provide for a quantitative and qualitative growth of the expressive resources of the language.

Polysemy is very characteristic of the English vocabulary where there are many monosyllabic root words. The greater the frequency of the word, the greater the number of meanings that constitute its

semantic structure. Frequency – combinability – polysemy are closely connected. A special formula known as **Zipf's law** has been worked out to express the correlation between frequency, word length and polysemy: the shorter the word, the higher its frequency of use; the higher the frequency, the wider its combinability, i.e. the more word combinations it enters; the wider its combinability, the more meanings are realized in these contexts.

The word in one of its meanings is termed a **lexical-semantic variant** (LSV) of this word (the term is introduced by professor A. I. Smirnitsky). Lexical-semantic variants of one and the same word are registered in dictionaries as different meanings of this word. All the lexical-semantic variants of a word taken together form its **semantic structure** or **semantic paradigm.** The word *face,* for example, according to the dictionary data has the following semantic structure:

1) 'the front part of the head': *Brian splashed water on his face, then brushed his teeth...;*

2) 'look, expression': *a sad face, smiling faces; she is a good judge of faces*;

3) 'surface, façade': *face of a clock, face of a building; he laid his cards face down;*

4) 'style of typecast for printing': *bold-face type.*

No general or complete scheme of **types of lexical meanings as elements of a word's semantic structure** has so far been accepted by linguists. Linguistic literature abounds in various terms reflecting various points of view and various bases of classification of meanings within the semantic structure of one and the same word.

The semantic structure of the word may include, among others, the following oppositions of its meanings.

Direct meaning :: transferred meaning. Meaning is **direct** when it nominates the denotatum without the help of a context, in isolation; meaning is **transferred** when the denotatum is named and at the same time characterized through its similarity or contiguity with other objects. Cf. *pan* 'a metal container used for cooking food in' and *pan* 'an amount of something contained in a pan' or *pan* 'a person's face' (AE, informal).

Concrete meaning :: abstract meaning. Meaning is concrete when its denotatum is a concrete object of reality; meaning is abstract when it denotes an abstract notion, e.g. the concrete meaning of the word *screen* is 'a blank white surface on which a photographic image or a film is projected'. When the same word is used in its transferred meaning (*the screen: she's a star of the screen*) it comes to denote 'films or television; the film industry' and is abstract in comparison with the concrete meaning.

Primary (or original) meaning :: secondary (or derived) meaning. Differentiation between **primary meaning and secondary meaning** is connected with the **diachronic approach** to polysemy. From this point of view polysemy is understood as the growth and development (or change) in the semantic structure of the word. It implies that a word may retain its previous meaning or meanings and at the same time acquire one or several new ones.

Semantic changes result as a rule in new meanings which are added to the ones already existing in the semantic structure of the word. Some of the old meanings may become obsolete or even disappear but the bulk of English words tend to an increase in the number of meanings.

Primary meaning is the meaning serving as the basis for derived meanings; secondary meanings in their turn are those derived from the primary meaning. The polysemantic word *table,* for example, has at least nine meanings in Modern English (MnE):

1) 'a piece of furniture with a flat top supported by legs';
2) 'the persons seated at a table';
3) 'the food put on a table, meals; cooking';
4) 'a flat slab of stone or wood';
5) 'slabs of stone with words written on it';
6) *Bibl.* 'words cut into slabs of stone': *the ten tables*;
7) 'an orderly arrangement of facts, figures, etc.';
8) *tech.* 'a part of a machine – tool';
9) 'a level area, plateau'.

In the course of a diachronic semantic analysis it is found that the primary meaning is 'a flat slab of stone or wood' which is proper to the

word as long ago as the OE period. All other meanings of this word are secondary as they are derived from the primary meaning.

Basic (or **main, central**) **meaning :: peripheral** (or **marginal**) **meaning**. Differentiation between basic meaning and peripheral meaning is connected with the **synchronic approach** to polysemy. **From this point of view** polysemy is understood as the coexistence of various meanings of the same word at a certain historical period of the development of the English language.

There is a tendency in modern linguistics to interpret the concept of the basic meaning in terms of the frequency of occurrence of this meaning. Meaning is basic when it possesses the highest frequency at the present stage of vocabulary development; all other meanings found in the semantic structure of the word appear to be peripheral. The basic meaning occurs in various and widely different contexts, peripheral meanings are observed only in certain contexts.

As far as the word *table* is concerned the meaning 'a piece of furniture' possesses the highest frequency of value and makes up 52 % of all the uses of this word. Thus, this meaning emerges as the basic meaning of the word, and all other meanings are peripheral (e.g. 'words cut into slabs of stone', 'a part of a machine – tool' etc.).

As the semantic structure is never static, the primary meaning of the word may become synchronically one of its peripheral meanings and diachronically a secondary meaning may become the basic meaning of the word. The relationship between the diachronic and synchronic evaluation of an individual meaning may be different in different periods of the historical development of language.

This can be illustrated by the semantic analysis of the word *timber* Originally, when this word first appeared in Old English in the 8thcentury (in the Old English translation of Genesis) it denoted 'a building, a house'. This meaning was both primary (diachronically) and basic (synchronically). Later on in Old English the word acquired a general (wide) meaning 'building material' (10th century) and in the Middle English period – more specific (narrower) meaning 'wood used as building material' (12th century). In Modern English the meaning 'a building, a house' diachronically is still described as primary, but synchronically it appears to be lost (as well as the meaning 'building material') and the basic meaning in the semantic structure of the word

timber has become its most frequent meaning 'wood used as building material'. The results of historical changes in the semantic structure of the word *timber* can be seen in the following table.

timber	'a building, a house'	'building material'	'wood used as building material'
Old English			
diachronically	primary	secondary	–
synchronically	basic	peripheral	–
Middle English			
diachronically	primary	secondary	secondary
synchronically	–	basic	peripheral
Modern English			
diachronically	primary	secondary	secondary
synchronically	–	–	basic

Obsolete meaning :: present-day (modern) meaning. Differentiation of these types of meaning in the semantic structure of the word is also possible if we approach polysemy from the **diachronic** point of view. Meaning is considered to be obsolete if it has gone out of use (e.g. the meaning 'a building, a house' of the noun *timber*). The present-day meaning is the one regularly used in the present-day language.

To distinguish between different meanings of a polysemantic word it is necessary to study its linear relationships with other words in typical contexts, i.e. its combinability or collocability. As a famous British linguist John Rupert Firth puts it, "You shall know a word by the company it keeps".

The term **context** denotes the minimal stretch of speech determining each individual meaning of the word. The context individualises the meanings, brings them out. Contexts may be of two types: **linguistic** (verbal) and **extra-linguistic** (non-verbal).

The two main types of linguistic context which serve to determine individual meanings of words are the **lexical context** and the **grammatical context**. These types are differentiated depending on

whether the lexical or the grammatical aspect is predominant in determining the meaning.

In **lexical contexts**, of primary importance are the words combined with the polysemantic word under consideration. The adjective *heavy*, for example, in isolation possesses the meaning 'of great weight, weighty'. When combined with the words denoting such natural phenomena as *wind, storm,* etc. it means 'striking, following with force, abundant', e.g. *heavy rain, wind, storm,* etc. In combination with the words *industry, arms, artillery* and the like, *heavy* has the meaning 'the larger kind of something' as *heavy industry, artillery*.

It can be easily observed that the main factor in bringing out the individual meanings of the adjective *heavy* is the lexical meaning of the words with which this adjective is combined. Thus, the meanings *of heavy* may be analyzed through its collocability with the words *rain, wind, storm; industry, arms, artillery,* etc. The meaning at the level of lexical contexts is sometimes described as meaning by **collocation** which Michael McCarthy metaphorically calls "a marriage contract between words" and adds that "some words are more firmly married to each other than others".

In **grammatical context** it is the grammatical (mainly the syntactic) structure of the context that serves to determine various individual meanings of a polysemantic word. Consider the following examples:

to make +N (Prn) + V$_{inf}$:	*I made Peter study.*
	He made her laugh.
	They made him work (sing, dance, write...).
to make + A + N:	*My friend made a good teacher.*
	He made a good husband.

In the pattern *to make +N (Prn) + V$_{inf}$* the word *make* has the meaning 'to force', and in the pattern *to make + A + N* it has the meaning 'to turn out to be'. Such meanings are sometimes described as grammatically bound meanings. Here the grammatical context of the polysemantic word *to make* (its **distribution**) helps to determine its meaning.

There are cases when the meaning of a word is ultimately determined by the actual speech situation in which the word is used. i.e. by the **extra-linguistic context** (or context of situation). In the sentence *John was looking for the glasses* linguistic context isn't sufficient to differentiate between two possible meanings – 'spectacles' and 'drinking vessels'. So it is possible to state the meaning of the word *glasses* only through the extended context or situation.

2.3. WORD-FORMATION IN ENGLISH

Depending on the morphemes used in the word there are four structural types of words in English:

– **simple (root) words** consisting of one root morpheme and an inflexion *(boy, warm, law, tables, tenth);*

– **derived (affixed) words** consisting of one root morpheme, one or several affixes and an inflexion (*unmanageable; lawful);*

– **compound words** consisting of two or more root morphemes and an inflexion *(boyfriend, outlaw);*

– **compound-derived (compound-affixed) words** consisting of two or more root morphemes, one or more affixes and an inflexion *(left-handed, warm-hearted, blue-eyed).*

In conformity with these structural types of words we distinguish two main types of word-formation: **word-derivation** (**affixation** and **conversion**) and **word-composition**. Apart from these **shortening** belongs to the most important and the most productive ways of word-formation in English. By **productivity** we mean the ability to form new words after existing patterns which are readily understood by the speakers of a language.

There are also minor ways of word-formation: sound interchange, stress interchange, blending, sound imitation.

Affixation

Affixation – the formation of a new word by adding derivational affixes to stems – is a basic means of forming words in English. It has been productive in all periods of the history of English. Affixation includes **suffixation** and **prefixation**.

Suffixation is the formation of words with the help of suffixes.

The main function of suffixes is to form one part of speech from another, e.g. *care (n)/care-less (adj), educate* (v)/*educate* (n).

Their secondary function is to modify the lexical meaning of the stem they are added to, e.g. *careful* (adj) /*careless* (adj).

They can also transfer a word into a different semantic group, e.g. a concrete noun becomes an abstract one: *friend – friendship*.

Prefixation is the formation of words with the help of prefixes.

The main function of prefixes in English is to change the lexical meaning of stems to which they are added. The prefixed derivative usually joins the part of speech the unprefixed word belongs to, e.g. *usual/unusual*.

In Modern English, however, there are also prefixes that form one part of speech from another, e.g. *en-* forms the verbs from nouns *(endanger* 'put at risk or in danger'*)* and from adjectives *(encalm* 'set at ease'); *be-* forms verbs from adjective, verb and noun stems *(belittle* 'to make little', *benumb* 'to make numb', *bespeak* 'to order in advance', *befog* 'to cover with fog', *befriend* 'to treat like a friend', *bemadam* 'to call madam'*)*.

The word-forming activity of affixes may change in the course of time. This raises the question of **productivity** of derivational affixes, i.e. the ability of being used to form new, occasional or potential words, which can be readily understood by the language-speakers. Thus, **productive affixes** are those used to form new words in the period in question.

The most productive prefixes in Modern English are: *de- (decontaminate), re- (rethink), pre- (prehistoric, predominate), non- (non-operational), un- (unfunny), anti- (antibiotic)*.

The most productive English suffixes are:

noun-forming:	*-er (manager), -ing (fighting), -ness (sweetness), -ance/-ancy (redundancy), -ation (automation), -ee (evacuee), -or (reactor), -ry (gimmickry), -ics (cybernetics), -ist (florist), -ism (colloquialism)*
adjective-forming:	*-able (tolerable), -ic (electronic), -ish (lightish), -ed (learned), -less (jobless), -y (tweedy)*
verb-forming:	*-ize/-ise (vitaminize), -ate (oxidate), -ify*

(*falsify*)

adverb-forming: *-ly* (*equally*)

Non-productive affixes are the affixes which are not able to form new words in the period in question. Non-productive affixes are recognized as separate morphemes and possess clear-cut semantic characteristics. In some cases, however, the lexical meaning of a non-productive affix fades off so that only its part-of-speech meaning remains, e.g. the adjective-forming suffix *-some (toothsome, plaguesome).*

Non-productive in Modern English, for example, are the following suffixes:

noun-forming: *-th (truth), -hood (sisterhood), -ship (scholarship)*

adjective-forming: *-ful (peaceful), -ly (weekly), -some (tiresome), -en (golden), -ous (courageous)*

verb-forming: *-en (strengthen)*

The productivity of an affix should not be confused with its **frequency of occurrence.** The frequency of occurrence is understood as the existence in the vocabulary of a great number of words containing the affix in question. An affix may occur in hundreds of words, but if it is not used to form new words, it is not productive. For example, the adjective-forming suffix *-ful* is met in hundreds of English adjectives (*beautiful, hopeful, trustful, useful),* but no new words seem to be built with its help, and so it is non-productive.

Conversion

Conversion is the other basic way of forming words in word-derivation. It is a characteristic feature of the English word-building system (it dates back to the Middle English period). It is also called **affixless derivation** or **zero-suffixation**. By conversion we mean the formation of a new word from the stem of a different part of speech without the addition of any formatives, e.g. *a fall* (from *to fall*), *to slave* (from *a slave*). As a result the two words are homonymous, having the same morphological structure and belonging to different parts of speech.

The term **conversion** first appeared in the book by Henry Sweet "New English Grammar" in 1891. Conversion is treated differently by

different scientists, e.g. prof. A. Smirnitsky treats conversion as a morphological way of forming words when one part of speech is formed from another part of speech by changing its paradigm, e.g. to form the verb *to dial* from the noun *dial* we change the paradigm of the noun (*a dial, dials*) for the paradigm of a regular verb (*I dial, he dials, dialled, is dialling*).

Other linguists (H. Marchand, V. Yartseva, Yu. Zhluktenko, I. Arnold) treat conversion as a morphological-syntactical way of word-building because the word changes not only its paradigm, but also its syntactic function, e.g.:

I need some good paper for my room (the noun *paper* is an object in the sentence).

I paper my room every year (the verb *paper* is the predicate in the sentence).

Especially affected by conversion are nouns and verbs.

1. Verbs may be derived from the stem of almost any part of speech, but the commonest is the derivation from noun stems:

– from simple noun stems: *tube* (n) – *tube* (v), *doctor* (n) – *doctor* (v), *face* (n) – *face* (v), *waltz* (n) – *waltz* (v), *star* (n) – *star* (v);

– from compound noun stems: *buttonhole* (n) – *buttonhole* (v), *weekend* (n) – *weekend* (v).

Derivations from the stems of other parts of speech are less common: *wrong* (adj) – *wrong* (v), *slim* (adj) – *slim* (v), *tame* (adj) – *tame* (v), *up* (adv) – *up* (v), *down* (adv) – *down* (v), *pooh-pooh* (interj) – *pooh-pooh* (v).

2. Nouns are usually derived from verb stems: *make* (v) – *make* (n), *cut* (v) – *cut* (n), *bite* (v) – *bite* (n), *drive* (v) – *drive* (n), *smile* (v) – *smile* (n), *walk* (v) – *walk* (n). These formations frequently make part of such verb-noun combinations as: to take a walk, to have a drink, to take a drive, to take a bite, to give a smile and others.

Nouns may be also derived from phrasal verbs. Such formations are very common in Modern English*: to make up – a make-up, to call up – a call-up, to come back – a come-back.*

A characteristic feature of Modern English is the growing frequency of new formations by conversion, especially among verbs.

Composition

Composition is the way of word-building when a word is formed by joining two or more stems to form one word. It is a very old word-formation type that goes back to Old English.

According to **the parts of speech** compounds are subdivided into:
– nouns, such as: *baby-moon, globe-trotter;*
– adjectives, such as: *free-for-all, power-hungry;*
– verbs, such as: *to honeymoon, to babysit, to henpeck;*
– adverbs, such as: *downdeep, headfirst;*
– prepositions, such as: *into, within;*
– numerals, such as: *fifty-five.*

The commonest compounds are among nouns and adjectives. Other parts of speech are few in number.

According to **the way components are joined together** compounds are subdivided into:

– compounds formed without linking elements, by mere juxtaposition of two stems (neutral), e.g. *goldfish, dog-house, sunflower, bedroom;*

– compounds composed with the help of a vowel or a consonant as a linking element (morphological), e.g. *hand<u>i</u>craft, speed<u>o</u>meter, state<u>s</u>man;*

– compounds composed with the help of linking elements represented by preposition or conjunction stems (syntactic), e.g. *son-<u>in</u>-law, pepper-<u>and</u>-salt, face-<u>to</u>-face.*

According to **their structure** compound words fall into compounds consisting of two stems and those consisting of three or more stems.

Compounds consisting of two stems in their turn are subdivided into compounds proper, derivational compounds (or compound-affixed words) and compound-shortened words.

Compounds proper consist of simple stems. They may have the following types of structure:
– noun stem + noun stem (*raincoat, speedometer*);
– adjective stem + noun stem (*bluebell*);
– adjective stem + adjective stem (*dark-blue*);
– gerundial stem + noun stem (*writing-table*);

– verb stem + post-positive stem (*make-up*);

– adverb stem + adjective stem (*outright*).

Derivational compounds are compound-affixed words, i.e. words besides stems having affixes (e.g. *week-ender,* music-lover*, honeymooner,* schoolboyish, sound-sleeper*, astronautics, astrophysical, house-keeping, blond-haired, mild-hearted*), or compounds formed from phrases by conversion (e.g. *a turnkey*, *a breakdown, a* killjoy, etc).

The formation of derivational compounds from phrases of different types is also called **phrasal derivation**. Some other similar examples: *nothing but > nothingbutism, first night > first-nighter, dress up > dressuppable, Romeo and Juliet > Romeo-and-Julietishness, do good > do-gooder, to come late > late-comer*, etc.

