

Ievgenii N. STEPANOV,

Doctor of Philological Sciences (Grand PhD), Head of the Russian language Chair of Odessa Mechnikov National University; 24/26 Frantsuzskij blvd., Odessa, 65058, Ukraine; tel.: +38 048 7762277; +38 096 4966406; e-mail: stepanov.odessa@gmail.com; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5441-9822

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.

Key words: impersonal-predicative word, model of a word-combination, incomplete sentence, mononuclear impersonal sentence, autosemantic word, key word of a word-combination, model of a sentence, structural and semantic syntax; the Russian language.

Статтю отримано 10.05.2016 р.

УДК 811.111'06'367.626

MOISEIENKO Natalia G.,

PhD, Candidate of Science in Philology, Associate Professor, lecturer at the Department of English Grammar, Odessa National I. I. Mechnikov University, 24/26 Francuzskij blvd., Odessa, 65058, Ukraine; тел.: +38 093 4388839; +38 067 1087618; e-mail: natalywx@mail.ru; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8465-5519

GRAMMATICAL STATUS OF PRONOUNS IN MODERN ENGLISH

Summary. The *object* of the study of this article is the points of view of the linguists on grammatical status of pronouns in Modern English. The *subject* of our investigation is cognitive characteristics of pronouns in Modern English and possibilities of their representation in classifications of pronouns. The *purpose* of our work is to try to find adequate criteria for classification of pronouns in Modern English. *Methodologically* our research is based upon the laws of cognition, on such psychological categories as conceptual category, archetype. The descriptive analysis and comparison were used. The *findings* of our work include principles of classification of pronouns in Modern English. *Practical value* of our research consists in possibility of acquiring its results in the course of teaching English as a foreign language and in possibility of their use in fundamental cognitive investigations of the parts of speech of the English language. *Results* of our work are: 1) 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 hypostasis within the subgroups of pronouns; 2) pronouns 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.

Key words: pronoun, part of speech, substance, conceptual category, prototype.

Problem justification. In modern linguistics in general, and in anglistics in particular there does not exist a unique point of view on categorial status of pronouns. The difficulties of its definition are closely connected with the general problem of definition of the parts of speech which remains topical since the time of Aristotle [9; 13; 15; 32; 33]. There exist a number of grammatical classifications of Parts of Speech, based upon different criteria [1–6; 8–35; 37–39]. The question

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; 17; 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 «nomen» 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].

American structuralist, professor W. Francis refers to pronouns only the words *I, we, you, he, she, it, they, who*. Other words traditionally classified as pronouns he refers to the nouns: full nouns (*somebody, nobody, something, nothing; anybody, anyone, anything, everybody, everyone, everything, someone, no one*) and function nouns (*all, any, both; enough, his, more; much, several, some; no, my, our, your, her, their; none, mine, ours, yours, theirs*) [10]. F. Palmer thinks that the pronoun should be possibly considered as a subclass of the noun because its functions are, to a certain extent, the same. To his opinion it is difficult to unite pronouns according to their morphological categories [cit. from 26, p. 28].

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 a specific reflection of objective reality. It can be illustrated by the references of the personal pronoun *she*. *She* points to a female human not directly but through other notions grammatically expressed by a noun or a noun phrase: a female human(a girl, a woman) → Mary → a human.

The woman wore a fashionable wrap. She wore a fashionable wrap.

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, somebody, 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, syntactically 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 of 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 hypostasis within the subgroups of pronouns.

