PREDICATIVE ADVERBIAL WORD-COMBINATIONS OR INCOMPLETE MONONUCLEAR IMPERSONAL SENTENCES?

Summary. The purpose of this article is to show the fallacy of the opinions about the functioning in the Russian language of predicative adverbial word-combinations in the Russian language and to prove that segments of mononuclear impersonal sentence, containing the principal member in its structure — impersonal-predicative word — are contextual incomplete mononuclear impersonal sentences. The object of study is multiword segments of mononuclear impersonal sentences, including an impersonal-predicative word (a word of the category of state). The subject of this research is the syntactic mechanisms of functioning of the segments under analysis in the Russian language. The method of structural and semantic analysis of language units and descriptive method have been used in the work. The purpose is fully achieved as a result of the study. The function of the principal member of impersonal mononuclear sentence is only possible syntactic function of impersonal-predicative words; impersonal-predicative words do not change in form. Consequently, all impersonal-predicative words can't perform other syntactic functions and can't be the components of any word-combinations. Our findings allow a number of contradictions that arise in the recognition of studied language units for word-combinations including impersonal-predicative words. Our point of view is fully consistent with the requirements relating to the word-combination, incomplete sentence, mononuclear sentence, impersonal sentence and its models, impersonal-predicative word, autosemantic word in the structural and semantic syntax. During the study of the problem, some trends were also observed. Thus, the correlative relationship between the concepts of «autosemantic word» and «key word of a word-combination» is incomplete and asymmetric due to restrictions on the grammatical and lexical distribution of autosemantic parts of speech, first of all, impersonal-predicative words, adverbs, pronouns and adjectives.
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of the criteria is decisive when one deals with classification of the words of any language into certain groups. Depending upon the criteria such groups of words can be called «lexical» [11; 18; 36], «grammatical» [4; 12; 19; 23; 38], «lexico-grammatical» [1; 2; 6; 20; 27—29].

The definition of the pronoun as a part of speech has been a problem in linguistics for about 100 years since the time of appearance of the first scientific grammar book [26, p. 11], this fact can be explained by a couple of reasons.

One reason is that the division of words into lexico-grammatical groups of parts of speech is based upon different criteria with different authors [1 — 39].

Another reason is that the lexical units, united in the group of pronouns, have quite different syntactic and semantic characteristics. It leads certain linguists to the conclusion that there can’t exist a separate part of speech called pronoun, that the words which constitute this group must be distributed between other groups of words [6, p. 84].

It is clear that the problem of grammatical status of pronoun is still unsolved. The topicality of our work is explained by this fact. Its object is the linguists’ points of view on grammatical status of pronouns in Modern English. The subject of our investigation is cognitive characteristics of pronouns in Modern English and possibilities to use them for classification of pronouns. The purpose of our work is to try to find adequate criteria for classification of pronouns in Modern English. Practical material for analysis constitutes 1500 examples of actual use of pronouns in modern English taken from modern British and American literature by consecutive selection and by random selection from the English explanatory dictionaries.

In 1926, academician L. V. Scherba analyzing the system of parts of speech in the Russian language doesn’t distinguish the pronouns as a separate part of speech at all. He refers them partly to a «special group of pronominal noun», partly to adjectives [cit. from 26, p. 40]. B. Hajmovich and B. Rogovskaya, for example, do not refer pronouns to a separate part of speech. «Summarizing, — they conclude in a theoretical course of grammar, — we can tell, that they can be united neither by any morphological categories, nor by any syntactic functions. Therefore they cannot be considered as separate parts of speech» [17, p. 116]. In 1959 A. I. Smirnitsky emphasized that «a question what pronouns represent and whether they are treated as a special part of speech, is difficult and disputable» [cit. from 26, p. 21].