The derivational compounds often become the basis of further derivation:

war-minded > war-mindedness; schoolboyish > schoolboyishness;

whole-hearted > whole-heartedness; whole-hearted > whole-heartedly;

do-it-yourselfer > do-it-yourselfism.

Compound-shortened words are compounds where at least one of the constituents is a clipped stem, e.g. *V-day* (*Victory Day*), *Eurodollar* (*Europe + dollar*), *Ecoforum* (*Ecological Forum), slanguist* (*slang linguist), boatel* (*boat hotel*), *Camford* (*Cambridge + Oxford), sysadmin* (*system administrator*), *comsat* (*communication satellite*), *Centcom* (*Central Command*), *Interpol* (*International police*), *compudict* (*computer dictionary), magalogue* (*magazine catalogue*), etc.

In **compound words consisting of three or more stems** the following types of structure may be traced:

– a compound stem + a simple stem, e.g. *eggshell-thin > (egg + shell*) + *thin*;

– an affixed stem + a compound-affixed stem, e.g. *singer-songwriter > (sing + er) + (song + writ + er).*

According to **the meaning of the whole compound** there may be idiomatic and non-idiomatic compounds.

Idiomatic compounds are very different in their meaning from the corresponding free phrases as the meaning of each component is either lost or weakened, e.g. *buttercup* 'a plant with bright yellow cup-shaped

flowers' ('лютик'), *snowdrop* 'a small white flower which appears in the early spring' ('подснежник'), *chatter-box* 'a person who likes to chatter' ('болтун').

Non-idiomatic compounds are not different in their meaning from the corresponding free phrases, e.g. *airmail* ('mail carried by planes'), *swimming-pool* ('a pool for swimming'), *speedometer* ('a meter for measuring speed').

Shortening

Shortening is the way of word-building by cutting off a part of the word. There are two main types of shortenings: graphical and lexical.

Graphical shortenings (graphical abbreviations) are the result of shortening of words and word-groups only in writing while in speaking the corresponding full forms are used. They are used for the economy of space and effort in writing.

The oldest group of graphical abbreviations in English is of Latin origin: *e.g. – for example* (Lat. *exampli gratia*), *No – number* (Lat. *numero*), *p.a. – a year (Lat. per annum), d – penny (Lat. dinarius), lb – pound (Lat. libra), i.e. – that is (Lat. id est), cf. – compare (Lat. confere), viz – namely (Lat videlicet).*

There are also graphical abbreviations of native origin representing several semantic groups of them:

– days of the week, e.g. *Mon – Monday, Tue – Tuesday,* etc.;

– names of months, e.g. *Apr – April, Aug – August, Sep – September,* etc.;

– names of counties in the UK, e.g. *Yorks – Yorkshire, Berks – Berkshire,* etc.;

– names of states in the USA, e.g. *Ala – Alabama, Alas – Alaska, Calif – California,* etc.;

– names of address, e.g. *Mr, Mrs, Ms* [miz], *Dr,* etc.;

– military ranks, e.g. *capt – captain, col – colonel, sgt – sergeant,* etc.;

– scientific degrees, e.g. *BA – Bachelor of Arts, DM – Doctor of Medicine.* (Sometimes in scientific degrees we have abbreviations of Latin origin, e.g. *MB – Medicinae Baccalaurus);*

– units of time, length, weight, e.g. *f./ft – foot/feet, sec. – second, in. – inch, mg. – milligram,* etc.

In scientific texts the following graphical abbreviations are frequently used: *p.* (*page*), *pp.* (*pages*), *s.* (*see*), *fig.* (*figure*), etc.

The reading of some graphical abbreviations depends on the context, e.g. *m* can be read as: *male, married, masculine, metre, mile, million, minute.*

Lexical shortenings are divided into two main types: abbreviations or clipped words (clippings) and initial words (initialisms).

Abbreviation or **clipping** is the process of formation of a new word by cutting off a part (one or more syllables) of the old one. What is left may be the beginning of the word (e.g. *ad, advert < advertisement, veg < vegetables, lab < laboratory, prof < professor, fif < fifteen, disco < discotheque, expo < exposition*), less frequently the end of the word (e.g. *fend < defend, phone < telephone, plane < aeroplane, drome < aerodrome, chute < parachute, copter < helicopter, varsity < university (reflects an archaic pronunciation)*), and seldom the middle of the word (*e.g. flu < influenza, fridge < refrigerator, tec < detective*) or both its beginning and its end (e.g. *specs < spectacles, fancy < fantasy, mart < market, maths < mathematics*). The meaning of the abbreviated word is that of the full word.

Initialisms (**initial abbreviations**) are words formed from the initial letters of a word combination.

There are three types of initialisms in English:

– initialisms with alphabetical reading, such as *UK* [ˌjuːˈkeɪ] – *United Kingdom, RAF* [ˌɑːreɪˈef] – *Royal Air Force, PWA* [ˌpiːdʌbljuːˈeɪ] – *a person with AIDS, BBC* [ˌbiːbiːˈsiː] – *the British Broadcasting Corporation,* etc.;

– initialisms which are read as if they were words, e.g. *UNESCO* [juːˈneskəu] – *United Nations Educational, Scientific, Cultural Organization, NATO* [ˈneɪtəu] – *North Atlantic Treaty Organization, OPEC* [ˈəupək] – *Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, UNO* [ˈjuːnəu] – *United Nations Organization,* etc.;

– *i*nitialisms which coincide with English words in their sound form, e.g. *CLASS* (*Computer-based Laboratory for Automated School System or Custom Local Area Signaling Service*), *CALL* (*computer-*

assisted language learning), *NOW* (*National Organization for Women*), *AIDS* (*Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome*), etc.

Initialisms which can be read as ordinary words (the second and the third groups) are called **acronyms**.

Initial abbreviations are often used in Internet communication:

AFAIK – as far as I know	*ICBW* – I could be wrong
BTW – by the way	(or it could be worse)
DH – dear husband	*ISWYM* – I see what you mean
DIY – do it yourself	*SCNR* – sorry, could not resist
FYI – for your information	*TTFN* – ta ta for now
HTH – hope this helps	*TIA* – thanks in advance
IMHO – in my humble opinion	*TWIMC* – to whom it may
	concern

Minor ways of word-formation

Sound-interchange is the formation of a word due to an alteration in the phonemic composition of its root. Sound-interchange falls into two groups: 1) vowel-interchange (or ablaut): *food – to feed, blood – to bleed, to sing – song*. In some cases vowel-interchange is combined with suffixation: *strong – strength*; 2) consonant-interchange: *advice – to advise, belief – to believe, serf – to serve*. Consonant-interchange and vowel-interchange may be combined together, *life – to live, bath – to bathe, breath – to breathe*.

Distinctive stress (**stress interchange**) is the formation of a word by means of the shift of the stress in the source word. It can be mostly met in verbs and nouns of Romanic origin: nouns have the stress on the first syllable and verbs on the last syllable, e.g. *áccent – to accént, cónflict – to conflíct, éxport – to expórt, éxtract – to extráct, etc.* In such cases the position of the stress helps to distinguish nouns from verbs. Stress interchange leads to vowel interchange as vowels are pronounced differently in stressed and unstressed positions.

Blending (**telescoping**) is the formation of a new word by combining parts of two words. In blends two ways of word-building are combined: abbreviation and composition. From the point of view of their structure blends are compound-shortened words. Blends may be of two types:

– blends that may be transformed into a phrase consisting of complete stems combined by the conjunction and, e.g. *smog* (*smoke and fog*), *slanguage* (*slang* and *language*), *gasohol* (*gasoline* and *alcohol*);

– blends that can be transformed into a phrase, the first element of which serves as a modifier for the second one, e.g.: *telecast* (*television broadcast*), *acromania* (*acronym mania*), *bit* (*binary digit*), *cinemaddict* (*cinema addict*), *cinemactor* (*cinema actor*), *chunnel* (*channel tunnel*), *dramedy* (*drama comedy*), *detectifiction* (*detective fiction*), *informercial* (*information commercial*), *medicare* (*medical care*), *slimnastics* (*slimming gymnastics*), *sociolite* (*social elite*).

Sound imitation (or **onomatopoeia**) is the naming of an action or a thing by a more or less exact reproduction of the sound associated with it. Cf.: *cock-a-doodle-do – ку-ка-ре-ку; to babble – лепетать; to giggle – хихикать; to hiss – шипеть; to buzz – жужжать; to splash – плескать; to jingle – звякать.*

2.4. ETYMOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE ENGLISH WORD-STOCK

The most particular feature of the English language is the mixed character of its vocabulary. Etymologically the English word-stock is far from being homogeneous. It consists of two layers – **the native stock of words** and **the borrowed stock of words**.

Native words

A native word is a word which belongs to the original English stock, i.e. of Anglo-Saxon origin, as known from the earliest available manuscripts of the Old English period. Native words comprise only 30% of the total number of words in the English vocabulary but they form the bulk of the most frequent words actually used in speech and writing.

Diachronically the native English words are subdivided into those of **the Indo-European stock**, those of **Common Germanic origin** and **English words proper**.

1. Words of **the Indo-European stock.** These words have their cognates (words of the same etymological root, of common origin) in the

vocabularies of different Indo-European languages. They form the oldest layer which readily falls into definite semantic groups:

– terms of kinship: *father*, *mother*, *brother*, *son, daughter*;

– names of natural objects and phenomena: *sun, moon, star, wind, water, stone;*

– names of animals and plants: *goose, wolf, cow, tree, corn, birch;*

– words naming parts of the human body: *nose, ear, eye, tooth, heart, lip, foot*;

– words denoting periods of time: *day, night*;

– words naming physical qualities and properties (including terms of colour): *hard, quick, slow, red, white, new;*

– words expressing a number (numerals) from one to a hundred: *one, two, twenty, eighty*;

– words referring to someone or something (pronouns): personal (except *they* which is a Scandinavian borrowing); demonstrative, interrogative: *I, you, he my, that, who*;

– words denoting various actions (some of the most frequent verbs): *be, stand, sit, do, bear, eat, know, come.*

2. Words from the **Common Germanic language.** Such words have parallels in other West Germanic languages – German, Norwegian, Dutch, Icelandic, etc., but none in Russian, Ukrainian or French: e.g. English *house*, German *Haus*, Dutch *huis*, Norwegian *hus*, Swedish *hus*.

Common Germanic stock contains a great number of semantic groups, some of which being the same as in the Indo-European group of native vocabulary. Here belong:

– words naming parts of the human body: *head, hand, arm, finger, bone;*

– words denoting periods of time: *summer, winter, spring, time, week;*

– names of natural phenomena and objects: *storm, rain, flood, ice, frost, ground, sea, earth, land;*

– words denoting human dwellings, buildings, structures: *house, shop, bridge, room, bench*;

– words naming sea-going vessels: *boat, ship*;

– words denoting materials: *coal, iron, lead;*

– names of animals, birds, plants: *sheep, horse, fox, crow, oak, grass, fir*;

– words naming different kinds of garment: *hat, shirt, shoe*;

– words denoting abstract notions: *care, evil, hope, life, need*;

– words expressing various actions (notional verbs): *bake, bum, buy, drive, hear, keep, learn, make, meet, rise, see, speak, tell, say, answer;*

– words denoting colours, size and other properties: *green, blue, grey, white, broad, dead, deaf, deep, small, thick, old, good*;

– words expressing a relation of place, time, etc. (adverbs): *down, out, before.*

3. **English words proper.** These words have no cognates in other languages. They are few: *boy, girl, bird, lord, lady.*

Words belonging to the native word-stock are for the most part characterized by a wide range of lexical and grammatical combinability, high frequency value and a developed polysemy; they are often monosyllabic, show great word-building power and enter a number of set expressions. Furthermore, the grammatical structure is essentially Germanic having remained unaffected by foreign influence.

Borrowed words (borrowings)

English history is very rich in different types of contacts with other countries, that is why it is very rich in borrowings. The Roman invasion, the adoption of Christianity, Scandinavian and Norman conquests of the British Isles, the development of British colonialism and trade and cultural relations served to increase the English vocabulary immensely. The majority of these borrowings are fully assimilated in English in their pronunciation, grammar, spelling and can be hardly distinguished from native words.

The term **borrowing** is polysemantic. It is used to denote:

1) (process) resorting to the word-stock of other languages for words to express new concepts, to further differentiate the existing concepts and to name new objects, etc.;

2) (result) a loan word, borrowed word – a word taken over from another language and modified in phonemic shape, spelling, paradigm or meaning according to the standards of the language-borrower.

Borrowing may be **direct** and **indirect**, i.e. through another language. Such languages-intermediaries were, for example, Latin through which many Greek words came into English and French by means of which many Latin words were borrowed.

Thus, distinction should be made between the term **source of borrowing** and the term **origin of borrowing**. The former should be applied to the language from which the word was borrowed into English. The latter refers to the language the word originated from. Thus, the English word *paper* < French *papier* < Latin *papyrus* < Greek *papyrus* has French as its source of borrowing and Greek as its origin (i.e. the word originated from Greek but it was borrowed from French).

Borrowings can be classified according to different criteria:
– according to the aspect which is borrowed;
– according to the degree of assimilation;
– according to the language from which the word was borrowed.

In accordance with the first criterion – the aspect borrowed – the following types of borrowings can be distinguished:

1. **Phonetic borrowings** (or **loan words proper**). These are the most characteristic borrowings in all languages which are borrowed with their sound-form, spelling and meaning. Then they undergo assimilation, each sound in the borrowed word is substituted by the corresponding sound of the borrowing language, in some cases the spelling, the structure of the word, its paradigm and meaning can be changed. Otherwise stated, phonetic borrowings are words taken over from another language and modified in phonemic shape, spelling, paradigm or meaning according to the standards of the English language. Such words as *labour, travel, table, chair, people* are phonetic borrowings from French; *apparatchik, nomenklatura, sputnik, kolkhoz* are phonetic borrowings from Russian; *bank, soprano, duet* are phonetic borrowings from Italian; *Autobahn, iceberg* are phonetic borrowings from German, etc.

2. **Translation borrowings (translation loans).** These are compound words or expressions formed from the elements existing in the English language according to the patterns of the source language. In other words, they are word-for-word (or morpheme-for-morpheme) translations of the source words or expressions: *masterpiece* (from

Germ. *Meisterstück), wonder child* (from Germ. *Wunderkind), first dancer* (from Ital. *prima-ballerina*), *the moment of truth* (from Sp. *el momento de la verdad*), *collective farm* (from Rus. *колхоз*), *five-year plan* (from Rus. *пятилетка*);

3. **Semantic borrowings (semantic loans).** These are new meanings that are borrowed under the influence of a related word in another language: e.g. the compound word *shock brigade* which existed in the English language with the meaning 'аварийная бригада' acquired a new meaning 'ударная бригада' which it borrowed from the Russian language; there are semantic borrowings between Scandinavian and English, such as the meaning 'to live' for the word *to dwell* which in Old English had the meaning 'to continue, remain'. Or else the meaning 'endowment, present' for the word *gift* which in Old English had the meaning 'the amount to be given by a suitor in consideration of receiving a woman *to wife*' ('выкуп за жену').

4. **Morphemic borrowings.** These are borrowings of affixes which occur in the language when many words with identical affixes are borrowed from one language into another, so that the morphemic structure of borrowed words becomes familiar to the people speaking the borrowing language, e.g. we can find a lot of Romanic affixes in the English word-building system, that is why there are a lot of **words-hybrids** in English where different morphemes have different origin, e.g. *goddess* (native root + Romanic suffix *-ess), beautiful* (French root + English suffix *-ful), uneatable (*English prefix un- + English root + Romanic suffix *-able), uncomfortable* (English prefix un- + Romanic root + Romanic suffix *-able), blackguard* (English root + French root), *schoolboy* (Greek root + English root), etc.

Words when they migrate from one language into another adjust themselves to their new environment and get adapted to the norms of the recipient language. They undergo certain changes which gradually erase their foreign features, and, finally, they are assimilated.

Assimilation of borrowings is the process of change that a borrowed word undergoes while being adapted to the phonetic, semantic, morphological and graphical systems of the receiving language.

The degree of assimilation depends upon the length of period during which the word has been used in the receiving language, upon

its importance for communication purpose and its frequency. Oral borrowings due to personal contacts are assimilated more completely and more rapidly than literary borrowings, i.e. borrowings through written speech.

According to the degree of assimilation borrowings fall into the following types:

1. **Completely assimilated borrowed words** (**complete loans**). This group includes the words that are not felt as foreign words in the language, as they completely assume word-building and word-changing paradigms. Completely assimilated verbs belong to regular verbs, e.g. *correct – corrected.* Completely assimilated nouns form their plural by means of *s*-inflexion, e.g. *gate – gates.* In completely assimilated French words the stress has been shifted from the last syllable to the first one, e.g. *capital, service.*

2. **Partially assimilated borrowed words** (**partial loans**). These are the words remaining unaltered in some of the aspects:

– borrowings not completely assimilated graphically: e.g. words borrowed from French in which the final consonant is not pronounced (*ballet, buffet, corps*), which keep a diacritic mark (*café, cliché*), having specifically French diagraphs *ch, qu, ou*, etc. (*bouquet, brioche*);

– borrowings not completely assimilated phonetically: e.g. French borrowings that keep the stress on the final syllable (*police, machine, cartoon),* those which contain sounds not occurring in the native words, e.g. [ʒ] *(bourgeois, camouflage, prestige*);

– borrowings not assimilated grammatically: e.g. some nouns borrowed from Latin and Greek retain their plural forms (*datum – data, criterion – criteria, analysis – analyses, thesis – theses, bacillus – bacilli, phenomenon – phenomena,* etc.);

– borrowings not assimilated semantically because they denote objects and notions peculiar to the country from the language of which they were borrowed, e.g. *sari, sombrero, sarafan* (clothing), *taiga, steppe* (nature), *kvass, borshch, sherbet* (food), *shah, rajah, Avar* (foreign titles), *rickshaw, troika* (foreign vehicles), *rupee, zloty, peseta* (foreign currency), etc.