References

1. Barabash, T. A. (2001), *English grammar [Grammatika anglijskogo yazyka]*, JuNVES, Moscow, 255 p.
2. Barhudarov, L. S. (1975), *Essays on Modern English morphology [Ocherki po morfologii sovremennogo anglijskogo yazyka]*, Vyssh. shk., Moscow, 155 p.
3. Barhudarov, L. S., Shteling, D. A. (1973), *English grammar [Grammatika anglijskogo yazyka]*, Vyssh. shk., Moscow, 423 p.
4. Beaumont, D., Grander, C. (2000), *English Grammar*, Macmillan Publishers Ltd, London, 352 p.
5. Biber, D. et al. (2000), *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*, Pearson Education, Harlow, 1204 p.
6. Blokh, M. Y. (2005), *A Course in theoretical English grammar [Kurs teoreticheskoy anglijskoj grammatiki]*, Vysshaya shkola Publ. House, Moscow, 220 p.
7. Bolinger, D. (1977), *Meaning and form*, Longman, London, 383 p.
8. Close, R. A. (1979), *A Reference grammar for students of English*, Prosveshchenie, Moscow, 342 p.
9. Filmore, Ch. (1957), «The Case for case», *Universals in linguistics theory*, NY., 258 p.
10. Francis, W. N. (1958), *The Structure of American English*, The Ronald Press Co, NY., 614 p.
11. Fries, Ch. (1952), *The Structure of English*, NY., 417 p.
12. Ganshina, N. A., Vasilevskaya, N. M. (1964), *English grammar [Anglijskaya grammatika]*, Vyssh. shk., Moscow, 380 p.
13. Gleason, H. A. (1965), *Linguistics and English Grammar*, NY., 434 p.
14. Gordon, E. M., Krylova, S. B. (2014), *A Grammar of Present-day English [Grammatika sovremennogo anglijskogo]*, Vyssh. shk., Moscow, 335 p.
15. Gurevich, V. V. (2003), *Theoretical Grammar of English [Teoreticheskaya grammatika anglijskogo yazyka]*, Flinta, Moscow, 135 p.
16. Guzeeva, K. A. (2003), *English grammar [Spravochnik po grammatike anglijskogo yazyka]*, Soyuz, Saint Petersburg, 286 p.
17. Hajmovich, B. S., Rogovskaja, B. I. (1967), *Theoretical grammar of English [Teoreticheskaja grammatika anglijskogo jazyka]*, Vyssh. shk., Moscow, 392 p.
18. Huddleston, R. D. (1984), *Introduction to the grammar of English*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 350 p.
19. Huddleston, R., Pullum, G. K. (2002), *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 328 p.
20. Ilyish, B. A. (1965), *The Structure of Modern English language [Struktura sovremennogo anglijskogo yazyka]*, Prosveshchenie, Leningrad, 320 p.
21. Ivanova, I. P., Burlakova, V. V., Pochepcov, G. G. (1981), *Theoretical grammar of modern English [Teoreticheskaya grammatika sovremennogo anglijskogo yazyka]*, Vyssh. shk., Moscow, 285 p.
22. Izrailevich, E. E., Kachalova, K. N. (2009), *English grammar usage [Prakticheskaya grammatika anglijskogo yazyka]*, IVES, Moscow, 450 p.
23. Joly, A. (1975), *Studies in English grammar*, Haskell House Publisher, NY., 295 p.
24. Kaushanskaya, V. N. et al. (2000), *A Grammar of the English language [Grammatika anglijskogo yazyka]*, Flinta, Moscow, 320 p.
25. Komarov, A. S. (2005), *A practical English grammar for students [Prakticheskaja anglijskaya grammatika dlia studentov]*, Flinta, Nauka, Moscow, 243 p.
26. Moiseienko, N.G. (1999), *The meaning and use of the indefinite pronouns in Modern English : Thesis [Znachenie i upotreblenie neopredelennykh mestoimennij v sovremennom anglijskom jazyke : dis. ... kand. filol. nauk : 10.02.04]*, Odessa, 180 p.
27. Morokhovska, E. Ja. (1993), *Fundamentals of theoretical English grammar [Osnovy teoreticheskoy grammatiki anglijskogo jazyka]*, Vysca Skola, Kyiv, 471 p.
28. Plotkin, V. Ja. (1975), *Grammatical systems in English [Grammaticheskie sistemy v anglijskom jazyke]*, Shtiinca, Kishinev, 126 p.
29. Raevska, N. M. (1976), *Modern English grammar [Grammatika sovremennogo anglijskogo jazyka]*, Vysca skola, Kiev, 304 p.
30. Ramsey, S. (1968), *The English language and English grammar*, Haskell House Publishers, NY., 571 p.
31. Reznik, R. V., Sorokina, T. S., Kazarickaja, T. A. (1999), *A Grammar of Modern English usage [Prakticheskaja grammatika anglijskogo yazyka]*, Flinta, Nauka, Moscow, 688 p.
32. Robins, R. H. (1985), *General linguistics : An Introductory survey*, Longman, London, 330 p.
33. Russell, B. (1963), *An Inquiry into meaning and truth*, Penguin Books, Middlesex, 332 p.
34. Seliverstova, O. N. (1988), *The pronoun in language and speech [Mestoimennje v jazyke i rechi]*, Nauka, Moscow, 151 p.
35. Swan, M. (1984), *Practical English Grammar*, Vyssh. shk., Moscow, 552 p.
36. Taylor, J. R., MacLaury, R. E. (Eds.) (1995), *Language and the cognitive construal of the world*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, NY., 312p.
37. Verba, G. V., Verba, L. G. (2005), *Handbook of English Grammar [Dovidnyk z gramatyky anglijskoji movy]*, Osvita, Kyiv, 320 p.
38. Voroncova, G. N. (1960), *Essays on English grammar [Ocherki po grammatike anglijskogo yazyka]*, ILIYA, Moscow, 399 p.