E. Gordon and I. Krylova write: «Pronouns include a miscellaneous group of words which function in the sentence as noun pronouns or adjective pronouns. To define the meaning of pronouns is difficult. Unlike nouns and adjectives, they do not name things or qualities but only point to them. In other words, they are deprived of a concrete lexical meaning. Instead they possess the generalized meaning which becomes clear only in a context or a situation» [14, p. 168]. As far as we can see the authors underline the nounal and adjectival functions of the pronouns, their generalized meaning; according to these criteria, in their opinion, these lexical units can belong to one and the same part of speech.

In her turn O. Seliverstova thinks that pronouns have quite a definite meaning because they bear information that does not depend upon the context [34, p. 45] O. Revzina and S. Chlenova also do not connect the pronominal meaning with the context, they call it «distinct and clearly felt» [cit. from 26, p. 64]. Though D. Biber et al. consider that pronouns are used instead of full noun phrases. The scientists call them the «economy devices», in their opinion they do not give detailed specification, they serve as pointers, requiring the listener or reader to find the exact meaning in the surrounding (usually preceding) text or in the speech situation. As far as we can judge from this definition its authors speak more about the function of the pronouns and what concerns their meaning he suggests looking for it not among some mental concepts of a reader or a speaker «but in the surrounding (usually preceding) text or in the speech situation» [5, p. 42]. For S. Ullmann pronouns do not have their own, independent meaning [cit. from 26, p. 48].

Speaking about the meaning we would like to mention that each word is connected with a certain mental space or even mental construction in a human conscience, coming from this statement we can state that there are no empty lexical units and words in a language. If we take the noun «examination» we can see that it is not associated with any concrete substance, it correlates with a certain abstract notion, the same can be said about the nouns «idea», «thing». These lexical units have a rather abstract meaning, especially the noun «thing», it can point to quite different notions in different contexts but its not deprived of its own lexical meaning. In our opinion it is also possible to define some special wide meaning for pronouns which they can actualize in different context.

In this connection Dwight Bolindger wrote: «Our mistake was that we wrongly identified the generalization of meaning with the absence of meaning» [7, p. 85].

Concerning functional characteristics of pronouns we can mention that a lot of linguists point to their ability to operate as substantive pronouns (Noun-Pronouns) and adjective pronouns (Adjective-Pronouns), L. S. Barhudarov and D. A. Shteling [3, p. 39], V. N. Kaushanskaja and co-authors [24, p. 53], E. Gordon and I. Krylova [14, p. 268], M. J. Blokh are among them [6, p. 39]. E. Izrailevich and K. Kachalova define a pronoun as «a part of speech which is used
instead of a noun or an adjective" [22, p. 67]. The use of these lexemes is illustrated by them in the following way:

I want some paper. Please give me some.
I want some matches. Have you got any?
Have you got any interesting books? [ibidem, p. 89].

Sometimes the function of pronouns is understood in a wider sense, they are said to 'deputize' for other parts of speech: nouns (he, she, it, we, they); adjectives (his, her, its, their; this/these, that/those); numerals (many, much, few, several, some), and adverbs (here, there, thus) [38, p. 42]. Etymologically, the word pronoun means "a word used instead of a noun". That is the reason why some English grammarians, such as J. C. Nesfield, G. Curme, A. M. Clark, define the pronoun as a word used instead of a noun only [cit. from 26, p. 7 — 8].

The basic material presentation. In our opinion the statement that pronoun is used instead of a noun is based upon a wrong grammatical interpretation of the word «name». The word «name» in Latin grammars and «onoma» in Greek grammars were used to point to the names of substances, qualities and quantities [cit. from 26, p. 41].

In connection with this we have to mention that it is possible to speak of morphological categorization only concerning personal pronouns within a wider system of pro-units in Modern English [6, p. 65]. In traditional grammar words are classified into parts of speech according to their meaning, form and syntactic function. The peculiarity of pronouns as a class of words is that they cannot be united by the above mentioned features. Their only common feature is to their qualitative characteristics «known, unknown, young». Let's consider another example.