3. **Unassimilated words (barbarisms).** Here belong words from other languages used by English people in conversation or in writing

but not assimilated in any way, and for which usually there are corresponding English equivalents (e.g. Ital. *addio, ciao – good-bye, dolce vita – a life of pleasure and luxury*; Lat. *ad-libitum – at pleasure*, Fr. *hors d'oeuvre – an appetizer, chef-d'oeuvre – a masterpiece, tête-à-tête – face to face.*

The English word-stock borrowed words from many languages such as Scandinavian, French, Latin, Greek and others. According to the language from which the word was borrowed borrowings form the following groups.

1. **Celtic borrowings (5th-6th A.D.).**

Several of the Germanic tribes (the most numerous amongst them being the Angles, the Saxons and the Jutes) migrated across the sea now known as the English Channel to the British Isles and invaded the territories inhabited by the Celts. Through their numerous contacts with the defeated Celts, the conquerors got to know and assimilated a number of Celtic words (*crag*, *down, druid, bard, cradle).* Especially numerous among the Celtic borrowings were place names, names of rivers, hills, etc. The Germanic tribes occupied the land, but the names of many parts and features of their territory remained Celtic. For instance, the names of the rivers *Avon*, *Exe*, *Esk*, *Usk* originate from Celtic words meaning 'river' and 'water'.

Ironically, even the name of the English capital originates from Celtic *Llyn + dun* in which *Llyn* is another Celtic word for 'river' and *dun* stands for 'a fortified hill', the meaning of the whole being 'fortress on the hill over the river'.

2. **Latin borrowings.**

Latin was one of the first languages to contact English and enrich it with borrowings. The English language came in contact with Latin several times. Accordingly Latin borrowings are classified into some groups.

2.1. The first group is made up by the words which came into English during the period when the British Isles were a part of the Roman Empire (**the 1st century B.C.**) – **Early Latin Loans**. The tribes had been in contact with Roman civilization and had adopted several Latin words denoting objects belonging to that civilization long before the invasion of Angles, Saxons and Jutes into Britain. They are the names of fruit and vegetables: *cherry* (Lat. *cerasum), pear*

(Lat. *pirum), plum* (Lat. *prunus), pea* (Lat. *pisum), beet* (Lat. *beta),* *pepper* (Lat. *piper)*; words of everyday life: *cup* (Lat. *cuppa), dish* (Lat. *discus), kitchen* (Lat. *coquina), kettle* (Lat. *catillus), inch* (Lat. *uncia), wine* (Lat. *vinum), chest* (Lat. *cista*); names of buildings, fortifications, town parts, etc.: mill (Lat. *molina), port* (Lat. *portus), wall* (Lat. *vallum), street* (Lat. *strata);* geographical names: *Lancaster, Manchester, Gloucester* (Lat. *castrum).*

2.2. The second group consists of many Latin words that came into English during the Adoption of Christianity in **the 6th -7th centuries A.D.** These are **Later Latin Loans** often called classical borrowings. Here belong learned Latin words connected with religion: *altar, bishop, apostle, cross, candle, creed, disciple, feast, priest, monk, nun*; education *dean, chapter, scholar, magister* and many others: *marble, chalk, linen, elephant, lily, fiddle, palm, pearl, pine*, etc.

2.3. The third group includes words which penetrated into English during the Middle English period due to **the Revival of Learning** or **the Renaissance (14th-16th centuries)**. These are mostly scientific words because Latin was the language of science at the time. They were not used as frequently as the words of the Old English period, therefore some of them were partially assimilated grammatically, e.g. *formula – formulae, memorandum – memoranda, minimum – minima, maximum – maxima.* These words are mostly abstract words (*major, minor, filial, moderate, intelligent, permanent, to elect, to create) and* numerous scientific and artistic terms (*datum, status, phenomenon, philosophy, method, music*). The words borrowed into English in the Renaissance period are referred to as **Latin of the third period.**

2.4. The fourth group of borrowings from Latin (**the Latest Latin Loans**) embraces abstract and scientific words adopted through writing and constituting the main part of international vocabulary of English. Here belong a great many Latin abbreviations having English equivalents: *e.g. (exempli gratia) – for example, i.e. (id est) – that is to say, v.v. (vice versa) – the opposite, etc. (et cetera) – and so on, cf. (confer) – compare* and others.

3. **Scandinavian borrowings (8th-11th centuries A.D.).**

From the end of the 8th century to the middle of the 11th century England underwent several Scandinavian invasions which inevitably left their trace on the English vocabulary. It is supposed that the

Scandinavian element in Modern English amounts to 650-700 root-words. They are nouns: *anger, bull, calf, cake, egg, fellow, guest, kid, knife, root, sister, window, husband*; adjectives: *flat, ill, low, loose, odd, rotten, ugly, wrong*; verbs: *cast, call, die, droop, guess, get, give, raise, scream, seem, take, thrust, want*; pronouns: *same, they, their, them* (this is the only case in which English adopted pronouns from another language); geographical place names in Northern England: *Braithwaite, Whitby, Derby,* etc.

Some of the words of this group are easily recognizable as Scandinavian borrowings by the initial *sk-* combination: e.g. *sky, skill, skin, ski, skirt.*

4. **French borrowings.**

4.1. French influence began with Battle of Hastings (1066), in which William the Conqueror defeated King Harold. After the Norman Conquest French became an official language and England became a bi-lingual country, and the impact on the English vocabulary made over two-hundred-years period (**11th-13th centuries**) is immense: French words from the Norman dialect penetrated every aspect of social life. Here is a very brief list of examples of **Norman French borrowings** *which* came from the Norman dialect up to the 14th century:

– administrative words: *state, government, parliament, council, power*;

– legal terms: *court, justice, judge, crime, prison*;

– military terms: *army, war, soldier, officer, battle, enemy*;

– *educational terms: pupil, lesson, library, science, pen, pencil.*

Everyday life was not unaffected by the powerful influence of French words. Numerous terms of everyday life were also borrowed from French in this period: e.g. *table, plate, saucer, dinner, supper, river, autumn, uncle,* etc.

4.2. During the Renaissance period French borrowings came into English from Parisian dialect of French. These borrowings are known as ***Parisian borrowings****: regime, routine, police, machine, ballet, matinee, scene, technique, bourgeois,* etc.

4.3. After 1650 words were borrowed into English from French mainly through **French literature**, but they were not as numerous

and many of them are not completely assimilated. There are the following semantic groups of these borrowings:

– words relating to literature and music: *belles-lettres, conservatoire, brochure, nuance, pirouette, vaudeville*;

– words relating to military affairs: *corps, echelon, fuselage, manoeuvre*;

– words denoting buildings and furniture: *entresol, chateau, bureau*;

– words naming food and cooking: *ragout, cuisine, gourmand*.

Through French many Latin words entered English. Most of these words are terms and learned words possessing low frequency. The total number of French and Latin loans into English is about 57%.

5. **Greek borrowings.**

Many Greek words were introduced into English through Latin, for the Latin language itself was largely indebted to Greek: *church, angel, anthem, school*.

Borrowings from Greek like those from Latin go back to an early period. But the influx of Greek words on a large scale did not begin until the time of the Renaissance. These are mostly bookish borrowings, scientific and technical terms that have become international in such fields as bacteriology, botany, history, physiology, physics, zoology, medicine, etc.

Here are some borrowings which linguistics owes to Greek: *antonym, archaism, dialect, etymology, euphemism, homonym, homophone, hyperbole, idiom, lexicology, metaphor, metonymy, neologism, polysemy, synecdoche, synonym,* etc.

Among numerous Greek borrowings in the English vocabulary we find the following: *analysis, botany, comedy, chorus, democrat, democracy, dialogue, epilogue, episode, epos, elegy, gymnastics, ode, physics, philology, philosophy, problem, prologue, psychology, rhythm, scheme, scene, tragedy,* etc.

6. **Italian borrowings.**

Cultural and trade relations between Italy and England brought many Italian words into English. The earliest Italian borrowing came into English in the 14th century, it was the word *bank* which originated from the Italian *banko* 'bench'. Italian moneylenders and

moneychangers sat in the streets on benches. When they suffered losses they turned over their benches, it was called *banco rotta* from which the English word *bankrupt* originated. In the 17th century some geological terms were borrowed: *volcano, granite, bronze, lava*. At the same time some political terms were borrowed: *manifesto, bulletin*.

But mostly Italian is famous by its influence in music and in all Indo-European languages musical terms were borrowed from Italian: *alto, baritone, basso, tenor, falsetto, solo, duet, trio, quartet, quintet, opera, operetta, libretto, piano, violin*, etc.

Among the 20th century Italian borrowings we can mention: *gazette, incognito, autostrada, fiasco, fascist, dilettante, grotesque, graffiti*, etc.

7. **Spanish borrowings.**

Spanish borrowings came into English mainly through its American variant. There are the following semantic groups of them: trade terms: *cargo, embargo*; names of dances and musical instruments: *tango, rumba, habanera, guitar*; names of vegetables and fruit: *tomato, potato, tobacco, cocoa, apricot, banana* (according to etymological dictionaries the word *banana* was borrowed by Spanish from one of West African languages, possibly Wolof); political terms: *junta*; notions and objects of everyday life: *siesta, patio, mosquito*.

8. **German borrowings.**

There are some 800 words borrowed from German into English. Some of them have classical roots, e.g. in some geological terms, such as: *cobalt, bismuth, zinc, quartz, gneiss, wolfram*. There are also words denoting objects of various spheres of life which originate from German: *hamburger, delicatessen, waltz, seminar, iceberg, lobby, rucksack, kindergarten, Volkswagen*. In the period of the Second World War the words *Luftwaffe, SS-man, Gestapo, gas chamber, blitzkrieg* and others were borrowed.

9. **Dutch borrowings.**

Holland and England have had constant interrelations for many centuries and more than 2000 Dutch words were borrowed into English. Most of them are nautical terms which were mainly borrowed in the 14th century: *freight, skipper, pump, keel, dock, reef, deck, leak, cruise, buoy, yacht*. Others refer to the sphere of painting such as *easel, sketch*.

10. **Russian borrowings.**

There were constant contacts between England and Russia and they borrowed words from one language into the other. Among early Russian borrowings there are mainly words connected with trade relations, such as: *rouble, kopeck, pood, sterlet, vodka* and also words relating to nature, such as: *taiga, tundra, steppe.*

There is also a large group of Russian borrowings which came into English through Russian literature of the 19th century, such as *Narodnik, moujik, duma, zemstvo, volost, ukase*, and also words which were formed in Russian with Latin roots, such as *nihilist, intelligentsia, Decembrist.*

After the October Revolution many new words appeared in Russian connected with the new political system, new culture, and many of them were borrowed into English: *collectivization, Komsomol, udarnik / shock worker, kolkhoz / collective farm, five-year plan*, etc.

One more group of Russian borrowings is connected with perestroika and Russian history of the latest decades: *glasnost, nomenklatura, apparatchik, siloviki.*

11. **Other sources.**

Besides the groups of borrowings mentioned above there are borrowings from a wide range of languages. English has taken over words from most of the other languages with which it has had contact – over 120 languages are on record as sources of the English vocabulary:

– Portuguese: *marmalade, cobra;*
– Finnish: *sauna;*
– Japanese: *karate, judo, hara-kiri, kimono, tycoon;*
– Arabic: *algebra, algorithm, fakir, giraffe, sultan, harem, mattress;*
– Turkish: *yogurt, kiosk, tulip;*
– Farsi: *caravan, shawl, bazaar, sherbet;*
– Eskimo: *kayak, igloo, anorak;*
– Yiddish: *goy, knish, latke, schmuck.*

Two words descending from the same etymological source, but differing in phonemic shape and in meaning are called **etymological doublets**:

– *inch* (borrowed from Latin) and *ounce* (borrowed from French) < Lat. *uncia;*

– **camera** (borrowed from Latin) and *chamber* (borrowed from French) < Lat. *camera;*

– **canal** (borrowed from Norman French) and *channel* (borrowed from Parisian French) < Lat. *canalis;*

– **captain** (borrowed from Norman French) and *chieftain* (borrowed from Parisian French) < Lat. *capitaneus;*

– *skirt* (borrowed from Scandinavian) and *shirt* (native Anglo-Saxon) < < Germanic **skurto-* 'a short garment'.

Etymological triplets (i. e. groups of three words of common root) occur rarer, but here are at least two examples: *hospital* (Latin) – *hostel* (Norman French) – *hotel* (Parisian French); *to capture* (Latin) – *to catch* (Norman French) – *to chase* (Parisian French).

It is often the case that a word is borrowed by several languages, and not just by one. Words of identical origin that occur in several languages as a result of simultaneous or successive borrowings from one ultimate source are called **international words**. The international word-stock of many languages includes the words of various origin: *democracy*, *philosophy*, *mathematics, physics, biology, lexicology, lexicography, logarithm, strategy, drama, lyric, theatre, tragedy*, etc. (Greek); *constitution, republic, socialism, class, dictatorship, auditorium, discipline, institute, rector, student, etc.* (Latin); *allegro, aria, arioso, baritone, concert, piano* (Italian); *football, match, tennis, baseball, hockey, golf, pullover, sweater, shorts, jeans, film, club, cocktail* (English); *balalaika, czar, Kremlin, sambo, sputnik, vodka* (Russian); *cacao, chocolate, mango, banana* (exotic languages) and others.

It is important to note that international words are mainly borrowings. The outward similarity of such words as the English *son,* the German *Sohn* and the Russian *сын* should not lead one to the quite false conclusion that they are international words. They represent the Indo-European group of the native element in each respective language and are **cognates**, i.e. words of the same etymological root, and not borrowings.

2.5. REGIONAL VARIETIES OF THE ENGLISH VOCABULARY

In Modern linguistics the distinction is made between Standard English, territorial (regional) variants and local dialects of the English language.

Standard English may be defined as that form of English which is current and literary, substantially uniform and recognized as acceptable wherever English is spoken or understood either within an English-speaking country or throughout the entire English-speaking world. It is the official language of Great Britain taught at schools and universities, used by the press, the radio and the television and spoken by educated people. Its vocabulary is contrasted to dialect words or dialectisms.

Local dialects are varieties of the English language peculiar to some districts, used as means of oral communication in small localities and having no normalized literary form. Dialects differ from other varieties grammatically, phonologically and sometimes lexically.

There are five main groups of local dialects in Great Britain: Northern, Midland, Eastern, Western and Southern. Every group contains several (up to ten) dialects.

One of the best known Southern dialects is **Cockney**, the regional dialect of London. According to E. Partridge and H. C. Wylde, this dialect exists on two levels. As spoken by the educated lower middle classes it is a regional dialect marked by some deviations in pronunciation but few in vocabulary and syntax. As spoken by the uneducated, Cockney differs from Standard English not only in pronunciation but also in vocabulary, morphology and syntax. B. Shaw's play "Pygmalion" clearly renders this level of Cockney as spoken at the time when the play was written.

The "Encyclopaedia Britannica" treats Cockney as an accent (a variety of the language which is phonetically and / or phonologically only different from other varieties), not acknowledging it the status of a dialect.

Some of the most characteristic features of the Cockney include the following:

– the interchange of [v] and [w], e.g. *wery vell* (this trait was lost by the end of the 19th century);

– the interchange of [f] and [θ], [v] and [ð], e.g. *thing* [fɪŋ] and *father* [fɑːrvə] *(this variation is not exclusively characteristic of Cockney and may be found in several dialects);*

– the omission of the initial [h], e.g. *'eart* for *heart*, *am* for *ham*, *ill* for *hill*, *'Arry* for *Harry*;

– the use of [h] in several words with initial vowels: e.g. *hopen* for *open*, *hup* for *up*, *hus* for *us*; *hart* for *art*;

– the replacement of the diphthong [eɪ] by [aɪ], e.g. the words *day, face, rain, way* are pronounced [daɪ], [faɪs], [raɪn], [waɪ];

– the use of [ɑː] for the diphthong [ɑu], e.g. *house* is pronounced [hɑːs], *now* is pronounced [nɑː];

– the substitution of [ɔː] for the diphthong [ou], e.g. *don't* is pronounced [dɔːnt];

– the replacement of the diphthong [ou] in unstressed positions by the neutral vowel [ə], e.g *window* is pronounced ['wɪndə];

– the omission of the sound [w] in *ekal* (*equal*), *freekently* (*frequently*);

– the omission of the sounds [d] and [t] in *an'* (*and*), *ol'* (*old*), *I don' know* (*I don't know*), *nex* (*next*), *Wa'erloo* (*Waterloo*), *Ci'y* (*City*), *drin' a wa'er* (*drink of water*).

Cockney is lively and witty and its vocabulary is imaginative and colourful. Its specific feature is the so-called rhyming slang, in which some words are substituted by other words rhyming with them. *Boots,* for instance, are called *daisy roots, hat* is *tit for tat, head is sarcastically called a loaf of bread, wife is trouble and strife, shirt is dicky dirt, stairs is apples and pears, etc.*

There are also such specifically Cockney words as *balmy, barmy (a* noun or an adjective meaning 'mentally unbalanced'), *toff (*'a person of the upper class'), *up the pole* ('drunk'), *tanner ('sixpence'), peckish ('hungry'), you'll get yourself disliked* (a remonstrance to a person behaving very badly).

The study of dialects has been made on the basis of information obtained with the help of special techniques: interviews, questionnaires, recording by phonograph and tape-recorder, etc. Data collected in this way show the territorial distribution of certain key words and pronunciations which vary from region to region.

Dialects are now chiefly preserved in rural communities, in the speech of elderly people. Their boundaries have become less stable than they used to be; the distinctive features are tending to disappear with the lifting of population due to the migration of working-class families in search of employment and the growing influence of urban life over the countryside. Dialects are said to undergo rapid changes under the pressure of Standard English taught at schools and the speech habits cultivated by radio, television and cinema.