39. Zelenshchikova, A. V., Petrova, E. S. (2003), *A New University English Grammar [Grammatika srovnennogo anglijskogo yazyka]*, Academia, Moscow, 640 p.
40. LD — *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (2000), Longman, Essex, 1668 p.
41. MEDAL — *Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learner* (2002), Oxford Prep, London, 1692 p.
42. *Novejskij filosofskij slovar* (2001), Minsk, 1279 p.
43. Coughlin, W. J. (1984), *The Twelve apostles*, Pan Books, London, 381 p.
44. Francis, D. (1983), *Whip Hand*, Pan Books, London, 256 p.
45. Hunter, J. D. (1966), *The Blue Max*, E. P. Dutton and Co., N.Y., 280 p.
46. Huxley, A. (1974), *After Many a Summer*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 243 p.
47. Huxley, A. (1994), *The Doors of Perception. Heaven and Hell*, Flamingo Modern Classic, 258 p.
48. John, N. (1982), *So Many Tomorrows*, Silhouette Special Ed., London, 250 p.
49. Lottman, E. (1987), *The Morning After*, Arrow Books, London, 192p.
50. O. Henry (1995), *100 selected Stories*, Wordsworth Editions Limited, Ware, Hertfordshire, 735 p.
51. Show, I. (1982), *Acceptable Losses*, Avon Books, NY., 309 p.
52. Steinbeck, J. (1967), *The Long Valley*, Coogi Books, London, 135 p.
53. Wallace, J. (1968), *The Fabulous Showman*, The New English Library, London, 209 p.
54. Wells, H. (1980), *The Door in the Wall*, FLPH, Moscow, 431 p.

МОЙСЕЕНКО Наталя Григорівна,

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри граматики англійської мови, Одеський національний університет імені І. І. Мечникова; Французький бульвар, 24/26, Одеса, 65058, Україна; тел.: +38 093 4388839; +38 067 1087618; e-mail: natalywx@mail.ru; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8465-5519

ГРАМАТИЧНИЙ 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 групи слів. *Методологічно* наше дослідження базується на законах пізнання, на таких психологічних категоріях як концептуальна категорія, архетип. *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 зводяться до наступних положень: 1) теорія прототипів може бути ефективною при розподілі такої різноманітної групи слів як займенник на класи згідно із концептуальними категоріями, які вони віддзеркалюють. Ця теорія також може допомогти пояснити випадки гіпостасиса у підкласах займенників; 2) займенники 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, володіння, локативність, темпоральність, кваліфікативність та квантитивність), що й зумовлює відмінність їх формальних ознак.

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

МОЙСЕЕНКО Наталя Григорівна,

кандидат филологических наук, доцент, доцент кафедры грамматики английского языка, Одесский национальный университет имени И. И. Мечникова; Французский бульвар, 24/26, г. Одесса, 65058, Украина; тел.: +38 093 4388839, 067 1087618; e-mail: natalywx@mail.ru; ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8465-5519

ГРАМАТИЧЕСКИЙ СТАТУС МЕСТОИМЕНИЙ В СОВРЕМЕННОМ АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

Аннотация. *Объектом* нашего исследования являются точки зрения лингвистов относительно грамматического статуса местоимений в современном английском языке. *Предмет* нашего исследования составляют когнитивные характеристики местоимений в современном английском языке и возможности их репрезентации в классификациях местоимений. *Цель* работы сводится к определению адекватных критериев для распределения местоимений по частям речи. *Методологически* наше исследование основывается на законах познания, на таких психологических категориях как концептуальная категория, архетип. *Результаты* нашего исследования содержат принципы классификации местоимений в современном английском языке. Они могут найти применение в ходе преподавания английского языка как иностранного, а также при проведении фундаментальных когнитивных исследования частей речи в английском языке. *Выводы* нашей работы сводятся к следующим положениям: 1) теория прототипов может быть эффективной при разделении такой разнородной группы слов как местоимения на классы в соответствии с теми концептуальными категориями, которые они отражают, эта теория также поможет объяснить случаи гипостасиса в подклассах местоимений; 2) местоимения могут быть объединены на основании общей функции указывать на определенные явления объективной действительности, не идентифицируя их, они соотносятся с различными концептуальными категориями (субстанция, обладание, локативность, темпоральность, кваліфікативность и квантифікативность), что и определяет их формальные различия.

Ключевые слова: местоимение, часть речи, субстанция, концептуальная категория, прототип.

Статтю отримано 8.05.2016 р.