He approached a young woman. He approached her [5, p. 346].
As far as we can see in the given examples she is associated with a concrete, known female human, and her points to the unknown young female human. We can also state that the meaning of the pronouns she and her in our examples include not only reference to substances, but also to their qualitative characteristics «known, unknown, young». Let's consider another example.

I looked around for toilet paper, but there was not any. [45, p. 8]
It's a puzzle that any intelligent child could solve. [41, p. 230]

Lexeme any is associated with each one or all members of the group, doesn’t matter which, but it points to the concrete phenomena of the objective reality through the noun phrases «toilet paper», «intelligent child». In the first example it stands not only for a single name of some substance but for the whole notion «any toilet paper».

From here we can conclude that variant meanings of pronouns are contextually dependent. What concerns their invariant meaning it proves to be a very general one and in our opinion should be defined within the frames of other classes of words.

Thus, such lexemes as my, your, his, function as adjectives (You should take my advice), some may function as a noun (I've made a pot of coffee. Would you like some?), adjective (That was some party last night! means very good, impressive) or adverb (Would you like some more cake?) [41].

Traditionally, pronouns are divided into: 1) personal (I, you, he, she, it; we, they); 2) possessive (my, your, his, her, its; our, their — mine, yours, his, hers, its; ours, theirs); 3) reflexive (myself, yourself, himself, herself, itself; ourselves, yourselves, themselves); 4) demonstrative (this / these, that / those, here, there, now, then, the same, such); 5) interrogative-relative (who, what, which, when, where, how, that); 6) reciprocal (one another, each other); 7) indefinite-negative (some, anybody, any, anybody, anyone, anything another, other — no, no-one, one, nobody, nothing); 8) generalizing (all each every, everything, either, both); 9) quantitative (much, many, few, several, some) [1, p. 45; 2, p. 28; 4, p. 25; 12, p. 55; 16, p. 101; 20, p. 56; 21, p. 38; 23, p. 101; 24, p. 35; 25, p. 51]. As far as we can see the division into subgroups is based upon a certain semantic feature. Formally and semantically they reveal substantive, adjectival and adverbial characteristics:

Whenever she sees something that she likes, she goes and buys it. [48, p. 6]
Something and it possess substantive characteristics, syntectically they function as objects and point to substances.
The students borrowed each other’s notes [45, p. 100]. Each other’s has substantive characteristics, it is used with formant ‘s, functions as an attribute of a noun, points to a substance.

There must be some reason for her behaviour [46, p. 21]. Some has adjectival characteristics, it functions as an attribute of a noun and is associated with a certain quality.

Why are you so angry this morning? [45, p. 73]. So has adverbial characteristics. It functions as an adverbial modifier, points to the degree of a quality.

From everything mentioned above we can conclude that pronouns differ both conceptually and formally.

Analysis of actual use if pronouns in speech shows that they are associated with the following conceptual categories: substance (I, you, she they, some, somebody, any, anybody, anyone, anything, no-one, nobody, nothing, everything, each other, one another); possession (my, your, his, her, its; our, their, mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs); location (here, there, where, this, that); temporality (now, when, this, that); quality (some, any, both, certain, such, the same, either, neither, so); quantity (some, any, several, much, many, little, few, a few, a little).

Peter and I will do the cooking [41, p. 236]. (I points to a speaker)

Anything made of wood needs to be protected from the weather [45, p. 20] (anything points to some objects).

He can’t sell the house. It isn’t his, it’s mine [47, p. 76] (his and mine point to the owners).

We’ve lived here for over 20 years [46, p. 61] (here points to a place).

He gave me this diamond ring [48, p. 22] (this points to a substance which is nearest to the speaker).

Benson was late again this morning [42, p. 34] (this is associated with the events connected with some present situation).

The children used to love those old Charlie Chaplin films [ibidem] (those describes something connected with past experience).

Hello, is that Robert Hoffman? [41, p. 15], (points to a person who is far away)

She married some guy she met on the boat [47, p. 21] (some points to a non-identified quality).