The dialect vocabulary is remarkable for its conservatism: many words that have become obsolete in Standard English are still kept in dialects, e.g. *to and* 'to envy' < OE *andian*; *barge* 'pig' < OE *berg*; *bysen* 'blind' < OE *bisene* and others.

Variants of English are regional varieties possessing a literary norm. There are variants of English existing on the territory of the United Kingdom (British English, Scottish English and Irish English), and variants existing outside the British Isles (American English, Australian English, Canadian English, New Zealand English, South African English and Indian English). Each of these developed a literature of its own, and is characterized by peculiarities in phonetics, spelling, grammar and vocabulary. British English is often referred to as the written Standard English and its pronunciation is known as Received Pronunciation (RP).

Variants of English in the United Kingdom

Besides **British English (BE)** which is often regarded as a collective term for the forms of English spoken on the British Isles, two other variants of the English language existing on the territory of the UK – **Scottish English** and **Irish English** – can be singled out.

Scottish English and Irish English have a special linguistic status as compared with dialects because of the literature composed in them. The name of Robert Burns, the great national poet of Scotland, is known all over the world. A few examples from his poetry: *slees't* meaning 'slyest', *pawkie* 'cunning, sly', *rief* 'robbery', *prief* 'proof', *aboon* 'above', *shoon* 'shoes'.

The poetic features of Anglo-Irish may be seen in the plays by J. M. Synge and Sean O'Casey. The latter's name is worth an explanation in this connection. *O'* is Gaelic and means 'of the clan of'.

Compare with *Mac* – Gaelic for 'son' found in both Scottish and Irish names. *Sean*, also spelled *Shown* and pronounced [ʃɔːn], is the Irish for *John*.

Words from dialects and variants may penetrate into Standard English. The Irish English gave, for instance, *blarney* 'flattery', *shamrock* 'a trifoliate plant, the national emblem of Ireland'.

The contribution of Scottish English is very considerable. Some of the most frequently used Scotticisms are: *bairn* [bɛən] 'child', *billy* ['bɪlɪ] 'chum', *bonny* ['bɔnɪ] 'handsome', *brogue* [brəug] 'a stout shoe', *glamour* ['glæmə] 'charm', *laddie* ['lædɪ] 'a boy or young man', *lassie* ['læsɪ] 'a girl or young woman', *slogan* ['sləugən] 'a motto' (originally 'a Scottish Highland war cry'), *tartan* ['tɑːt(ə)n] 'a woollen cloth woven in one of several patterns of coloured checks and intersecting lines, especially of a design associated with a particular Scottish clan', *kilt* [kɪlt] 'a knee-length skirt of pleated tartan cloth, traditionally worn by men as part of Scottish Highland dress', *wee* [wiː] 'small', *kirk* [kəːk] 'church', *burgh* ['bʌrə] 'Scottish chartered town', *loch* [lɔk] 'Scottish lake or landlocked arm of the sea', etc.

Variants of English outside the British Isles

American English (AE) is the variety of the English language spoken in the USA.

The American variant of the English language differs from British English in pronunciation, spelling, punctuation, grammar, but chiefly in vocabulary.

Pronunciation

In American English we have *r*-coloured fully articulated vowels, in the combinations: *ar, er, ir, or, ur, our*, etc. In BE the sound [ɔ] corresponds to the AE [ʌ], e.g. *not*. In BE before fricatives and combinations with fricatives the letter *a* is pronounced as [aː], in AE it is pronounced [æ], e.g. *class, dance, answer, fast*, etc.

There are some differences in the position of the stress in BE and AE: *laboratory* [lə'bɔrət(ə)rɪ] – ['labrə͵tôrē], *recess* [rɪ'ses] – ['rē͵ses], *research* [rɪ'sɜːʧ] – ['rē͵sərch], *inquiry* [ɪn'kwaɪərɪ] – ['inkwərē], *excess* [ɪk'ses] – ['ekses], *access* ['ækses] – ['ak͵ses]. Some words in BE and AE

have different pronunciation, e.g. *clerk* [klɑ:k] – [klə:rk], *neither* ['naiðə] – ['ni:ðə], *schedule* ['ʃedju:l] – ['skedju:l].

Punctuation

Periods (.): A period is used after initials of abbreviations. Americans tend to write *U.S., U.N., Mr., Mrs., Dr.* etc., while most British will write *US, UN, Mr, Mrs, Dr* (or even *D'r*), etc. However, many British writers would tend to write without a full stop other abbreviations, such as *Prof, etc, eg*, and so on.

Letter-writing: When starting a formal letter, Americans usually write a colon after the greeting (*Dear Sir:*), while Britons usually write a comma (*Dear Sir,*).

Dates: The date *14th of September 2016* is put down as *14/09/16* in British English and *09/14/16* in American English.

The mark # (often called a hash) is used for 'number' in American English, while in British English the mark № is used.

Numbers

When saying or writing out numbers, the British will put a conjunction *and* before the last part, as in *one hundred and fifty-six* and *two thousand and seven,* whereas Americans go with *one hundred, fifty-six* and *two thousand, seven.*

Americans also have a tendency to read numbers like *1123* as *eleven twenty-three,* which would be *one thousand, one hundred and twenty-three* in Britain unless discussing the year 1123, when *eleven twenty-three* would be the norm.

There is also a historical difference in the use of words *billion, trillion* and *milliard.* Historically, the number of one thousand million (1,000,000,000) was expressed by the word *billion* in the United States and the word *milliard* in Great Britain where the word *billion* meant 'one million million' (1,000,000,000,000). However, the American English (both systems were actually invented by the French) version is now also used in the United Kingdom, particularly in business and government: the word *milliard* is being superseded by *billion* and in both variants the word *trillion* is used to denote the number of one million million.

When referring to the number 0, Americans use the term *zero* almost exclusively, whereas Britons would use *nought* or *o* [əʊ] as well, or *nil* in instances such as sports scores and voting results. The digit *0*, e.g. when reading a phone or account number aloud, is nearly always pronounced [əʊ] in both languages for the sake of convenience.

Spelling

The reform in the English spelling for American English was introduced by the famous American lexicographer Noah Webster who published his first dictionary in 1806. This reform mostly concerned the unpronounced elements and other spelling peculiarities of the words of French or Romanic origin. The following of his proposals, for example, were adopted in American English spelling:

The elements changed	*British English*	*American English*
-our > -or	*colour, honour*	*color, honor*
-ou- > -o-	*favourite, mould*	*favorite, mold*
-re > -er	*centre, theatre*	*center, theater*
-gue > -g **-que > -ck**	*catalogue, dialogue, cheque*	*catalog, dialog, check*
-ce > -se	*defence, offence, licence*	*defense, offense, license*
-ise > -ize, **-yse > -yze**	*realise, harmonise, analyse*	*realize, harmonize, analyze*
-xion > -ction	*connexion, reflexion*	*connection, reflection*
-me > Ø	*programme, gramme*	*program, gram*
-ll- > -l-	*counsellor, modelling*	*counselor, modeling*
-ae- > -e-	*encyclopaedia, anaemia*	*encyclopedia, anemia*

Grammar

The following distinctive features in the field of grammar can be traced in British and American English:

1. **In American English** the auxiliary verb *will* in the first person singular and plural of the Future Indefinite Tense is used, in contrast to the British normative *shall*. The American *I will go there* does not imply modality, as in the similar British utterance (where it

will mean 'I am willing to go there'), but pure futurity. The British-English Future Indefinite shows the same tendency of substituting *will* for *shall* in the first person singular and plural.

2. The present perfect tense is more common in British English than in American, where the simple past tense is usually used instead, especially in oral communication. An American is likely to say *I saw this movie* where an Englishman will probably say *I've seen this film.* Similarly, the past perfect tense is seldom heard in the USA, also replaced by the past simple tense.

3. American English has retained the old form of the Past Participle of the verb *to get: to get – got – gotten: He's gotten much better at playing tennis (AE). He's got much better at playing tennis (BE).*

4. In both American and British English there are verbs having two acceptable forms of the past simple/past participle, the irregular form being generally more common in British English and the regular one being more common in American English: *burn – burnt/burned, lean – leant/leaned, smell – smelt/smelled, spill – spilt/spilled, dream – dreamt/dreamed, learn – learnt/ learned, spell – spelt/spelled, spoil – spoilt/spoiled, light – lit/lighted, forecast – forecast/ forecasted, wed – wed/wedded.* The verb *fit* has two forms in American English (*fit/fitted*) and only one form in British English (*fitted*).

Prepositions

There are some differences between British and American English in the usage of prepositions, such as prepositions with dates, days of the week British English requires *on*: *I start my holiday on Friday*; in American English there is no preposition: *I start my vacation Friday*. In British English they use *by day*, *by night/at night*, in American English the corresponding forms are *days* and *nights*. In British English they say *at home*, in American English *home* is used. Other examples of this kind: *a quarter to five* (BE) – *a quarter of five* (AE), *in the street* (BE) – *on the street* (AE), *to chat to somebody* (BE) – *to chat with somebody* (AE), *different from something* (BE) – *different from/than something* (AE).

Vocabulary

Speaking about the historic causes of vocabulary deviations it is necessary to mention that American English is based on the language imported to the new continent at the time of the first settlements, i.e. on the English of the 17th century. The first colonies were founded in 1607, so that the first colonizers were contemporaries of W. Shakespeare, E. Spenser and J. Milton. Words that died out in Britain, or changed their meaning might survive in the USA. For more than three centuries the American vocabulary developed more or less independently of the British stock and was influenced by the new surroundings and historical contacts of the Americans with other nations on the American continent. That's why the vocabulary used by American speakers has distinctive features of its own. More than that: there are whole groups of words which belong to American vocabulary exclusively and constitute its specific feature. These words are called **Americanisms**.

The first group of such words may be described as **historical Americanisms**, e.g. *fall* 'autumn', *to guess* 'to think', *sick* 'ill, unwell'. In American usage these words still retain their old meanings whereas in British English their meanings have changed or fell out of use.

The second group of Americanisms includes words which are not likely to be discovered in British vocabulary. These words may be called **Americanisms proper**.

Early Americanisms proper were coined by the early Americans which had to find names for the new environment (flora and fauna) and new conditions of life, e.g. *backwoods* 'wooden, uninhabited districts'; *cold snap* 'a sudden frost'; *redbud* 'an American tree having heart-shaped leaves and small budlike pink flowers, the state tree of Oklahoma'; *bluegrass* 'a field-grass characteristic especially of Kentucky and Virginia'; *eggplant* 'a plant with edible fruits'; *blue-jack* 'a small American oak'; *cat-bird* 'a small North-American bird whose call resembles the mewing of a cat'; *sun-fish* 'a fish with a round flat golden body' and others.

Later Americanisms proper are represented by names of objects which are called differently in the United States and in England. For instance, the British *lift* is called *elevator* in the USA,

railway (BE) is called *railroad* (AE), *underground* , *tube* (BE) is called *subway* (AE).

Another group of Americanisms consists of words which may be described as specifically **American borrowings**. These borrowings reflect the historical contacts of the Americans with other nations on the American continent, e.g.

– Negro borrowing: *banjo*;

– Indian borrowings *toboggan, caribou, wigwam, squaw, canoe, moccasin, tomahawk* (phonetic borrowings); *pale-face, war path, war paint*, *pipe of peace*, *fire-water* (translation-loans of Indian origin);

– Spanish borrowings: *ranch* 'a large farm where cattle or other animals are bred', *sombrero* 'a broad-brimmed felt or straw hat', *canyon* 'a deep gorge, typically one with a river flowing through it', *lasso* 'a noosed rope for catching cattle';

– Dutch borrowings: *boss* 'master', *dope* 'a drug', *sleigh* 'a sledge drawn by horses or reindeer';

– French borrowings: *bureau* 'a writing desk', cache 'a hiding place for treasure, provision', depot 'a store-house', *pumpkin* 'a plant bearing large edible fruit';

– Italian borrowings: *pizza* 'a dish of Italian origin', *spaghetti* 'a type of pasta';

– German borrowings: *delicatessen* 'a shop selling cooked meats, cheeses, and unusual or foreign prepared foods', *lager* 'a kind of beer', *hamburger* 'minced beef', *noodle* 'a very thin, long strip of pasta', *schnitzel* 'a thin slice of veal or other light meat, coated in breadcrumbs and fried' and many others.

One more group of Americanisms is represented by **American shortenings**. These are shortenings which were produced on American soil, yet most of them are used in other variants of English as well, e.g. *dorm* (*dormitory*), *mo* (*moment*, e.g. *Just a mo*), *circs* (*circumstances*, e.g. *under the circs*), *n.g.* (*no good*), *b.f.* (*boyfriend*), *g.m.* (*grandmother*), *OK*.

Speaking about the lexical differences between the British and American variants of the English language, the following cases are of importance:

1. Cases where there are no equivalent words in one of the variants. For example, British English has no equivalents to the

American words *drive-in* 'a cinema or restaurant that one can visit without leaving one's car', *FOB* 'a Friend of Bill (Clinton)' (acronym), *Clintonomics* 'the economic policies of US President Bill Clinton'. There are also words found in British English only: e.g. *ISA* 'individual savings account', *Cameronism* 'David Cameron's political philosophy'.

2. Cases where different words are used to denote the same object in the United States and in England:

definition	*BE*	*AE*
'day when offices are closed'	*bank day*	*legal holiday*
'payment in a restaurant'	*bill*	*check*
'front of a car'	*bonnet*	*hood*
'a citizen or native of Great Britain'	*Briton*	*Britisher*
'a road vehicle'	*car*	*automobile*
'a machine that automatically provides cash'	*cashpoint*	*ATM*
'place where medicines are bought'	*chemist's*	*drugstore (or druggist's)*
'potatoes cut into strips and deep-fried'	*chips*	*French fries*
'the dot at the end of a sentence'	*full stop*	*period*
'large bag carried by females'	*hand bag*	*purse*
'contest between two teams'	*match*	*game*
'unit of paper currency'	*note*	*bill*
'a collection of playing cards'	*pack*	*deck*
'fuel for vehicles'	*petrol*	*gasoline*
'code used when sorting mail'	*postcode*	*zip code*
'a group of people waiting for their turn'	*queue*	*line*
'ticket for one trip'	*single*	*one way*
'confectionery'	*sweets*	*candy*
'device for obtaining water'	*tap*	*faucet*
'an airtight sealed container for preserving food'	*tin*	*can*
'portable battery operated light source'	*torch*	*flashlight*
'the business part of a city'	*town centre*	*downtown*
'the name of the final letter of the alphabet'	*zed*	*zee*

3. Cases where some words are used in both variants but are much commoner in one of them. For example, *shop* and *store* are used in both variants, but the former is frequent in British English and the latter – in American English.

4. Cases where one (or more) meaning(s) is (are) specific to either British English or American English. For example, both British and American English have the word *faculty*, but in the meaning of 'all the teachers and other professional workers of a university or college' this word is used only in American English. As a rule, such words have lexical oppositions to these meanings in another variant of English or in Standard English, e.g. AE *faculty* – BE *teaching staff*.

5. Cases where one and the same word in one of its meanings is used oftener in British English than in American English. For example, the most common British meaning of the word *brew* is 'a cup of tea' while in American English this word is mostly used in the meaning 'a beer or coffee drink'.

6. Cases where the same words have developed different meanings in British English and American English. For example, the word *homely* used to describe a person in British English means 'home-loving, domesticated, house-proud', while in American English this word denotes 'unattractive in appearance'. Other examples of this kind are adduced in the following Table.

Word	*UK usage*	*USA usage*
bathroom	'a room containing bath or shower'	'a room containing a toilet'
dinky	'attractively small and neat'	'disappointingly small; insignificant'
mean	'unwilling to give or share things, especially money; not generous'	'vicious or aggressive in behavior'
public school	'fee-paying school'	'state school'
smart	'well-dressed'	'clever'
wash up	'wash dishes after meal'	'wash face and hands'

In some cases the connotational aspect of meaning of such words comes to the fore in one of the variants. For example, the word

politician in British English possesses the meaning 'a person who is professionally involved in politics', thus it is rather neutral, whereas in American English this word is derogatory as it means 'a person who acts in a manipulative and devious way, typically to gain advancement within an organization'.

Word-formation

British English and American English have their own derivational peculiarities that are usually confined to the frequency with which a certain pattern or a means of word-formation is used. For example, some of the affixes more frequently used in American English are: *-ee* (*draftee* 'a person conscripted for military service'), *-ster* (*roadster* 'an open-top automobile with two seats'), *super-* (*supermarket* 'a large self-service shop selling foods and household goods').

American English sometimes favours words that are morphologically more complex, whereas British English uses clipped forms, cf. AE *transportation* – BE *transport*. In some cases the formation of words by means of affixes is more preferable in American English while in British English the form is a back-formation, cf.: AE *burglarize* – BE *burgle* (from *burglar*). Shortening and postpositivation are highly productive ways of word-building in American English, e.g. *to cable up* 'to become connected to a cable TV system'.

As has already been mentioned, American English is not the only variant of English outside the UK. There are also Australian English, Canadian English, New Zealand English, Indian English. Each of these has developed a literature of its own, and is characterized by peculiarities in phonetics, spelling, grammar and vocabulary.

Canadian English is influenced both by British and American English but it also has some specific features of its own. Specifically Canadian words are called canadianisms. They are not very frequent outside Canada, except *shack* 'a hut' and *fathom out* 'to explain'.

The vocabulary of all the variants is characterised by a high percentage of borrowings from the language of the people who inhabited the land before the English colonisers came. Many of them denote some specific realia of the new country: local animals, plants or weather conditions, new social relations, new trades and conditions of labour. The local words for new notions penetrate into the English language

and later on may become international, if they are of sufficient interest and importance for people speaking other languages.

International words coming through **the English of India** are for instance: *bungalow* 'a low house having only one storey', *jute* 'a substance that is used to make cloth and rope', *khaki* 'a strong cotton or wool fabric of a dull brownish-yellow colour', *mango* 'a tropical fruit', *nabob* 'a Muslim official', *pyjamas* 'a loose-fitting jacket and trousers for sleeping in', *sahib* 'a polite title or form of address for a man', *sari* 'a piece of clothing worn especially by Indian women'.

Similar examples, though perhaps fewer in number, such as *boomerang* 'Australian aboriginals hunting weapon', *dingo* 'a wild or half-domesticated dog found in Australia', *kangaroo* 'a large Australian animal', are all adopted into the English language through its **Australian variant** and became international. They denote the new phenomena found by English immigrants on the new continent. Words borrowed from **New Zealand English** are as follows: *kiwi* 'a flightless New Zealand bird with hair-like feathers', *tui* 'a large New Zealand honeyeater', *kauri* 'a tall coniferous forest tree' and others.

Check yourself issues:

1. Define the notion of word-meaning. What are its types?
2. What do we call «the grammatical meaning of the word»?
3. What type of word-meaning is referred to as lexical-grammatical? Why?
4. What components does lexical meaning consist of?
5. What are the main characteristic features of the denotational meaning?
6. How is the connotational component of meaning defined? What connotations does it comprise?
7. Draw a parallel between emotive charge and emotive implication. What features distinguish one from the other?
8. Why are some colloquial and literary words identified as general?
9. What groups of words are included into special colloquial and special literary layers?
10. What linguistic phenomenon is called polysemy?
11. What does the process of enriching the vocabulary consist in?

12. What is meant by a lexical-semantic variant? Who introduced this term?

13. Define the notion of the semantic structure of the word.

14. What oppositions of meanings may the semantic structure of the word include?

15. What does the term "context" denote? What types of context can you name?

16. How many structural types of words are there in English? What are they?

17. What types of English word-formation are considered to be the main types?

18. What is meant by word-derivation?

19. What is conversion? What period in the history of English does it date back to?

20. What parts of speech are especially affected by conversion?

21. According to what criteria are English compounds classified?

22. Describe lexical and graphical shortenings.

23. What are the minor ways of word-formation in English?

24. What layers does the English word-stock consist of etymologically?

25. What groups of words are found within the native vocabulary of English?

26. What languages are called the source of borrowing and the origin of borrowing?

27. What criteria underlie different classifications of borrowings?

28. How is Standard English defined?

29. What varieties of the English language are referred to as local dialects? How many groups of local dialects are there in English?

30. What varieties of the English language are called variants of English? What variant of English in the United Kingdom and outside the United Kingdom do you know?

Literature:

1. Антрушина Г. Б. Лексикология английского языка : учеб. пособие для студентов вузов, обучающихся по пед. специальностям / Г. Б. Антрушина, О. В. Афанасьева, Н. Н. Морозова. – 7-е изд. – М. : ДРОФА, 2007. – 287 с.

2. Арбекова Т. И. Лексикология английского языка (практический курс): Учеб. пособие для 2-3 курсов ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. / Т. И. Арбекова. – М.: Высшая школа, 1977. – 240 с.

3. Арнольд И. В. Лексикология современного английского языка: Учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. – М.: Высшая школа, 1986. – 295 с. – на англ. яз.

4. Бабич Г. Н. Лексикология английского языка. – Екатеринбург: Уральское издательство; Москва: Большая медведица, 2005. – 176 с. – на англ. яз

5. Гвишиани Н. Б. Современный английский язык. Лексикология = Modern English Studies. Lexicology: Учеб. пособие для студ. филол. фак. высш. учеб. заведений. – М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2009. – 224 с.

6. Дубенец Э. М. Лексикология современного английского языка: лекции и семинары. Пособие для студентов гуманитарных вузов. – М.: «Глосса-Пресс», 2002. – 192 с. – на англ. яз.

7. Зыкова И. В. Практический курс английской лексикологии = Practical Course in English Lexicology : учеб. пособие для студ. лингв. вузов и фак. ин. языков. – М.: Издательский центр «Академия», 2008. – 288 с. – на англ. яз.

8. Лексикология английского языка: Учебник для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. / Р. З. Гинзбург, С. С. Хидекель, Г. Ю. Князева, А. А. Санкин. – М.: Высш. школа, 1979. – 269 с. – на англ. яз.

9. Навчальний посібник з теорії англійської мови : для студ., які вивч. англ. як другу іноземну мову / [уклад.: С. Т. Богатирьова, Т. Я. Волкова, Н. М. Косенко] ; Донецький нац. ун-т, Ф-т інозем. мов, Каф. англ. філол. – Донецьк : ДонНУ, 2005. – 130 с.

10. Ніколенко А. Г. Лексикологія англійської мови – теорія і практика. – Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2007. – 528 с. – англійською мовою.

11. Раевская Н. Н. Курс лексикологии английского языка / Н. Н. Раевская. – К.: Вища школа, 1971. – 336 с. – на англ. яз.

3. STYLISTICS

3.1. LEXICAL STYLISTIC DEVICES

Among multiple functions of the word the main one is to denote, denotational meaning thus being the major semantic characteristic of the word. Now we shall deal with the foreground of this particular function, i.e. with such types of denoting phenomena that create additional expressive, evaluative, subjective connotations.

The act of name-exchange between the existing names, approved by long usage and fixed in dictionaries, and new, occasional, individual ones, inspired by the speaker's subjective view, is traditionally referred to as **transference**, (for, indeed, the name of one object is transferred onto another, proceeding from their **similarity** (of shape, colour, function, etc.) or **closeness** (of material existence, cause / effect, instrument / result, part / whole relations etc.)).

The interaction between dictionary and contextual lexical meanings is called **transferred meaning.** Each type of intended substitution result in a stylistic device called also a **trope**.

Metaphor

Metaphor is the result of transference of the name of one object to the other, which is based upon **similarity** (analogy) of the objects. **Metaphor** is also defined as the power of realizing two lexical meanings simultaneously, it is generally regarded as one of the expressive speech means or methods to develop polysemy in the language.

Metaphor has two parts: the **tenor** and the **vehicle**. The **tenor** is the subject to which attributes are ascribed. The **vehicle** is the object whose attributes are borrowed.

The nature of metaphor is versatile, so metaphors can be classified according to a number of principles.

1. Metaphors, like all other stylistic devices, can be classified according to their **degree of unexpectedness**, to the pragmatic effect produced upon the addressee. Thus metaphors, which are commonly used in speech and even turn into idiomatic phrases (phraseological expressions) that are fixed in dictionaries as expressive means of a

language, are **trite** (or **dead**) metaphors. Metaphors which are absolutely unexpected, i.e. are quite unpredictable, are called **genuine** (or **original**, **fresh**) metaphors.

Dead metaphors are ones that are overused in speech, so they have lost their freshness of expression. They often sound banal and hackneyed, like clichés; they are time-worn and well rubbed into the language. Such metaphors often turn into idiomatic phrases (phraseological units) that are fixed in dictionaries: *to prick up one's ears, to burn with desire, seeds of evil, a flight of imagination, to be sunk in a deep thought, to collect appetite, to get something out of one's mind, to drift into bankruptcy, a spark of interest, a ray of hope, floods of tears, a storm of indignation, a shadow of a smile, virgin soil* (целина)*, a rooted prejudice, to fish for compliments, to over-egg the pudding, a nail in the coffin, etc.*

Trite metaphors are often used by authors to describe different situations and phenomena, e.g.:

Ned <u>cupped his mouth round Leclare's ear</u> *and breathed…*(S. Fry)

When <u>the dust</u> *of defeat* <u>had settled</u> *and the present leader had gone, as go he must, the Tories would look to someone like Ashley to lead them to victory in 2005.*

Mr Gaine was still <u>wrestling with the crossword</u> (S. Fry).

Original metaphors are not registered in dictionaries. They are created by the speaker's or writer's imagination and sound fresh, expressive and unpredictable. The wider is the gap between the associated objects the more striking and unexpected is the metaphor. Not only objects can be compared in a metaphor, but also phenomena, actions or qualities:

It sounded <u>pretty thin</u> *to me, but they* <u>bought</u> *it and* <u>chewed</u> *on it for a while.*

'Must have been fun for him to have <u>a blank canvas on which to paint,</u>*' said Oliver. '*<u>Dumb brick of a child</u>*, eager to learn'.*

2. Metaphors can also be classified <u>according to their structure</u> or according to complexity of the image created. Metaphor has no formal limitation: it can be a word, a phrase, any part of a sentence, or a sentence as a whole. There are such metaphors as **simple** (or **elementary**) and **prolonged** (or **sustained, complex**) (сложная метафора).

A **simple metaphor** consists of a single word or word-combination expressing indiscrete notion:

Portia had started using the word 'completely' a lot recently. Ned peppered his letters with it, and she thought of it as his word.

Was he now nothing more than a bird in a gilded cage?

A **sustained metaphor** appears in cases when a word that has been used metaphorically (**the central image**) makes other words of the sentence or paragraph also realize their metaphoric meanings (**contributory** or **supporting images**).

...the tide of history had washed weirder flotsam than Barson-Garland into Downing Street and no doubt would do so again.

To understand a sustained metaphor a broader context is often required because such metaphors include more than one element of the text:

No one rode the dot.com bubble harder, funding young, energetic and ambitious dreamers whose ventures, when floated on the European technology exchanges, made opening valuations that caused the eyes of seasoned traders to pop. Some said that the swollen, iridescent membrane of e-commerce would soon burst, but for the moment no one was soaring higher than Simon Cotter of CotterDotCom. The doomsayers insisted that the balloon was given its stratospheric lift by hot air and that the world was growing giddy with altitude sickness.

Sustained metaphors are also created when the speaker (writer) in his desire to present an elaborated image does not limit its creation to a single metaphor but offers a group of them, each supplying another feature of the described phenomenon.

What was this telephony revolution, with its faxes, pagers, cellular and satellite phones, email, intranets and real-time video-conferencing but a cheap and faster way to chatter and gossip and jabber? If it was more than that, then it could keep for the moment. Give us time to think, they said. We who wait on the platform may arrive later than those that jump aboard the speeding train, but we've a better chance of a good seat and a restful journey. We get there in the end, sounder in wind and limb. Only bandwagons are to be jumped upon, and bandwagons always crash at the first dangerous corner.

3. Apart from being a most powerful stylistic device metaphor is also considered to be a universal means of nomination. Thus according to their <u>functional types</u> we can distinguish between **nomination(al) (cognitive)** metaphors and **figurative (imaginative)** metaphors.

Nomination metaphors, as distinct from figurative ones, are deprived of stylistic information. They are intended to name new objects or phenomena of the objective world. A nomination metaphor is purely technical device of nomination, when a new notion or object is named by means of old vocabulary, e.g.: *the arm of a chair, the foot of a hill, the eye of a needle, the mouth of a river, the keyboard and the mouse of a computer, caterpillar tractor, butterfly stoke, a coat of paint, belt of fire, shift of tenses.*

The most expressive kind of metaphor is **imaginative metaphor.** Imaginative metaphors are occasional and individual. They are bright, image-bearing, picturesque and poetic:

I think perhaps Sir Charles and the young lady here should leave before the <u>media circus</u> arrives and all <u>hell breaks loose</u>.

I shrugged with open hands as if to suggest that, while I may have picked up the odd pebble of interest on the shore, like Newton I was all too aware of the great ocean of knowledge that lay undiscovered before me.

The **semantic classifications** of metaphors are quite numerous and are based on various associative principals. Among them there are some based on the subject of the vehicle, for example, the names of parts or functions of the human body, illnesses, etc. are grouped under the heading <u>anthropomorphic metaphors</u>, e.g.: *the hands of a clock, the leg of a chair, the nose of a car, a finger of a bit.*

Boring school gossip, Number One: I've been made <u>Head</u> Boy.

As Secretary of State for Northern Ireland he had extended the limits of internment without trial and authorised all kinds of extreme measures — <u>'strong medicine for a strong infection'</u> he had said to Ned once, without revealing details.

<u>Zoomorphic</u> (animalistic) and <u>vegetative</u> (floristic) metaphors deal with transferences of meanings connected with animals, birds and different plants and their parts, e.g.:

If this is the quality of our political leaders, I thought, then no wonder the country has gone to the <u>dogs</u>.

'Vasilly Smyslov, world champion from the Soviet Union. I saw him play, as it happens. A master of the endgame and as wily a <u>fox</u> as you'd care to be matched against'.

The beautiful, the ridiculous uniform of <u>tail</u> coats and striped trousers discarded in favour of sweaters and cords.

'You're sure we weren't <u>tailed</u> on the way up?'

'I sprang from an impoverished <u>branch</u> of the grand and ancient Scottish family of Fraser and was christened Simon'.

The objects and phenomena of <u>inanimate nature</u> often become the vehicle of metaphors, too, e.g.:

Every turn and bump that Mr Gaine negotiated, driving in the cabin up front, sent through him blinding <u>surges</u> of a pain so intense that at each <u>wave</u> of it, orange and yellow <u>light</u> <u>flashed</u> in his eyes, the blood roared in his ears and the very guts within him seemed to explode in shock.

<u>Social metaphors</u> deal with such spheres of human activity as war, crime, entertainment, economy, sport, politics, different occupations, etc.:

A book that would blow the whistle on every dirty trick, every hypocritical evasion and every filthy lie that ever came out of the west in its squalid <u>battle</u> for supremacy over its perceived enemy.

Perhaps such a lack of cooperation, <u>allied</u> to the arrogant Maddstone manner, had so annoyed the arresting officers that they had thrown him in a cell simply in order <u>to teach him a lesson</u>.

The ground for similarity <u>in artifact metaphors</u> comprises things and objects created by a human and such metaphors are the names of mechanisms, machines, buildings, different equipment, devices, household utensils, etc.:

'I don't like to see you thrashing your <u>engine</u> like this,' he would say. 'There is nowhere to take it. It can only burn you up.'

'Well now — dear God, you've a lot to learn about chess, young monkey. Have you never heard of a fork? —well now, I thought that must be so. She had reformer and new broom stitched into her milken breasts.

People can also project their life experience onto the objects and phenomena that surround them. This is reflected in <u>orientation</u> metaphors, i.e. metaphors that are built on the basic on a person's

orientation in space. Thus *happiness* orients upwards, *sadness* – downwards; *health* and *life* are up, *sickness* and *death* are down; *having control* is up, *being subjected to control* is down; *virtue* is up, *depravity and sin* are down; *rational* is up, *emotional* is down.

My spirit rose.
I am feeling down.
I am feeling up.
I fell into depression.
His health is declining.
He is in the upper echelon.
He fell from power.
My means hang on the lowest rung of the monetary ladder.
His income fell last year.
He is at the peak of his career.
He is at the bottom of social hierarchy.
She has high standards.
He fell in the abyss of depravity.

Imaginative metaphor is one of the most powerful means of creating images and **its main function is aesthetic**. Its natural sphere of usage is poetry and elevated prose.

Metaphor can serve as a helpful means of understanding human psychology and even psychology of a nation, as it reflects typical associations and stereotypes.

Canonized metaphors tend to become **symbols**. A symbol is an object, which stands for something else. It is a reference in speech or in writing, which is made to stand for ideas, feelings, events, or conditions. A symbol is usually something tangible or concrete, which evokes something abstract. The following are standard symbols in the context of English:

the rose often stands for *love, the dove* stands for *peace, the cross* stands for *Christianity, the red colour* stands for *passion, the ace of spades* stands for *death.*

If he wanted, a man can become American. He can become Jewish. He can, like Leslie Howard, make himself not just English but a symbol of all that England ever stood for.

The metaphor study has been so popular since the ancient times and the scientific works have been so numerous that in the second half

of the XXth century metaphor became an independent object of linguistic theory and this new branch of modern linguistic, called by some linguists **linguometaphorology,** aims at studying the generalizing nature of metaphor as a mental-verbal unit.

Regardless of the types of metaphors you favour, keep in mind Aristotle's observation 2,500 years ago in Rhetoric: "Those words are most pleasant which give us new knowledge. Strange words have no meaning for us; common terms we know already. It is metaphor which gives us most of this pleasure".

Metonymy

Metonymy is based on **contiguity (nearness)** of objects, i.e. a relation between the dictionary and contextual meanings based on some kind of association connecting the two concepts, which these meanings represent.

The <u>school</u> used him as some sort of sailing instructor… (*school* 'an institution for educating children; college' → *school* 'the pupils and staff of a school').

Transference of names in metonymy doesn't involve the necessity for two different words to have a common component in their semantic structures, as in the case with metaphor, but proceeds from the fact that two objects (phenomena) have common grounds of existence in reality. Such words as *cup* and *tea* have no linguistic (semantic) nearness, but the first one may serve the container of the second, hence – the conversational cliché *Will you have another cup?*, which is a case of metonymy, once **original**, but due to long use, no more accepted as a **fresh** stylistic device, but as a case of a **trite** metonymy.

Many attempts have been made to pin-point the types of relation which metonymy is based on.

The semantic classification of metonymic transfers in recent research is made on the basis of the analysis of explanatory dictionary entries. The words with the transferred metonymic meanings refer to this or that type if there are common semantic markers in their primary meanings.

The main types of metonymic transfers comprise **causal, attributive, local, temporal, synecdochical and some mixed**

types, which, in their turn, are stratified into different semantic models and thematic groups.

Thus, the **causal** type of metonymic transferences comprises metonyms whose dictionary definitions have the semes 'action', 'state', 'process', 'event', 'doer of the action', 'object of the action', 'instrument of the action',e.g.

disappointment 'sadness or displeasure caused by the non-fulfilment of one's hopes or expectations' → *disappointment* 'a person or thing that causes disappointment';

More examples*: government, guard, suicide, pen, gun, love.*

The metonymic transfers of **attributive** type have in their meaning the semantic signs 'quality', 'ability', 'feature', e.g.:

babushka 'an old woman or grandmother' → *babushka* 'a headscarf tied under the chin, typical of those traditionally worn by Russian women'.

More examples: *skirt, general, red, Virgo, talent, three.*

The nouns whose semantic structure contains the semes 'territory', 'place', 'premises' are referred to as **local** metonymy, e.g.:

dish 'a shallow, flat-bottomed container for cooking or serving food' → *dish* 'the food contained or served in a dish';

country 'a nation with its own government, occupying a particular territory' → *country* 'the people of a nation'.