I am feeling some better [41, p. 79] (some has a quantitative meaning).

As far as we can see the pronouns can be divided into a number of well distinguished groups of words reflecting some definite conceptual category. Their only common feature is to point to a certain phenomena of the objective world without identifying it.

We think that analysis of this group of words from the point of view of conceptual structures they reflect: substance, relations, quantities, qualities, locations, dimensions, and so on can help in solving the problem of their grammatical status. Coming from the fact that each conceptual structure has the mental archetype in its core which functions as a category prototype [36, p. 45], in our opinion we have to connect the lexical units under analysis with a certain prototypical category, in this way we will get a number of groups of words united on the basis of prototypical similarity.

As soon as the language units we are investigating function as substitutes of grammatically different elements we have to assume that their categorial meaning may be rather flexible. The suggestion that categorial meaning is flexible receives an initial expression in prototype theory [36, p. 121; 42, p. 628].

According to D. Geeraerts, features that are frequently mentioned as typical of a prototype-theoretical conception include the following:

a. Prototypical categories exhibit degrees of typicality; not every member is equally representative for a category.

b. Prototypical categories are blurred at the edges.

c. Prototypical categories cannot be defined by means of a single set of criterial (necessary and sufficient) attributes.

d. Prototypical categories exhibit a family resemblance structure, or more generally, their semantic structure takes the form of a radial set of clustered and overlapping readings [36, p. 139].

Analysis of pronouns on the basis of the above mentioned principles show that these lexical units can be united on the ground of their common function — to point to a certain phenomena of the objective world without identifying it, they are associated with different conceptual categories (substance, possession, location, temporality, quality, quantity) which explains differences in their formal characteristics.

Conclusions. Summing up everything mentioned above we can state that the problem of grammatical status of pronouns in Modern English hasn’t been solved yet. The attempt to classify them on the basis of traditional criteria: semantic, morphological and syntactic leads scientists to controversial conclusions about these words ability to be united into one lexico-grammatical group. Structural approach to this problem narrows the class of pronouns only to substitutes of the nouns, not taking into consideration their wider semantic potential and leaving aside a great number of other lexical units having the same function to point to a phenomenon of the objective
world without identifying it. In our opinion the prototype theory can be very effective in helping to classify the miscellaneous group of pronouns according to the conceptual categories they reflect, it can also help to explain the cases of hyponymy within the subgroups of pronouns.
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ГРАММАТИЧНИЙ СТАТУС ЗАЙМЕННИКА В СУЧАСНІЙ АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ

Анотація. Об’єкт нашого дослідження складають точки зору лінгвістів стосовно граматичного статусу займенників у сучасній англійській мові. Предметом наукової розвідки є когнітивні характеристики займенників у сучасній англійській мові та можливості їх репрезентації у класифікаціях займенників. Мета нашої роботи зводиться до визначення адекватних критеріїв щодо виділення займенників у частиномовні як іноземної, а також при проведенні фундаментальних когнітивних досліджень частин мови в англістиці.

Результати нашої роботи пропонують принципи класифікації займенників у сучасній англійській мові. Вони можуть бути застосовані при викладанні англійської мови як іноземної, а також при проведенні фундаментальних когнітивних досліджень частин мови в англістиці. Висновки нашої роботи впливають до наступних положень: 1) теорія прототипів може бути ефективною при розподілі такої різноманітної групи слів як займенники на класи згідно із концептуальними категоріями, які вони віддзеркалюють; 2) местоимення можуть бути об’єднані в одну групу слів на підставі загальної вказівної функції: вони вказують на певне явище об’єктивної дійсності без його ідентифікації, співвідносяться із різними концептуальними категоріями (субстанція, обладнання, локативність, темпоральність, кваліфікаційність та квантифікаційність), що й зумовлює відмінність їх формальних ознак.

Ключові слова: займенник, частина мови, субстанція, концептуальна категорія, прототип.