More examples: *village, ship, chair.*

Temporal metonymy is represented in English by the nouns which have the primary meanings 'time', 'period', e.g.: *age* 'the period of time that a person, animal, or plant has lived or is expected to live' → *age* 'generation'.

More examples: *11th of September; 4th of July*

Synecdoche (quantitative metonymy) is based on the interaction of the names of a part and the whole, e.g.: *blood* 'the red liquid that circulates in the arteries and veins...' → *blood* 'a person of specified descent'.

More examples: *hand, face, soprano, enemy*

The **mixed** type of metonymic transfers combine in their meanings the seme signs of different types of metonymic transfers, e.g.:

administration 'the process or activity of running a business, organization, etc.' → *administration* 'the term of office of a political

leader or government' → *administration* 'the people responsible for running a business, organization, etc.'.

Youth naturally appealed to youth and she told herself that there was no reason for her to feel anxious if for a few days the two of them were so wrapped up in one another that Tom had no thought for her – (*youth* 'a state or period of being young' → *youth* 'young people').

More examples: *snobbery, college, manhood.*

On losing its originality metonymy becomes instrumental in enriching the vocabulary of the language.

I wouldn't even go for my exit-permit till the last moment in case she had a relation in the immigration-office – (*relation* 'the way in which two or more people or things are connected' → *relation* 'a person who is connected by blood or marriage; a relative').

"Nothing to do with the fact that he didn't select you for the first eleven?" – (*eleven* 'the number and figure 11' → *eleven* 'a group or unit of eleven people or things; a sports team of eleven players').

Genuine (**original**, **contextual**) metonymy, though generally based on the usual models mentioned above, reveals a quite unexpected substitution of one word for another, or one concept for another, on the ground of some strong impression produced by a chance feature of the thing. It must also be noted that metonymy, being a means of building up imagery, generally concerns concrete object, which are generalized.

There was nothing I wanted there, except to get away from that silence sitting in a chair – (*silence* 'complete absence of sound' → *silence* occasional meaning 'a person who is silent').

...hadn't she been fond of me and hadn't she left me for Pyle? She had attached herself to youth and hope and seriousness and now they had failed her more than age and despair.

He made his way through perfume and conversation.

He could see the answering machine light flashing and ignored it. Probably Jo, Jane or Julie moaning about money. Why couldn't he have married a girl whose name didn't begin with a J?... In the next life he'd run a mile before speaking to any Js.

Generally to decipher genuine metonymy a broader context than that required by a metaphor is necessary. It is obligatory to understand the words in their proper meanings first and only then it is possible to grasp the metonymy.

Rufus had sent Michael Jackson, Madonna, Marilyn Monroe and the Prince of Wales to the launch of another new e-commerce company… He had better things to do than watch Madonna spilling wine and Michael Jackson having his hair pulled by drunken journalist.

Sometimes the reader or listener can not understand metonymy without so called "background knowledge":

Tim Robbins escapes and the prison governor commits suicide. Morgan_Freeman finally gets his parole and joins Robbins in Mexico… (the film 'The Shawshank Redemption').

There are some words in English which can be used in both metaphoric and metonymic meanings in different contexts, e.g.:

second hand 'extra hand in some watches and clocks which moves round to indicate the seconds' – metaphor;

second-hand '(of goods) having had a previous owner; not new' – metonymy.

In such cases either metaphor is developed on the basis of metonymy or vice versa, e.g.:

…certainly it would be impossible to guess that all his attention was on this awkward new <u>arrival</u> into the world of the sun-room – (*arrival* 'the action or process of arriving' → *arrival* 'a person who has arrived somewhere';

"…he is your granddad is he?" "He is my father", said Ned defensively. "I was a…a late <u>arrival</u>" – (*arrival* 'a baby who has just been born').

Metonymy is often treated to be less expressive than metaphor, it may perform the nomination function (as the subject or an object) and serve as a means of "the language economy", i.e. it makes speech economical, though being used in the **predicative syntactic function** even the usual metonymy regularly performs the characterizing function.

"I'm the complete <u>sensation</u> of this place".

I don't know why Pyle stomachs you. Maybe it's because he's <u>Boston</u>. I'm <u>Pittsburg</u> and proud of it.

Genuine metonymy builds up imagery, points out this or that feature of the object described. Sometimes there are cases in which several metonyms of different types are used, which makes the statement sound emotionally coloured.

…hadn't she been fond of me and hadn't she left me for Pyle? She had attached herself to youth and hope and seriousness and now they had failed her more than age and despair.

Synecdoche is traditionally treated as the variety of metonymy, which is realized in two variants:

1) naming the whole object by mentioning the part of it or the singular instead of the plural:

They were twins, and the eye was shocked and incredulous at such cheery duplication.

…perhaps they thought the sound of our white voices – for voices have a colour too, yellow voices sing and black voices gargle, while ours just speak – would give an impression of numbers.

A hungry belly has no ears (proverb).

2) using a name of the whole object to denote a constituent part of this object:

"We didn't much like the idea of his going on the stage: you see, on both sides of the family, we are the army, but he was set on it" (S.Maugham).

In most cases the latter type of synecdoche is combined with different types of metonymy, mostly with the local one:

I think I might have played for Oxford and maybe even for a county if things had turned out differently.

Irony

Irony is a stylistic device which like metaphor and metonymy is based on the simultaneous realization of the two logical meanings – dictionary and contextual, but the two meanings stand in opposition to each other. To put it differently irony is the contradiction between the said and implied, e.g:

It must be delightful to find oneself in a foreign country without a penny in one's pocket.

She turned with the sweet smile of an alligator.

Last time it was a nice, simple, European-style war.

In these examples we dealt with **verbal** irony – a type of irony when it is possible to indicate the exact word whose contextual meaning diametrically opposes its dictionary meaning, in whose meaning we can trace the contradiction between the said and implied. But the context

may vary from the minimal – a word combination – to the context of a whole book. There are cases of **sustained** irony – a number of statements, the whole of the text, in whose meaning we can trace the contradiction between the said and implied. The sustained irony is formed by the contradiction of the speaker's (writer's) considerations and the generally accepted moral and ethical codes. Many examples of sustained irony are supplied by D. Defoe, J. Swift or by such XX-century writers as S. Lewis, K. Vonnegut, E. Waugh and others.

But every Englishman is born with a certain miraculous power that makes him master of the world. As the great champion of freedom and national independence he conquers and annexes half the world and calls it Colonization.

Four and a half years ago, during his barmitzvah, he had mentally crossed his fingers and thought scabrous blasphemous thoughts throughout the ceremony. For weeks afterwards he had been in dread of God's revenge. None had come. God had expressed his wrath by giving him good friends, sound health and kindly parents. To crown it all he was now to become a favourite in the Court of King Cotter.

This stylistic device is realized when the speaker intentionally breaks the principles of sincerity of speech: ironical 'good' means 'bad', 'enough' means 'not enough', 'pleased' means 'displeased'.

Irony must not be confused with humour, although they have very much in common.

Treasure Island, did you ever read that?

'Oh yes!' said Ned enthusiastically. 'I must have read it at least six times'.

'Only six times? And what was wrong with it? The book's a masterpiece'.

Humour always causes laughter but the function of irony is not confined to producing a humorous effect. It rather expresses a feeling of irritation, displeasure, pity or regret. Irony is generally used to convey a negative meaning.

I'm sure only those who've holidayed on Mars for the last two years have failed to hear of CotterDotCom.

The contextual meaning always conveys the negation of the positive concepts embodied in the dictionary meaning.

Bookcases covering one wall boasted a half-shelf of literature.

Zeugma

Zeugma is a cluster stylistic device, when a polysemantic verb that can be combined with nouns of most varying semantic groups is deliberately used with two of more homogeneous members, which are not connected semantically e.g.:

He took his hat and his leave.

In very many cases polysemantic verbs, that have a practically unlimited lexical valency, can be combined with different nouns, which is highly characteristic of English prose.

She possessed two false teeth and a sympathetic heart.

My mother was wearing her best grey dress and gold brooch and a faint pink flush under each cheek bone.

The words are used in the same grammatical but different semantic relations to two adjacent words in the context, the semantic relations being, on the one hand, literal, and, on the other, transferred.

He gave her a folded hundred mark note and his best smile.

'Ashley, sir,' I said, as Ned buried himself in confusion and the menu.

Pun (a play on words, paronomasia)

Pun is another stylistic device based on the interaction of the two well-known meanings of a word or phrase. It is a simultaneous realisation of two meanings through misinterpretation of one speaker's utterance by the other, which results in his remark dealing with a different meaning of the misinterpreted word (polysemy) or its homonym, e.g.:

"Have you been seeing any spirits?" "Or taking any?" – added Bob Allen. – (The first "spirit" refers to supernatural forces, the second one – to strong drinks).

Visitor to a little boy:

-Is your mother engaged?

-Engaged?! She is already married!

A pun can also be based upon similarity of pronunciation:

John said to Pete at dinner: "Carry on". But Pete never ate carrion.

When I am dead, I hope it may be said: "His sins were scarlet, but his books were read"

The speaker's intended violation of the listener's expectation produces stylistic effect, e.g.:

There comes a <u>period</u> in every man's life, but she is just a <u>semicolon</u> in his. – (a punctuation mark instead of an interval of time).

In comparison with zeugma, which is the realization of two meanings with the help of a verb, the pun is more independent because there need not necessarily be a word in the sentence to which the pun-word refers.

A horse is a very <u>stable</u> animal.

Now, you'll have to excuse me. Things are getting rather busy. I'm in the middle of trying to buy a newspaper. You've no idea how complicated a process it's turning out to be.'

'Really? I do it every day,' said Albert, surprised at his own daring. 'You just hand over money to the man in the shop and... voilà!'

Puns are often used in riddles and jokes.

-What is the difference between a school-master and an engine-driver?

-One trains the mind and the other minds the train.

- What is the meaning of the word matrimony?

- Father says it isn't a word, it's a sentence.

A young lady, weeping softly into her mother's lap:

-My husband just can't bear children!

-He needn't bear children, my dear. You shouldn't expect too much of your husband.

Epithet

Epithet is a stylistic device based on the interplay of emotive and logical meaning in an attributive word, phrase or even sentence, used to characterise and object and pointing out to the reader, and frequently imposing on him, some of the properties or features of the object with the aim of giving an individual perception and evaluation of these features or properties, e.g.: *wild wind, loud ocean, remorseless dash of billows, heart-burning smile; destructive charms, glorious sight, encouraging smile, the wine-dark sea*

Epithet is markedly subjective and evaluative. It expresses characteristics of an object, both existing and imaginary.

There are **strings of epithets** and **transferred epithets.**

Chains or strings of epithets present a group of homogeneous attributes varying in number from three up to sometimes twenty and even more, e.g.:

You're a <u>scolding</u>, <u>unjust</u>, <u>abusive</u>, <u>aggravating</u>, <u>bad old</u> creature.

That he, Ashley Barson-Garland, should be patronised by this <u>brainless</u>, <u>floppy-haired</u>, <u>goody-two-shoed</u>, <u>squeaky-clean</u>, <u>doe-eyed</u>, <u>prefect-perfect</u>, <u>juicy-fruity</u> piece of —

He was English. One hundred per cent hearts of <u>oak</u>, <u>village green</u>, <u>mapole</u> and <u>mutton</u> English.

Transferred epithets (смещенный эпитет) are ordinary logical attributes generally describing the state of a human being, but made to refer to an inanimate object, e.g.: *the sleepless pillow, unbreakfasted morning, a disapproving finger, happy meal*

'Look at that,' he said, stabbing down an <u>angry finger</u>.

I had decided to offer him exactly the same <u>spaniel-eyed tactlessness</u> and <u>clumsy sympathy</u> that he so crassly meted out to me.

In comparison with the Russian language in English there are specific structures of epithets such as inverted constructions and phrase-attributes.

Inverted or **reversed** epithets are composed of two nouns linked in an *of*-phrase. Inverted epithets based on the contradiction between the logical and the syntactical: logically defining becomes syntactically defined and vice versa, e.g.:

this devil of a woman instead of *this devilish woman*,

the prude of a woman ('a prudish woman'),

the toy of a girl ('a small, toylike gir'l),

the kitten of a woman ('a kittenlike woman')

A phrase or even a whole sentence may become an epithet. Such compositional models in English are called **phrase (phrasal) epithets**. They are expressed by word-combinations or clauses of quotation type, e.g.

go-to-devil request

head-to-toe beauty

I-don't-want-to do-it feeling

…a move-if-you-dare expression

Phrase-epithets always produce an original impression.

There is a sort of <u>'Oh-what-a-wicked-world-this-is-and –how-I-wish-I-could-do-something-to-make-it-better-and-nobler'</u> expression about Montmorency that has been known to bring the tears into the eyes of pious old ladies and gentlemen.

Well, do you have a <u>double-poison-and-cut-my-throat</u> secret?

Carry off that natural, effortless <u>taking-it-all-for-granted</u> air.

Practically any phrase or sentence which deals with the psychological state of a person may serve as an epithet. The phrases and sentences transformed into epithets lose their independence and assume a new quality which is revealed both in the intonation pattern (that of an attribute) and graphically (by being hyphenated).

The epithet is a direct and straightforward way of showing the author's attitude towards the things described, whereas other stylistic devices, even image-bearing ones, will reveal the author's evaluation of the object only indirectly.

Oxymoron

Oxymoron is a combination of two words (mostly an adjective and a noun or an adverb with an adjective) in which the meanings of the two clash, being opposite in sense. It helps to emphasise contradictory qualities simultaneously existing in the described phenomenon as a dialectical unity, e.g.:

low skyscraper, sweet sorrow, nice rascal, pleasantly ugly face, horribly beautiful, to shout mutely, to cry silently, hot snow, loving hate, deafening silence

the street damaged by improvements,

silence was louder than thunder.

Predicative relations are also possible in oxymoron: *Sofia's beauty is horrible.*

If the primary meaning of the qualifying word changes of weakens, the stylistic effect of oxymoron is lost. This is the case with what were once oxymoronic combinations, for example, *'awfully nice', 'terribly sorry'* and the like, where the adjectives have lost their primary logical meaning and are now used with emotive meaning only, as intensifiers.

"Gosh, that's all right. My fault, actually. Please don't worry yourself. Awfully sorry".

Oxymoron has great expressive potential. It is normally used in cases when there is a necessity to point out contradictory and complicated nature of the object described.

Barson-Garland had ordered a boiled egg crammed with Beluga caviar which he ate with <u>repulsive elegance</u> as he talked.

Antonomasia

Antonomasia is a lexical stylistic device in which a proper name is used instead of a common noun or vice versa, i.e. a lexical stylistic device in which the nominal meaning of a proper name is suppressed by its logical meaning or the logical meaning acquires the new – nominal – component, e.g.:

He took little satisfaction in telling each <u>Mary</u> (=any female), shortly after she arrived, something ...

He is the Napoleon of crime (= a genius in crime as great as Napoleon was in wars).

John Doe, Jane Doe – an anonymous male/female party, typically the plaintiff, in a legal action; a hypothetical average man/woman;

Some proper names are treated as common ones only by some particular cultures. Thus, in English there are well-known to the American readers "allusive names" such as:

Lincoln – a symbol of honesty and incorruptibility;

Longfellow – poetic talent;

Barrymore – a talent for acting (after the name of John Barrymore (1882-1942);

Benedict Arnold – a synonym of treachery and betrayal (After Benedict Arnold (1741 - 1801), American general and traitor. During the American Revolution, with Ethan Allan, he was instrumental in the capture of Fort Ticonderoga but later planned to betray West Point to the British. He fled behind British lines and lived the rest of his life in Britain. His name became synonymous with "traitor".)

There are also so-called **token** or **telling (speaking) names** in the works of classical literature whose origin from common nouns is still clearly perceived. Antonomasia is intended to point out the leading,

most characterizing feature of a person or event, peculiarities of behavior, outlook, e.g.:

Miss Languish 'Мисс Томней',

Mr. Backbite 'М-р Клевентаун',

Mr. Credulous 'М-р Доверч',

Mr. Snake 'М-р Гад' (Sheridan).

Lord Chatterino 'Лорд Балаболо',

John Jaw 'Джон Брех',

Island Leap-High 'Остров Высокопрыгия' (F.Cooper).

Mr. What's-his-name, *Mr. Owl Eyes*, *Colonel Slidebottom*, *Mr. Surface, Miss Sarcastic, Miss Sneerface, Becky Sharp, Miss Toady* (подхалим)*, Murdstone* (murder+stone),

The next speaker was a tall gloomy man. Sir Something Somebody. (J.B.Priestley).

It is very important to note that this device is mainly realized in the written language, because generally **capital letters** are the only signals to denote the presence of this stylistic device.

He could be charming. He could be romantic. But she gave him no chance to be. Mr Wonderful, Mr Perfect absorbed her whole being.

However, antonomasia is not used in belles-letters style only. It is often found in publicistic style in magazine and newspaper articles, e.g.:

I suspect that the Noes and Don't Knows would far outnumber the Yesses (The Spectator).

Mr. Facing-Both-Ways doesn't get very far in this world (The Times)

Antonomasia is also treated as a lexical stylistic device in which a common noun serves as an individualising name, e.g.:

There are three doctors in an illness like yours. I don't mean only myself, my partner and the radiologist who does your X-rays, the three I'm referring to are Dr. <u>Rest</u>, Dr. <u>Diet</u> and Dr. <u>Fresh Air</u>.

As it is seen from the above mentioned examples, on the one hand, antonomasia can be treated as a subtype of metaphors and metonymies, on the other hand, there are cases of periphrases with proper names.

Allegory

Allegory is akin to metaphor and in its most common form is a variety of antonomasia but the domain of allegory is not a sentence but the whole text – a poem or a story.

In the case of allegory the names of objects or characters of a story are used in a figurative sense, representing some more general things, good or bad qualities, etc. This is often found in fables and parables. Completely allegoric are such fables by I. Krylov as "Elephant and Mongrel", "Monkey and Spectacles".

It is also a typical feature of proverbs, which contain generalizations, express some general moral truths:

All is not gold that glitters (= impressive words of people are not always really so good as they seem);

Every cloud has a silver lining (= even in bad situations we may find positive elements);

There is no rose without a thorn (= there are always disadvantages in the choice that we make);

Make the hay while the sun shines (= hurry to achieve your aim while there is a suitable situation).

Personification

Personification can also be treated as a kind of antonomasia and a subtype of allegory. By personification human qualities are ascribed to inanimate objects, phenomena or things, e.g.:

Lie is a strange creature, and a very mean one.

No sleep till morn, when Youth and Pleasure meet
To chase the glowing Hours with flying feet.

"My impatience has shown its heels to my politeness".

In poetry, fables, fairy-tales personification is often represented grammatically by the choice of masculine or feminine pronouns for the names of animals, inanimate objects or forces of nature.

The pronoun *He* is used for *the Sun, the Wind*, for the names of any animals that act like human beings, e.g.: *The Cat who walked by himself.*

He is used for strong, active phenomena or feelings, e.g.: *Death, Ocean, River, Fear, Love*

The pronoun *She* is used for what is regarded as rather gentle, e.g.: *The Moon, Nature, Silence, Beauty, Hope, Mercy.*

In Aesop's fable "The Crow and the Fox", the pronoun *She* is used for *the Crow*, whose behavior is coquettish and light-minded, whereas *He* is used for *the Fox.*

He played with the idea and grew willful; tossed it into the air and transformed it; let it escape and recaptured it; made it iridescent with fancy and winged it with paradox. The praise of folly, as he went on, soared into a philosophy, and <u>Philosophy</u> <u>herself</u> became young, and catching the mad music of pleasure, wearing, one might fancy, <u>her</u> wine-stained robe and wreath of ivy, danced like a Bacchante over the hills of life, and mocked the slow Silenus for being sober (O. Wilde).

Allusion

Allusion is indirect reference to or a hint at some historical, literary, mythological or biblical character, fact or event commonly known. Allusion presupposes the knowledge of such a fact on the part of the reader or listener, so no particular explanation is given (although this is sometimes really needed)

Very often the interpretation of the fact or person alluded to is generalized or even symbolized, e.g. *Hers was a forceful clarity and a colourful simplicity and a bold use of metaphor that Demosphenes would have envied* – allusion to the widely-known ancient Greek orator.

He felt as Balaam must have felt when his ass broke into speech – allusion to the biblical parable of an ass that spoke the human language when its master, the heathen prophet Balaam, intended to punish it).

"Eliza: you are an idiot.I waste the treasures of my Miltonic mind by spreading them before you" – allusion to the English poet of the 17th century John Milton, the author of the poem «Paradise Lost»; apart from that, the words *spreading the treasures of my mind before you* contain an allusion to the biblical expression *to cast pearls before swine* (метать бисер перед свиньями).

In A. Christie's book of stories *The Labours of Hercules* the name of the famous detective Hercule Poirot is an allusion to the name of *Hercules* and the twelve heroic deeds (labours) of this hero of the

ancient Greek myths: *He looked at himself in the glass. Here, then, was a modern Hercules – very distinct from that unpleasant naked figure with plenty of muscles, brandishing a club.*

Other examples of the kind:

Armed with a microphone and a bank of experts, victims and unbelievers, he stalked the studio like a grand inquisitor, probing moral and ethical issues to their depths: a Great White Oprah, an intellectual Jerry Springer, a Moral Montel for the New Millennium.

It wouldn't be love without opposition, would it? I mean, if Juliet's dad had fallen on Romeo's neck and said, 'I'm not losing a daughter, I'm gaining a son, and Romeo's mum had beamed 'Welcome to the Montague family, Juliet my precious,' it would be a pretty short play.

Simile

Simile is an imaginative comparison of two unlike objects belonging to two different classes on the grounds of similarity of some quality. Strictly speaking, simile is a kind of lexical-syntactic stylistic device because the emphasis depends not only on the lexical meaning but also on the arrangement of the sentence members.

The object which is compared is called **the tenor**, the one with which it is compared, is called **the vehicle**. The tenor and the vehicle form the two semantic poles of the simile, which are connected by one of the following link words: *like, as, as if, as though, such as, seem, as ... as,* etc., e.g.:

She is like a rose.

He stood immovable like a rock in a torrent.

His muscles are hard as rock.

The conversation she began behaved like green logs: they fumed but would not fire.

It was that moment of the year when <u>the countryside seems to faint</u> from its own loveliness, from the intoxication of its scents and sounds.

The above given example can be treated as a simile which is half a metaphor. If not for the structural word *seems*, we would call it a metaphor.

Ordinary comparisons and simile must not be confused. Comparison means weighing two objects belonging to one class of things with the purpose of establishing the degree of their sameness or

difference. To use a simile is to characterize one object by bringing it into contact with another object belonging to an entirely different class of things. Comparison takes into consideration all the properties of the two objects, stressing the one that is compare, i.e. comparative constructions are not regarded as simile if no image is created. Simile excludes all the properties of the two objects except one which is made common to them, e.g.:

The boy seems to be as clever as his mother – an ordinary comparison (*boy* and *mother* belong to the same class of objects – human beings).

John skates as beautifully as Kate does.

Peter is very much like his brother.

In the English language there is a long list of **hackneyed** similes pointing out the analogy between the various qualities, states or actions of a human being and the animals supposed to be the bearers of the given quality, e.g.

treacherous as a snake, sly as a fox, busy as a bee, industrious as an ant, blind as a bat, faithful as a dog, stubborn as a mule, fresh as a rose, white as snow, to work like a horse, to be led like a sheep, to fly like a bird, to swim like a duck, …

In belles-lettres writing authors often find quite unexpected images for comparison creating original, fresh similes, e.g.

Pete, of course, after going as red as Lenin, swallowed his rage and his baffled pride and began to Talk to me. (S. Fry)

From the **grammatical** point of view there is such a peculiarity of English similes as the use of the word *like* as a semi-affix in some epithets-similes:

dog-like devotion 'собачья преданность';

with cat-like tread 'неслышно, кошачьей поступью';

a lamb-like girl 'нежная, покорная девушка'.

Note that, unlike a simile, a metaphor contains a covert (not expressed openly) comparison, which is already included in the figurative meaning of a word:

cf. *What a peacock he is!* – metaphor

He is proud as a peacock. – simile

Metaphors are usually more emotionally coloured than similes just because they do not express the comparison openly.

Periphrasis

Periphrasis is using a more or less complicated syntactical structure instead of a word that is the replacement of a direct name of a thing or phenomenon by the description of some quality of this thing or phenomenon. They are classified into **logical** periphrasis and **figurative** periphrasis.

Logical periphrasis is based upon one of the inherent properties of the object:

weapons – instrument of destruction;

love – the most pardonable of human weaknesses;

ordinary person – a man in the street.

Figurative periphrasis is based upon metaphor or metonymy. Periphrasis is used to convey a purely individual perception of the described object, it deepens our knowledge of the objective world, e.g.

to marry – to tie the knot (metaphor);

enthusiasm – young blood (synecdoche);

money – root of evil (metaphor);

sun – the punctual servant of all work;

The hospital was crowded with <u>the surgically interesting products of the fighting</u> in Africa (=wounded);

I understand you are poor, and wish to earn money by nursing the little boy, my son, who has been so prematurely deprived of <u>what can never be replaced</u> (=mother).

As it is seen from the above given examples, periphrases are based on either metaphor or metonymy.

Euphemism

Euphemism is a word or word-combination which is used to replace an unpleasant word or word-combination. Euphemisms might be viewed as periphrasis; they have the same mechanism of formation.

Euphemisms can be classified according to the sphere of their application.

In English there are **religious** euphemisms, e.g.:

the Lord, the Supreme Being, Heaven; goodness, Almighty instead of *God;*

the Prince of Darkness, the deuce, the Evil One, the dickens, old Nick, old Harry instead of *devil.*

Some **moral** euphemisms, especially those connected with *death* are also typical. They go back to the ancient beliefs of sameness of the names and things they denote and the taboos to the use of the most significant notions, e.g.:

to die – to pass away, to be gone, to expire, to be no more, to depart, to go west, to join the majority, to breathe one's last, to pass into darkness, to go the way of all flesh;

to commit a suicide – to put an end to one's life;

dead – deceased, departed, late.

To the moral euphemisms some phenomena which are unpleasant to mention are also referred to in the two languages:

to hit the bottle 'закладывать за воротник';

to tell stories 'сочинять, фантазировать';

he's no genius 'звезд с неба не хватать';

loo 'одно место (туалет)'.

There are also **medical** euphemisms which are used to avoid mentioning the names of hospitals and diagnoses:

lunatic asylum – mental hospital,

idiots – mentally abnormal;

cripple – disabled;

The particularly noticeable is the so-called **politically correct language**, which has become very important for the English language. The aim of this is to mislead public opinion and to express what is unpleasant in a more delicate manner, e.g.:

Negro – Afro-American;

Indian – Native American;

the aged, the elderly – senior citizens;

the poor – the needy, the neediest, the deprived, the socially deprived, the underprivileged, the disadvantaged, low-incomed people, less fortunate elements.

The latter group of euphemistic synonyms is an example of the process of **devaluation** of such names, which means that the life of euphemisms is short. For example, the word *cripple* was first changed into *handicapped*, which later was considered to be negative in meaning and was changed into *disabled* which has not been overtaken itself by

newer coinages such as *differently abled* or *physically challenged.* Although the usage is very widespread, some people regard the use of the adjective as a plural noun (as in *the needs* of *the disabled*) as dehumanizing because it tends to treat people with disabilities as an undifferentiated group, defined merely by their capabilities. To avoid offence, a more acceptable term would be *people with disabilities.*

There is a humorous example from *Harper Dictionary of Contemporary Usage,* which illustrates this process of devaluation:

*I used to think I was poor. Then they said it was self-defeating to think of myself as **needy**, that I was **culturally deprived**. Then they told me deprived was a bad image, that I was **underprivileged**. Then they told me that underprivileged wasn't used, that I was **disadvantaged**. I still don't have a dime but I have a great vocabulary.*

One more group of euphemistic substitutions is connected with the rise of professions' prestige – **name-lifting.** The examples in modern English is very numerous:

janitor → facility manager;
secretary → team assistant;
cleaning lady → interior care provider;
garbage collector → sanitary engineer;
rat catcher → exterminating engineer;
gardener → landscape engineer.

The euphemisation of some lexical units in order to reach the political correctness sometimes has the exaggerated character in English, which is in general not typical of Russian:

blind – optically challenged;
fat – differently sized;
short – vertically-challenged;
stupid – wisdom-challenged;
wicked – kindness-impaired;
old – chronologically-gifted.

Such nomination are registered in some American dictionaries with the mark "humorous" or "politically correct".

Euphemisms have their antipodes called **disphemisms**. Disphemisms are conspicuously rough, rude and impolite words and

word-combinations, which are used to express negative emotions, such as irritation, hate, scorn, mockery, animosity, e.g.:

> *to die – to kick the bucket, to bite the dust; to turn up one's toesж*
> *to treat someone badly – to give someone the finger.*

Hyperbole

Hyperbole is a stylistic device in which emphasis is achieved through deliberate exaggeration. It does not signify the actual state of affairs in reality, but presents the latter through the emotionally coloured perception and rendering of the speaker. Hyperbole may be the final effect of other stylistic devices: metaphor, simile, irony, e.g.:

> *My vegetable love should grow faster than empires.*
> *I was scared to death when he entered the room.*
> *He was so tall that I was not sure he had a face.*
> *I beg a thousand pardons.*
> *I've told you a thousand times.*
> *I'd give anything to see her.*

Meiosis (Understatement)

This figure of quantity is opposite in meaning to hyperbole. Meiosis is a deliberate diminution of a certain quality of an object or phenomenon. Meiosis underlines insignificance of such qualities of objects and phenomena as their size, volume, distance, time, shape, etc. The domain of meiosis is colloquial speech, e.g:

> *There was a drop of water left in the bucket.*
> *She wore a pink hat, the size of a button.*
> *It was a cat-size pony.*

Litotes

Litotes is a specific variant of meiosis. It has a peculiar syntactic structure and is sometimes referred to as lexical-syntactic stylistic device. It is a combination of the negative particle **not** and a word with the negative meaning or a negative prefix. Such a combination makes positive sense. The extenuation of positive qualities of objects or phenomena makes statements and judgments sound more delicate and diplomatic, it expresses irony.

It is not bad.
He is no coward.
There are not a few people who think so.
It was done not without taste.
Martin is not without sense of humour.
After the brawl Julia was not dissatisfied with herself.

3.2. MORPHOLOGICAL EXPRESSIVE MEANS

The stylistic potential of the morphology as a grammar level of the language is somewhat restricted in comparison with that of the lexical level. It can be explained by the fact that grammar (and especially morphological structure) is a main organizing and unifying layer of the language. It is characterized by stable and unchangeable systemic ties. Extralinguistic factors, which give rise to stylistic phenomena, as much less influential in the morphology than in the lexical system of the language.

Stylistic morphology is mainly preoccupied with the unusual usage of different parts of speech. In most cases the stylistic function is observed as a result of violation of traditional grammatical valencies, which helps the speakers express their emotions and attitudes to the subject of discussion.

Words of all parts of speech have a great stylistic potential. Being placed in an unusual syntagmatic environment which changes their canonized grammatical characteristics and combinability, they acquire stylistic significance. In informal English these forms may be used in a specific way for the sake of expressiveness and emotiveness.

The central notion of morphological stylistics is the notion of **transposition**.

Transposition is a divergence between the traditional usage of a neutral word and its situational (stylistic) usage.

Words of every part of speech are united by their semantic and grammatical properties.

Verbs

Transposition of verbs is quite varied. It is explained by a great number of grammatical categories the meanings of which may be

transposed. Most expressive are tense forms, mood forms and voice forms.

One of peculiar features of English tense forms is their polysemantism: the same form may realize various meanings in speech. Deviation from the general (most frequently realized) meaning makes verbs stylistically coloured.

1. The **Historic (dramatic, narrative) Present** – the use of the Present Indefinite in literary style to describe a succession of actions in the past.

One of peculiar verbal transpositions is the change of temporary planes of narration when events of the past or future are described by present tense forms. Such transposition brightens the narration, raises its emotional tension, expresses intrigue, makes the continuity of events visual and graphic.

It is used to make a vivid narrative of past events.

'You have to think of it from Delft's point of view», murmured Babe, more to himself than to Ned. «He_'s on duty. A flash comes through that a youth has been picked up with a document that might interest the service. He interrogates you, all seems fine, you turn out to be nothing but an innocent. He discovers his own mother is implicated. What can he do?'

In narratives, the historic present may be used to create an effect of immediacy.

If the funeral had been yesterday, I could not recollect it better. The very air of the best parlour, when I went in at the door, the bright condition of the fire, the shining of the wine in the decanters, the patterns of the glasses and plates, the faint sweet smell of cake, the odour of Miss Murdstone's dress, and our black clothes. Mr. Chillip is in the room, and comes to speak to me.

"And how is Master David?" he says, kindly.

I cannot tell him very well. I give him my hand, which he holds in his.

Summaries of the narratives (plots) of works of fiction are conventionally presented using the present tense rather than the past tense.

This story is about Julia Lambert, one of the best and brilliant actresses in London. In her late forties she has everything – beauty,

money, fame... Her marriage is supposed to be ideal for her husband Michael is a really reliable and handsome man, she also has an adult son Roger. However, her peaceful and routine life is disturbed by Tom Fennel, a young accountant employed by her husband …

2. The use of the **Continuous** forms to express recurrent, habitual actions combining the features of the Indefinite (Simple) forms with the ideas of the action in process.

The Continuous form in this case imparts a subjective, emotionally coloured tone, it usually introduces the negative connotations of irritation, condemnation, regret, sadness and others.

The adverbs of frequency *always* and *constantly* are used in such cases, e.g.:

We are constantly looking for bright, imaginative and creative personnel to join us in our mission to continue to forge new businesses on the leading edge of the digital revolution.

The Past Continuous in such cases expresses recurrent actions in the past expressing the speaker's attitude to the described events, often negative, e.g.:

'*When I was a boy I used to get really hacked off by that bell', Ned explained in answer to my questioning look. 'The House sits at the weirdest times and it was always waking me up at two or three in the morning'.*

3. The use of the **stative verbs** in the **Continuous form** expresses great intensity of feeling.

There is a rule that verbs of sense perception and mental activity are not used in the continuous tense forms. This rule is often broken by the speaker intentionally or subconsciously. In both cases verbal forms convey additional stylistic meanings of subjective modality in combination with some quantitative characteristics, e.g.:

Dear Amy, I've settled in now and I am liking my new life very much.

I am seeing you, I am not blind.

You can use their car when they get here. I'll be needing yours straight away.

They'll be wanting their money back.

Gordon's face was grey and he was finding it difficult to control his breathing.

The use of the Continuous forms is considered to be more polite in comparison with the Indefinite ones, which is also a reason to use stative verbs in the continuous form, e.g.:

'She doesn't know anything about this. In fact, I've been wanting to ring her'.

There are a number of verbs whose lexical meaning makes it possible to use them **either in the Indefinite or Continuous forms** (*feel, live, look, long, smile, talk, tremble, shake* and a few others). The Continuous form is more emotional and personal than the Indefinite one; it gives special force and vividness to the utterance.

I did something completely awful this morning, in Biology. It's a bit complicated to describe and I feel awful about it.

I'm feeling like Simone de Beauvoir and I hope you're feeling like Jean-Paul Sartre.

I hate to be the one to tell you, Thomas, but you look nearer thirty-seven or forty-seven.

You're looking awfully tired, darling. Positively hagged.

4. The use of ***shall*** with the second and third persons (modal verb denoting threat, warning, promise, determination):

He shall do it! = I shall make him do it (neutral counterpart)

You shall not leave the house after 9pm.

Enlightenment came to Buddha and Newton under trees they say, and it shall come to Ned Maddstone there too.

5. The **modal verb *must*** used to denote emphatic invitation or advice:

You mustn't miss the film. It is very good.

Come with me to Bristol. We'll have a much better time. I shan't bully you about it though. You must do whatever you want to do.

I love you, I love you, I love you.

6. The use of the modal verb ***will*** in clauses of time and condition with different modal colouring or to emphasize the idea of futurity – 'emphatic future", e.g.:

'It's a great pleasure to see you, Mr Cotter. If you'll let me shoot upstairs and change'.

I can't bear either that I've got to come back here in September while you'll be as free as a bird.

The day will come when you'll be pleased to go back there.

7. The use of **emphatic *do, did*** instead of neutral forms of the Present and Past Indefinite:

'Oliver, my dear, what a delightful surprise. I <u>do wish</u> you'd let me know. I can't offer you a scrap to eat'.

The day <u>did come</u>, however, when I had perfected the art of counting without dropping a stitch, as I called it, and I could be sure that four and a half hours passed between breakfast and lunch.

'I <u>do love</u> you very much. You know that, don't you?'

'I <u>do apologise</u> for calling so late'.

8. The use of **emotional *should*** after the expressions of surprise, doubt, pleasure or displeasure and in some set-phrases and types of sentences.

How <u>should</u> I know? Why <u>should</u> I go there?

'It seems so <u>funny</u> that all of a sudden you <u>should</u> run around all over the place with a clerk in the firm that does your accounts'.

'<u>Why</u> in the name of God's green earth <u>should</u> I do the slightest thing to help you?'

Who <u>should</u> then turn up, flushed and triumphant in scarlet and green stained flannels, hot from glory in the field, <u>but</u> Maddstone himself?

It always <u>amazed</u> Portia that her mother, such an ardent and devoted feminist on paper and in conversation, <u>should</u> spend so much time, when it came to the realities of everyday life, looking after Pete's every need.

9. The use of **the Subjunctive Mood** forms.

A wide range of subjunctive mood forms offers a good stylistic choice of synonymous ways to verbalize one and the same idea. Compare the following synonymous pairs of sentences:

It is time for me to go = It is time that I went.

It is necessary for him to come = It is necessary that he come.

We must go now not to be late = We must go now lest we be late.

Let it be = So be it.

The first sentence of each pair is stylistically neutral while the second sentence is either bookish or obsolescent.

My suggestion is that you and I <u>develop</u> an informal relationship.

It's very important that I <u>speak</u> to you.

113

10. In spoken English auxiliaries in the Present Perfect are often omitted and only the second part of the predicate remains, e.g.:

<u>Been</u> for a run?

Nouns

General lexico-grammatical meaning of nouns is substantivity, i.e. the ability to denote objects or abstract notions. Due to the diverse, nature of substantivity, nouns are divided into proper, common, concrete, abstract, material and collective. Cases of transposition emerge, in particular, when concrete nouns are used according to the rules of proper nouns usage, or vice versa. It results in creation of stylistic devises named antonomasia or personification (for examples see lexical stylistic devices).

Besides general lexico-grammatical meaning, nouns possess grammatical meanings of the category of number and the category of case. These meanings may also be used for stylistic objectives.

Category of number

1. Unusual use of **abstract nouns in the form of plural**.

According to the category of number, nouns are classified into countable and uncountable. Each group has its own regularities of usage. When these regularities are broken for stylistic reasons, speech becomes expressive. Uncountable **singularia tantum** nouns evoke picturesque connotations

The abstract noun (normally uncountable) used in the plural form (**hyperbolic plural**) makes the narration more expressive and brings about aesthetic semantic growth.

Heaven remained rigidly in its proper place on the other side of death, and on this side flourished the <u>injustices</u>, the <u>cruelties</u>, the <u>meannesses</u>, that elsewhere people so cleverly hushed up.

'Oh dear <u>heavens</u>,' she whispered.

The two policemen half rose from their seats and nodded grave <u>good mornings</u> to me.

Sometimes such usage can be the basis for puns when the polysemantic words are used in the same context, e.g.:

He used to work in commodities, trading tea and coffee <u>futures</u> in the City, but he went out there to Africa once and saw how the people

lived and it completely changed his outlook. He now says, it's not about coffee <u>futures</u>, it's about human <u>futures</u>.

2. The **plural which is added to the whole sentence**:

Occasionally the whole sentence can take the plural form. Such sentences are normally hyphenated, e.g.:

One I-am-sorry-for-you is worth twenty <u>I-told-you-so's</u>

Category of case

Normally, the genitive case form is a form of animate nouns. When inanimate nouns are used in this form, their initial meaning of inanimateness is transposed. In such cases they render the meanings of:

– <u>time, place or distance</u> , e.g.:

<u>London's</u> *appetite for trenchant attacks on 'Political Correctness' seemed to know no bounds and Ashley was happy to feed it.*

If he found a source he would buy at least ten, a <u>lifetime's</u> supply.

'Hm... I have to confess it was quite the most riveting <u>evening's</u> television I have ever experienced'.

– <u>part of a whole</u> (*book's page, table's leg*), e.g.:

Ned awoke again in darkness to the sound of the <u>van's engine</u> and the swift hum of passing traffic.

– <u>qualitative characteristics</u> (*plan's failure, winter's snowdrifts, music's voice*), e.g.:

'If there were an art to find <u>the mind's construction</u> in the face, then I would say you were thinking imponderable thoughts and that light was beginning to break'.

Perhaps these are <u>nature's</u> way of warning us off, he thought.

Such uses attract additional attention to important issues, e.g.:

'We are merely <u>the stars' tennis-balls,</u> Ned, struck and banded which way please them'.

The use of some inanimate nouns in the genitive case can also be a formal marker of such stylistic devices as metonymy, e.g.:

His name had been openly mentioned by the <u>BBC's</u> senior political correspondent as a contender in any future leadership election.

A double-sided plasma wide-screen television was hung high in <u>CotterDotCom's</u> atrium.

The constructions **Double Genitive** is an *of-phrase* in which the noun is in the genitive case. When it is used attributively to a noun denoting some kind of human relationship (*friend, cousin, niece*, etc.), the genitive is interchangeable with the common case, but the double genitive is more informal, e.g.

Ashley Barson-Garland. Says here you're a researcher for Sir Charles and <u>a school friend of Edward's.</u>

Babe's brain was <u>a freak of God's</u> and God deserved better than to have that freak die with the old man that housed that.

The use of **Group Genitive** when the elements of it belong to different levels and the genitive refers to the whole word-combination or even sentence is expressly colloquial:

She's <u>the boy I used to go with's</u> mother.

She's <u>the man that bought my wheelbarrow's</u> wife.

He is <u>the niece, I told you about's</u> husband.

Articles

Stylistic potential of nouns is significantly reinforced by transpositions in the usage of articles as noun-determiners. Such transpositions occur against generally accepted normative postulates which run: articles are not used with names of persons and animals, some classes of geographical names, abstract nouns and names of material.

Uncommon usage of articles aims at importing specific shades of meaning into speech. Thus, the indefinite article combined with names of persons may denote

– one representative of a family: *Mary will never be <u>a Brown.</u>*

– a person unknown to the communicants: *Jack was robbed by <u>a Smith.</u> I'm sure that I do remember <u>an Ashley</u> and that I think of him with someone like me.*

– a temporary feature of character: *That day Jane was different. It was <u>a silly Jane</u>.*

The use of an indefinite article with a person's name can also show the speaker's despise and the desire to humiliate somebody, e.g.:

Ashley found it very hard to stay angry with a species as low down the evolutionary ladder as <u>a Cade</u>.

Not less expressive are cases when the name of a person is used as a common noun preceded by the indefinite article:

Mike has the makings of <u>a Byron</u>.

Stylistic usage of the definite article takes place

– when names of persons are modified by limiting attributes:

You are not <u>the John</u> whom I married.

He could not, however, reassemble in his mind the identity of <u>the Ned</u> who had undergone those infernal torments of soul and body. That Ned had been as innocent, terrified and blinded by the world and its cruelty as a newborn puppy…<u>The Ned</u> who travelled now was an entirely different being, a man of iron will, an avenging angel – an instrument of God.

– when a proper name denotes the whole family

'As far as <u>the Suleimans</u> are concerned John is a nobody. A bagman, nothing more.' (S. Fry)

– when a name of a person is modified by a descriptive attribute denoting a permanent feature of character

I entered the room. There she was – <u>the clever Polly.</u>

But have you forgotten the other Portia. <u>The Portia</u> in *Julius Caesar?'* (S. Fry)

Suchlike deviations in the usage of articles are possible with other semantic classes of nouns: geographical names, abstract and material nouns.

Adjectives

General lexico-grammatical meaning of adjectives is that of qualitativeness. Qualitative adjectives are always estimative, that is why they are used as epithets and can form degrees of comparison.

Relative adjectives normally do not form degrees of comparison and serve as **logical** (**non-stylistic**) attributes (*red colour, Italian car, dead man*).

However, they may be occasionally transposed into qualitative. Such transposition imports originality and freshness in speech:

"Ferrari" is <u>the most Italian</u> car which you can meet in this remote corner of the world.

Garry was the <u>deadest</u> man ever present in that ambitious society.

Very few people have lips that really are red in the way that poets write about red. Yours are the <u>reddest red, a redder red</u> than ever I read of...

His being a Lover though, a Lover with <u>the most capital</u> of Ls, made him burst with so much pride he could scarcely recognise himself.

The Swiss pointed to his head offices outside Geneva, not five kilometres from where the World Wide Web itself had been devised and declared Cotter to be <u>Swisser</u> than a yodel.

Expressiveness of adjectives may be as well enhanced by non-grammatical transpositions in the formation of the degrees of comparison, when well-known rules of their formation are intentionally violated:

My bride was becoming <u>beautifuler</u> and <u>beautifuller</u>:

You are the bestest friend I've ever met.

Now I want you to swear on that <u>most holy</u> thing that what I ask you to do you will do without telling a soul.

The car swept into a farmhouse driveway and again a little stab of déjà vu visited the pit of his stomach. A childhood holiday? <u>Mysteriouser</u> and <u>mysteriouser</u>.

In familiar and low colloquial speech the pleonastic comparative and superlative forms are used to give them greater emphasis, i.e. forms in *–er* and *–est* are intensified by the addition of *more* and *most*, e.g.:

a more abler man; *the most carelessest man.*

Consider also: *the bestest man*; *a worser condition.*

Pronouns

Expressive devices may be created by transposition of pronouns.

1. Informal use of **case forms of personal pronouns**.

When objective forms of personal pronouns are used predicatively instead of nominative forms, sentences obtain colloquial marking, e.g.:

It is <u>him</u>. It is her. It is <u>me</u>. It is <u>them</u>. It is <u>us</u>.

'Er, that was <u>me</u> actually, Dad. I'll pay you back for it soon, I promise'.

Portia stared at him. 'Quarrel? <u>Me and Ned</u>? No, that was impossible. We have never ... we could never... We were like...'

2. The use of different **personal pronouns instead of *I*.**

The meaning of the pronoun *I* may be contextually rendered by the pronouns *we, you, one, he, she* and others.

'I shall call you Thomas,' he said, after gazing for a while at a picture on the wall behind Ned. 'How is Thomas? An English name I think, for you are an English young man. This <u>we</u> know'.

The so-called "**scientific we**" is used in scientific prose instead of *I* for modesty reasons.

The same replacement in a routine conversation creates a humoristic effect, e.g.:

A tipsy man coming home after a workday and addressing his wife cheerfully, about himself: Meet us dear! <u>We</u> have come!

When *I* is substituted by *he, she*, or nouns (*the guy, the chap, the fellow, the fool, the girl*, etc), the speaker either tries to analyse his own actions with the eyes of a stranger, externally, or he is ironical about himself.

When the pronoun *you* is replaced by the pronoun *one*, the statement becomes generalized, its information being projected not only to the listeners, but to the speaker himself:

<u>One</u> should understand, that smoking is really harmful!

Ned introduced me to his father who came as near to bowing as <u>one</u> can these days. (S. Fry)

3. The use of **archaic forms** of pronouns.

Stylistic effects may also be achieved by the usage of archaic pronouns: the personal pronoun *thou* (2nd person singular) and its objective form *thee*, the possessive pronoun *thy* and its absolute form thine, the reflexive pronoun *thyself*.

These obsolete pronouns create the atmosphere of solemnity and elevation, or bring us back to ancient times.

What would Ned have done next? Prayed probably. Ashley wanted to snort at the very idea of it. Yes, Ned would have gone to the chapel, fallen to his knees and prayed for guidance. And what manner of guidance would have been offered by Ned's shining auburn-haired shampoo-commercial Christ? 'Go <u>thou</u> and hold Ashley to you as a brother. My son Ashley is frightened and filled with self-hatred. Go <u>thou</u> then and may the kindness and love of God shine upon his countenance and make him whole'.

4. The use of the **pronoun *you*** in imperative sentences both affirmative and negative:

'*You come along with us, sir*'.

'*He is not like all men!*' *she yelled at Hillary.* '*Don't you dare say that!*'

You don't touch it till you've washed your hands.

'*Lunch,*' *said Portia firmly.* '*In fact it's last night's supper and this morning's breakfast too. You absolutely must eat. I'm going to watch you. I don't care if I sound like the worst Jewish mother in the world. You simply must eat.*'

'*Yeah, yeah. Whatever. Look, Mum...*'

'*Don't you "whatever" me! I'm going to watch every sandwich going down your throat...*'

5. The use of the **pronoun *it*** to denote animate objects:

'*Oh, Lord!*' *He involuntary ejaculated as the incredibly dilapidated figure appeared in the light.* *It stopped; it uncovered pale gums, and long upper teeth in a malevolent grin.*

6. The use of **demonstrative pronouns in combination with possessive pronouns in postposition** especially with epithet: *this lovely ring of yours; that old ramshackle house of his.*

'*I hate to be the one to tell you, Thomas, but you look nearer thirty-seven or forty-seven. There's grey mixed in your hair by the temples and those eyes of yours do not contain at all the look of youth*'.

NB! Grammar rules in works of belles-lettres style can be <u>intentionally violated</u> to produce the effect of a badly educated person's speech a foreigner, e.g.:

Is time now you go to rooms. Tomorrow shall be an inspection. Shave in the morning, be behaving well'.

'*I don't take you to nobody,*' *Martin sneered.* '*Who you think you are? You don't tell me orders. I tell you orders*'.

'*Yes. Your accent is bad. Maybe, now Babe gone, we are better friends,*' *said Martin.* '*You teach English, I teach Swedish. You teach music and the mathematics to me also*'.

Check yourself issues:

1. What is a metaphor?
2. What semantic, morphological, syntactical, structural and functional peculiarities is metaphor characterized by?
3. What is a metonymy? Give a detailed description of the device.
4. What is a synecdoche?
5. What is included into the group of stylistic devices known as "play on words"?
6. Describe the difference between pun and zeugma.
7. What is the basic effect achieved by the play on words?
8. What is irony, what lexical meaning is employed in its formation?
9. What types of irony do you know?
10. What is antonomasia?
11. What types of antonomasia do you know?
12. What lexical meaning is instrumental in the formation of epithets?
13. What semantic and structural types of epithets do you know?
14. What meaning is foregrounded in a hyperbole?
15. What types of hyperbole can you name?
16. What are meiosis and litotes?
17. In what way do meiosis and litotes differ from hyperbole?
18. What is an oxymoron and what meanings are foregrounded in its formation?
19. What is a simile and what is a simple comparison?
20. What are the main functions of a simile?
21. In what cases can a logical or a figurative periphrasis also be qualified as euphemistic?
22. Speak about semantic types of periphrasis.
23. What is a dysphemism?
24. In what cases are dysphemisms usually used?
25. What expressive means are referred to as morphological?
26. What morphological expressive means in the sphere of the English verb do you know?

27. What expressive means in the sphere of nouns are used in English?

28. What morphological expressive means in the sphere of pronouns are there in English?

29. How can English adjectives bear stylistic colouring?

30. In what cases is the use of articles stylistically coloured?

Literature:

1. Гальперин, И. Р. Стилистика английского языка : [Учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз.]. – 3-е изд. – М. : Высш. шк., 1981. – 334 с.

2. Єфімов, Л. П. Стилістика англійської мови і дискурсивний аналіз : [навч.-метод. посіб]. – Вінниця : Нова книга, 2011. – 228 с. – англійською мовою

3. Знаменская, Т. А. Стилистика английского языка : Основы курса. – 2-е изд. – М. : Едиториал УРСС, 2004. – 208 с.

4. Кухаренко, В. А. Практикум по стилистике английского языка : учеб. пособие. – 4-е изд. – Москва: Флинта : Наука, 2010. – 182 с.

5. Плещенко, Т. П. Стилистика и культура речи : Учеб. пособие для стулентов филол. специальностей вузов / Под общ. ред. П. П. Шубы. – Минск : ТетраСистемс, 2001. – 544 с.

6. Разинкина, Н. М. Функциональная стилистика : На материале англ. и рус. яз.. – 2-е изд. – М. : Высш. шк., 2004. – 269,[2] с.

7. Скребнев Ю. М. Основы стилистики английского языка: Учебник для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз. / Ю.М. Скребнев. – 2-е изд., испр. – М.: ООО «Издательство Астрель»: ООО «Издательство АСТ», 2003. – 221 с. (на англ. яз.).

8. Стилистика английского языка : [Учеб. для ин-тов и фак. иностр. яз.] / А. Н. Мороховский, О. П. Воробьева, Н. И. Лихошерст, З. В. Тимошенко. – К. : Выща шк., 1991. – 271 с.

Основы теории английского языка

Учебное пособие

Подгайская Ирина Михайловна
Удинская Алла Геннадиевна
Дроздов Владимир Александрович